

The Judicial Council of California is the constitutionally created policymaking body of the California courts. The council meets at least six times a year for business meetings that are open to the public and audiocast live via the California Courts website. What follows is a formatted and unedited transcript of the last meeting. The official record of each meeting, the meeting minutes, are usually approved by the council at the next business meeting. Much more information about this meeting, the work of the Judicial Council, and the role of the state court system is available on the California Courts website at www.courts.ca.gov.

>> Good afternoon this is the business meeting for Thursday, July 27, 2017. The meeting is now in session. I remind all people to meet your phones and tablets. This is the first ever today business meeting and we will adjourn later this afternoon and reconvene this morning at 8:30 AM for the remainder of our agenda. I believe members are joining us by phone. Please announce yourselves.

>> Debra Paul. I believe Justice Miller may join us so there -- if there is a great interruption, it may be Miller. [Laughter]. September 15 is an important date in our councils annual agenda because it is the date when the appointments of new or returning councilmembers become effective. This afternoon we had 10 newly appointed are reappointed members who are present and they have had an orientation earlier today. And I think the judicial councilmembers and the staff that facilitated that briefing. Once again, I continue to be grateful that we have such a wealth of talent within the California judicial branch and are Bar Association and that so many are willing to volunteer their time and expertise to join on the judicial Council. I know they are willing to take on what amounts to be a second job and that is to improve statewide judicial administration and to be responsible ultimately to be equal access to justice needs of all Californians and it comes up in many ways for the Council throughout their terms here on counsel. So thank you for all the volunteers and nominations. File appointments to the advisory committees and counsel will come out soon. It's obvious to me from our meetings in today's orientation that we have an incredible institutional knowledge and practical expertise in the Council that comes from our many members. This knowledge not only covers court management and operations but also branch governance and policy making and the important interactions with her sister branches of government are just -- justice system partners in the public. So I encourage all of you who are here and are listening to think about service on the judicial Council, and I would like to take the time now to welcome to the judicial Council no additional work just yet, except for those who have been reappointed, to the new members probably brought touch welcome back presiding Judge Todd Buckley Rachel Hill, and would you please stand if you're here, welcome. Judge Harold Hopp. Presiding Judge Patricia Lucas, Commissioner [Indiscernible] Ms. Gretchen Maria Nelson, Judge Stewart price. Mr. Reichel -- Michael Roddy and Ms. Andrea Rowman. We welcome all of you and thank you for being here today and staying after orientation to observe our afternoon meeting and thank you all for your service and your future service. For the first item is our judicial councilmembers liaison report so Judge Anderson as the executive planning committee will facilitate those. The program provides an avenue to improve the administration of justice by enhancing communication and access between the trial courts and the judicial Council. Today we have two presenters who will

be covering forecourts in our first presenter is Judge Gordon and he will be's reporting in the Superior Court of Fresno in Kings County and her second presenter will be the Honorable. David Gunn who will report on the courts of Shasta and Tehama. Judge Gordon.

>>Thank you. Thank you and I have the honor and -- to report on business to two wonderful courts in our state and I think both of these courts are courts that are taking times of change and challenge and presenting some wonderful opportunities that will hopefully I will go through with you. At Kings County, is in [Indiscernible] area about hundred 50,000 people and one of the things that is interesting is there are about 14,000 state prisoners that we will talk about in a second as population of the county which presents some unique challenges to the court. As you can see, the court is, in the center of the state, it isn't really a rich agricultural area. There are three state prison facilities in Kings County the substance abuse facility and the two prisons in this is significant because it presents a unique workload to this court and changes the workload with some of the risks and other litigation that comes out of these institutions. This is one of the rich agricultural areas in the state and it's a beautiful County that really is -- provides a lot of work for agricultural products in the state. The second biggest employer is the naval air station. It is a diverse operation and what you get between agriculture and tactical fighters. It's a very diverse place. As I said, one of the things with changes and challenges, will see that because of some budget cuts a few years ago, we had actually closed to smaller courtrooms and in 2016 they opened up the court in this is what the artists. It is a beautiful facility and they have done some innovative things at the courthouse. So there are seven judges and one.6 commissioners and 79 staff members. Like many of the courts throughout the state, they have seen a budget reduction and other staff has been reduced from 100 down to 79 and they are still doing some amazing things. This is the interior of the court and it really is a striking building. They did close to other small courtroom some of the challenges as an agricultural court, these are court -- courtrooms and rural areas where the residents that lived in those areas have vital services and had to come up with creative ways to centralize the services without having to put the burden on citizens. So really the opening of the courthouse provided 10 courtrooms, so more courtrooms and they had which means they have room for growth. Even though they had a -- close to operations, being in a single new facility allowed them to streamline and provide even greater services. The new court has also tries -- provides much greater security for the law enforcement and public and the judges. And [Indiscernible] followed by the Kings County police officers Association it's the one piece brought from the old courthouse, some art, into the new courthouse and it is down in the lobby. As I indicated before, because of the state prison population, the writs of habeas corpus present a unique challenge for the judicial officers of Kings County. They run about 50 running writs for each judicial officer and you can see how it lines up two other courts that have these kind of facilities, and Kings is about 59 going down to 13. And Judge Barnes indicated it's a challenge for the courts.

>> A lot of innovative things, they have a self-help center in the court and it provides assistance with the solution matters, paternity, other family law, custody and civil harassment and name changes and some civil actions. Not only are they manning it in hand that they are doing

everything they can to reach out to other parts of the county and provide this very report -- this very important assistance.

>> Citing Judge Barnes here, one of the impressive things just beyond his knowledge, him and Mr. Lewis, the CEO, is he really has become a leader in case management and technology which I will talk about in a second. Their case manager system is very impressive. This is one of the new courtrooms and they are very dutiful and accessible. They are open and there are great workspaces and great places where I think anyone in the courtroom witnesses and jurors have a tremendous two of the proceedings and are extremely accessible. This is there clerks window and public waiting area. It's open and spacious and it provides a great environment for both staff to work in the public and on the right is a have a system where you go up and get a number and you are logged in, so there are not log lines -- long lines. It's more organized and just a pleasant place to be. There is a beautiful new jury assembly room. It is large and it provides much more security for the jurors. That was a real challenge for the environment because they were asking people to come in and provide support and service and the place -- this is a much more positive place. So they have done a great deal of work with their case management system. They have really gone to a paperless environment. And Judge Barnes is really knowledgeable on the system and has been a leading driving force in that.

>> They have not only paperless systems but a virtual desktop. This is the view that the judicial officers have on the bench. It is a very elegant solution that Judge Barnes helped to develop. It was a phenomenally elegant solution and documents are available to the judges and they can stream it quickly and it is an impressive piece of technology and may have gone to a completely paperless system. The biggest challenge is articulating with anyone else is going to one courthouse, they still have -- working to make their courtrooms accessible for the residents in the rural areas, especially with regard to domestic violence and other kinds of restraining orders. They are doing as much outreach as they can trying to come up with solutions. With their caseload, they struggle to get authorized more positions and like all of us sitting around this counsel deal with budget situations as we all do. That is my report on Kings County. Again it was a very impressive court that is really doing a lot of amazing things. Questions.

>> Moved to Fresno. -- I will move to Fresno. I have the honor of meeting with Judge Kimberly Gabe and Alice Simpson the presiding assistant judge there. again, this is one of our Central Valley courts which is right in the heart of California. The home of the Fresno grizzlies and they are very proud of their baseball stadium in the middle of the city of Fresno. It's almost 1,000,000 people living there and it's a large county with 6000 mi.² which is one of the challenges they have in performing their duty. It's the leading agricultural county in the United States. Most of us probably at lunch or dinner are eating something that is a product of our citizens in Fresno. I thought it was interesting. They are very -- they have done a lot of work in looking at this time of change and compression and reevaluating themselves. This is their new mission statement that they have adopted to serve the community and enhance public trust and confidence in the administration of justice through the disc -- impartial and timely resolution of disputes and in compliance with the law and court orders in fostering a vital community

relationship that gives equal access to the courts. I think they are really living this mission statement. It's a fairly large court with 43 judges and six commissioners and 526 staff members. It's a good sized court. They operate multiple facilities and the civil courthouse is their main one downtown and a newer juvenile delinquency court facility and the M St. courthouse other primary court facilities. It was a response to some of the challenges and what they have to do is go to new and interesting ways to extend the resources they have. They have a very active video interpreting service and they have a very diverse county with needs for language interpreters and they have gone to working with a video service so they say they are getting great results with those and they also have had the challenge of having to restrict some of their rural court due to budget cuts, and they are now using a remote video proceeding to allow Wirral residents to access courts through traffic tickets and those kind of things so that those people can get their business done with the court without having to drive great distances and they are having such great success with this video project they're looking to expand this to other areas and other types of engagement. They have gone to a E citation program where the primary law enforcement agencies are all doing these so it allows officers to file immediately through the citations, and they have also started a new electronic dashboard. This is where they are getting their reports electronically from probation and from some of their drug treatment and they are really working to make their justice partners be able to access their courts through the electronic text -- desktop as much as they can. This is down to the point that their risk assessment work and probation using the desktop to generate task -- text is something they are doing. They are looking to every way they can extend technology. They have gone to a E PCD system and a E search warrant system. Judge gave said this really made the search warrant process easier and allows for more interaction by the judicial officers with the police officers, law enforcement agencies. There unlimited civil filings when paperless and 2016 and probate in family had just gone in July and they are working very quickly on both the juvenile and criminal sections to go paperless. For the case management and technology is a primary mission of the court. They are doing some amazing and innovative things. They are doing some really innovative things. They have the Fresno veterans court, which I thought this headline from the be was very interesting which seeks to rehabilitate, not incarcerate, veterans. Starting in 2016, it's an innovative collaborative veterans court that is getting notice from throughout the state and nation. They have extended out, when prop 47 came through like many other counties, they saw a real change in the way their drug court, programs, are working. They used that as an opportunity to revamp their drug court. This is a very innovative and collaborative partnership. They are using that drug court to really leverage his service and navigate defendants into recovery and supported services and they say they are having tremendous success were other counties are really having challenges. They started a family dependency treatment court to assist families in crisis and work through the issues that are associated with parental drug issues. And they just got a grant that are starting to innovate with a new human trafficking court to address some of the needs of juvenile victims of human trafficking. They have a dedicated court that is really impressive and looking for new ways to handle every challenge that comes forward. Any questions? Thank you for the opportunity to visit these two wonderful courts.

>> The next report will be from Commissioner gone and he will first start with Shasta and then [Indiscernible]? Or just wait until the PowerPoint to see if I guessed that great.

>> Well if it's queued up it will start with just a -- Shasta. I am sure it will be. A great deal of faith over here. On April 5, 2017, I visited the Shasta County Superior Court and met with the judges and commissioners and CEO and staff. We tour the facilities and had a very pleasant lunch meeting. Shasta County is in the northern part of California and Siskiyou County is to the north and Modoc County is to the northeast and Lassen County is to the east. [Indiscernible] counties to the southeast and Colusa County is to the south and Trinity County to the West. The county has a total square area of 3847 mi.² and as of January 1, 2016, the estimated population was 178,000 as of January 1, 2016, the estimated population was 178,592. The county seat is the city of Reading and Shasta County with one of the original counties in the state of California created in 1850 at the time of statehood. The County was named after Mount Shasta which was the name of a tribe that once lived in the area. Shasta County has an unemployment rate of about 5.1 percent. The Shasta court has five locations including the main courthouse. The justice center, a modular building, a juvenile location and a branch court in Bernie which was closed in 2013 due to budgetary constraints. Juvenile delinquency calendars were just recently relocated to the main courthouse in order to take full advantage of scarce judicial resources where the need is greatest and in addition the court leases space for the collections division. The presiding judge is the honorable Gary Gibson. The assistant presiding judge is the honorable Daniel Flynn. The court executive officer is Ms. Melissa Fowler Bradley and the assistant court executive officer is Mr. John size. The current courthouse was built in 1955 and was designed as a County office building. A partial remodel took place in 1994 and 1995 and the building is unsafe and inadequately sized for the courts current day-to-day operations. The buildings heating and air-conditioning system is a problem in the summer and winter. With that feeling in the hot summer months and the boiler feeling to stay lit in the winter. Single pane windows cause additional problems, and they do little to provide any barrier from street noise. Courtrooms at the front of the building have to stop each time a train passes through town because of the noise. A new courthouse was funded in 2009 as an SB 1407 project and working drawings were completed in 2016, and the for courtroom building which would consolidate all court operations under one roof, awaits approval to move into construction. The site has been acquired across the street from the existing courthouse and demolition of the buildings on the acquired site is occurring now. It had become an eyesore for the community and a haven for illegal drug activity. The Shasta court has 10 judges -- 10 judges and 10 commissioners. In addition one full-time assigned judge has historically been allocated, although the court struggles to find an assigned judge willing to sit with such frequency. The most recent judicial need assessment indicates Shasta should have 16.7 and officers according to workload statistics and an additional four points of the judicial officers. To vacant judgeships were filled shortly after my visit. An additional vacancy will occur in the next month. Shasta has a .6 child support mission or plus an additional .3 for child support, 1058 services rendered for Trinity County. The demand for assigned judges far surpasses the supply of retired judges willing to sit. Budget for the fiscal year 2016, 2017, including grant funding is 18,000,970 2016, 2017, including

grant funding is \$18,975,116. The projected fund balance is still a moving target. The court is in the process of replacing most of the computers, which are over eight years old and well beyond the three-year replacement standard. The fiscal year 1516 budget was \$17,961,061 with expenditures of 17,000 775,000 \$775,006 leaving a balance of \$565,899. The courts currently has 188.5 nonjudicial support staff. This by the way is a view of the clerks area in the court. The number is somewhat inflated compared to other courts because Shasta has a marshal's office with 27 positions in a collection division with 22 positions. This is the sign which is over one of the break areas in the courthouse. I will get off of that. This is a picture of the statue of justice, lady of liberty, that came from one of the original courthouses, and it is tied up in a corner awaiting the new courthouse because it will have a place of honor in the new courthouse if the funding ever arrives. This is the jury assembly area in the existing courthouse. In addition to the court has another five positions that work for the integrated justice system which supports a shared case management system for all justice agencies in Shasta County and the DA public defender probation in the court. The team is funded by all of the agencies on a pro rata basis. A total of 26.5 they can divisions are being carried at this time. The vacancies are a result of normal attrition. Some courts have been held -- some physicians have been held in order to come within budget and a lack of space to house additional staff. The court does not outsource any services. All staff are located in a complex of three buildings including the main courthouse and Annex and the justice center and a modular building. You need to the Shasta court is a marshal's office. Since they are in-house, they are part of the court family. They provide security, transportation of inmates and intensities, subject to County reimbursement, serving warrants at night and on weekends, and administering the prearrangement release program. Court has made a number of organizational changes since 2013 when they began converting archived records to digital. And thereby eliminated least storage costs. The project is ongoing. I got a demonstration of it while I was there and it's incredible how fast these digitizers will go through a stack of papers. But there is a lot of paper in a file and they multiply it times the number of files we got and it is tremendous. But it's interesting to watch. Traffic filings have been paperless for several years and the misdemeanor arraignment department now operates with a single summary sheet instead of court files. Court has been rebuilding since a labor strike in 2013 and layouts and 2014 a branch court was closed and hours of operation had then reduce. Trying to fill positions and return to normal hours has been much more difficult than anticipated. Effective in January of this year, the court restored hours to the public. However, they continue to lose employees to better paying jobs, positions out of the area, and retirement. The courts current case management system was installed in 1992. The system is the only fully integrated system in California. The other justice agencies have a separate modules within the system, which allows the sharing of information between agencies according to security parameters. As a group, they began looking at newer systems and have collectively decided it's time to move forward with a new system. The court has yet to identify funding options and the justice agencies are also exploring how they may seek funding so they all can move together. In spite of the problems, the judiciary and staff seem to be very positive. All were very friendly and accommodating and they are all dedicated professionals and the citizens of Shasta County should be proud of that. This is a jury room by the way. I like to take pictures of odd things. This is the notice on the door that goes into the jury room telling them not to use the restroom,

which is to the door that comes from the jury room into the restroom. Like I say, I like odd things. This is the judge's parking lot. Now what you need to notice about this is the sniper position on top of the public parking lot over near upper left-hand corner. Law enforcement would get a real kick out of that picture. This is the juvenile courthouse, the modular courthouse that I was talking about. This concludes my report. I will deposit this report along with a written part in pictures with the judicial Council staff. Thank you.

>> I must say, well we are changing up, I had mostly small counties, which are counties close to where I am, my home-court. I will say that the attitude of people that I talk to, and I know that I probably talk to the upper echelons of the court system, but they are all positive. In spite of the problems and budget cuts, they are all happy to see me and nobody complained too much. They complained a little, and then they promoted themselves a little. It was just nice. It was nice to go throughout the state, at least throughout Northern California in spite of some of the state of Jefferson comments that you hear from the northern part of the state. Gave hasn't started with the Tama presentation. That is why I wanted to finish with that. I did this on purpose. Beside that you were the last one is visited. On May 5, 2017 I visited the Tehama Superior Court and met with the judicial officer see you in staff and we toured the facilities and had a very pleasant lunch with the staff on staff appreciation day. Tehama County is in the northern part of the state and Shasta County is to the north and Plumas County to the east and Glenn and Butte counties are to the south and Mendocino County is to the southwest and Trinity County is to the west. The county has a total Square area of 2962 2962 mi.². As of January 1, 2016, the estimated population was 63,934. The county seat is the city of red Bluff. The Sacramento River dissects the county. The County was formed in 1856 from parts of Butte to Lisa and Shasta counties. Famous early personalities included Kit Carson, Jedediah Smith, John Fremont, and William B I'd called the only and first President of the California Republic. The unemployment rate is about five points 6 percent. The Honorable. -- presiding judge of the court is [Indiscernible] as we all know and I can pronounce his name. You are welcome. Assistant presiding judge is the Honorable. Matthew Glenn and the court executive officer is missed Karen Downing and his assistant court executive officer is Michelle Haney. The port -- court has four judges with one vacancy recently filled and 1 quart Commissioner. As with other northern courts, the Tehama court finds it difficult to find a judge from the assigned judges program willing to sit in Tehama County for an extent -- extended period of time but is nonetheless able to call on retired judges as needed. For the fiscal year 2016, 17 the beginning fund balance was \$1,045,073 and the total revenues are estimated at \$5,384,144 with total estimated expenditures at 5,663,000 5,663,900 [Indiscernible] and an estimated ending balance of \$765,234 which represents a 27 percent decrease from 20,015 and -- 2015 and 2016. This is the old courthouse which was a combination city Council chambers and it has city staff and court staff and one courtroom up above as I recall and the city Council chambers which was used as a second courtroom. Beautiful old building, but totally unworkable it comes to any kind of efficiency. There is the sign for the new courthouse. This is one of the courtrooms in the new courthouse and it can be explained more about this but it's a courtroom designed in the round. So rather than just have four walls, everybody gets equal access to everybody, the litigants and the jury in the judge and staff. This is one of the innovations that Tehama County County went

through. This courtroom has a dual purpose. If you look on the far end of the courtroom you will see there is the typical unusual court facilities. And then that dark space that runs to the ceiling, a wall can be drawn through there so you can have a conference room in the back. It can be conducted while court is in session upfront. So it's one of the many innovations that Tahema County incorporated into their new courthouse. Tahema County is very proud of its new courthouse. It replaced told -- for total facilities, two of which were overcrowded and consolidated services under one roof and provides a more efficient operations and better access to justice for court users and these numbers are interesting. The original budget was 78,000,000+. At this is the final budget been pared down to 56,000,000+. The project came in under budget at \$48,300,607. A savings of \$7,796,393. Nice job. Groundbreaking occurred on send -- September 17, 2014 and the court took possession of the five courtrooms 62,000 sq. ft. building on August 26 cut 2016, and began occupying the building last October 17. This is a mural in the lobby of the new courthouse, which brings the past into the future. That is a mural from the logo, the sign on the old courthouse. Jury assembly area and one of the jury checking computers and clerk stations are all beautiful and well laid out. Staff are all happy and they were smiling. They did not know who I was and were still smiling. The motto of the Superior Court is collaboration, efficiencies, success. To that end, they have developed a number of innovations and efficiencies. The Tahema County behavioral health court is a collaboration between the court competition department, Tahema County health services agency, and the center of the evaluation and research. It serves individuals with felony convictions to have a severe and persistent mental health disorder. The program divide -- provides intensive supervision, drug treatment, to help treatment, random drug testing, and a host of supportive social services. The adult cell in drug court is a collaboration between the court Dist. Atty. Scott public defenders, probation, Tahema County health services agency, the Tahema County Department of Social Services, and the Tahema County employment and education programs. It is a specialty treatment court that handles felony court cases involving people with significant substance abuse disorders and involves extensive use of comprehensive probation supervision, drug testing, treatment services, vocational and educational services, and frequent court appearances. Family treatment and recovery court is a collaboration between the court, child protective services, Tahema County health services agency, and the drug and alcohol division, and parents. It's a solution focused model designed to ensure that participants receive appropriate services as part of their reunification plan, including, but not limited to, drug and/or alcohol treatment services, parenting, mental health services, and visitation. The juvenile behavioral health court is a collaboration between the court, Dist. Atty., public defenders, probation, Tahema County health services agency, the drug and alcohol and mental health divisions, and local community-based organizations. It's an intervention program for 602 so the County juvenile Court who is significant substance abuse issues. The interventions focus on intensive substance abuse treatment and family therapy and probation supervision. This is with frequent court appearances and frequent drug and alcohol testing an individual and group and family counseling. This is the children's waiting area in the new courthouse. The collaborative self-help family and juvenile innovations grant is a project which expands the ability to collaborative is collaboratively use remote videoconferencing technology to 13 courts to overcome geographic and technological barriers to improve access to justice. This technology

will breach the often underserved and remote court users and provide them with the tools to more effectively participate in their cases. The cornerstone of the project is to ensure that every participating court has adequate bandwidth and technological infrastructures in their court facilities to support a self-help program that can be used collaboratively -- collaboratively by sharing self-help resources between courts. Collaboration, efficiencies, and success. This is the parking lot behind the new courthouse and this is where the staff appreciation day was in this is the outside eating facilities, probably not being used today unless you have some huge fan and sprinkler systems. There is the new courthouse. And to finish it out, there it is at night. The citizens of Tahema County have a right to be proud of their Tahema County Superior Court and the dedicated professionals who work there and. This concludes my report and I will deposit this report along with the various written materials and pictures that I received from the court with the judicial Council staff. Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to visit my fellow courts.

>> That includes the member liaison reports. I think the courts for their cooperation and sharing this information and providing the photos and to the members for going there and talking with them and hearing the details of how they operate. And what they need and how well they are doing with efficiencies knowing full well the demand is still out for the court. I understand Justice Miller has joined us by phone and is now on the line along with Deborah. Next on our agenda is her education agenda, which is often of interest to the public and especially the courts. It refers to the judicial branch technology update and you have heard a lot about it in these liaison court visits and let me tell you a far cry from where we were seven years ago. This is the judicial Council information-technology transformation in case management system replacements and I understand that we may not have a person in the public who wishes to speak to IT on this education is -- education item. I will have Judge Anderson call for public comment. The Council welcomes public comment and it allows members of the public to express their ideas and state their consent on policy matters. I do believe we have one person today who will be speaking on a specific agenda item, and it's the judicial branch technology update and we do have Mitch Smith. If you are present, you can step forward and you have three minutes to speak. I will let you know when there is one minute left and when there are 30 seconds left. Your comments will be directed to the judicial branch technology update and tomorrow morning is our public comment that is for general areas of judicial administration, so I am assuming your comments are directed towards technology. Is that correct?

>>Yes.

>>We will go ahead. Introduce yourself and you have three minutes.

>>You may refer to me as Mitchell Smith Chief Justice judicial Council and members of the staff, it's an honor to serve the needy today. I would like to state that I have honored judges of the last 30 years and in recent time, the school principal at a school named cornerstone Christian school in Antioch. I have been kicked out of the school be turned -- because I turned

in a paper to the court that said that I volunteered and then from his lawyer, I was arrested by Homeland security --

>> Mr. Smith. I apologize for interrupting you. I haven't heard anything so far with respect to technology. If you would like to comment on General. administration of justice that is tomorrow morning at eight Mr. Smith. I apologize for interrupting you. I haven't heard anything so far with respect to technology. If you would like to comment on General. administration of justice that is tomorrow morning at 830 in the morning. If it does not involve technology, I can ask you to have a seat and would love to hear from you in the morning.

>>Thank you, Chief Justice, I appreciate it.

>>Judge Slough and [Indiscernible] welcome.

>>Thank you, chief. I know we got started a little bit behind schedule and we may be running a little bit late. So rather than me drone on, let me just simply say, that you will know we like to come before you two or three times a year to update you on progress and various technology initiatives that are in play and Rob [Indiscernible] who is the new director for us at GCI T came in with energy and ideas and a desire to transform his book of business and he has been well received by staff and the court and by all of us, and I would like to say thank you for all you are doing, Rob. You may charge ahead.

>>Thank you, Justice Slough. I will give you a brief update on the two topics. The first one is the transformation of the judicial Council information-technology office and the second one is a quick update on our case management system replacements. So all the work we do is really driven by strategic planning and the goals for the branch Drive the goals for technology, which then drive technology initiatives. The technology initiatives are really driven by the strategic plan which was adopted in 2014 as a reminder we do have four goals of the branch technology that is to promote the digital court is the first one and you heard some good examples of moving towards the digital court in the liaison reports just a few minutes ago. With the importance of having a digital court, and making sure we are optimizing our infrastructure so that it is robust and resilient and that is essential. This is because we have scarce resources, our third goal is to optimizer branch resources, and the fourth goal is to promote rule and legislative changes so we can move from a paper-based court to a digital court. The technical -- tactical plan was approved by judicial Council at its March 24 meeting, and the tactical plan outlines all of the technology projects and initiatives that didn't support the overall branch technology goals. The branch works on these goals together as an IT community, which brings together the various courts, the judicial Council, various committees, anybody who has an interest in technology that has an input and voice to helping guide the direction of technology. So we feel we are working as a full IT community, not just of technology but as a branch. When I had started my position last November, I did reach out to all of the courts to get their input to see what they thought was working well with judicial Council IT and what needed improvement and so that became the basis for a brand-new business plan for judicial Council IT, and so we

fine-tuned our business focused to make sure that we are providing enterprise IT leadership, where individual courts are providing technology leadership at the court level and JC IT is providing that at the branch level. We do this by implementing for different types of programs and the first one is making sure we have a strong set of baseline services and those are then obsoleted as time allows and replaced by new services and new services then it created through the innovation that happened both at the branch level and at the local court level. Again, due to a lot of the scarce resources cost of the challenges, especially that you have heard in the smaller court, we also want act as a trusted IT advisor especially for the small quartz. So earlier this year we held a small quartz Summit where we brought together a lot of the small quartz to talk about their business challenges and talk a little bit about different ways and resources that we could help them. And finally we are establishing a program management office to make sure we have the consistency and well-managed portfolio of services. One of the big focuses in the new JC IT is really this focus on new services. What we are doing is we are identifying this process called productize thing court innovations. What happens typically is that many courts are good at innovating at the local court level and they come up with great ideas but it's difficult for courts to leverage that because of either resources or knowledge in a particular technology. And so we see that JC IT has a role in helping courts productize quartz innovation so the IT community can come together and take a look at all the wonderful things happening at the individual court level and then determine which one of those things they would like to spread across the entire branch. So JC IT can take a role then to coordinate and help facilitate the product is Asian of that individual court innovation to make sure that is shared across all of the individual courts. That is one of the new focuses for JC IT. On July 1, we announced our new organization. There is nothing very spectacular about the new structure. It's a pretty standard IT organization. What is important to notice is there is a strong link which -- linkage to the others because we are the IT department for judicial Council. So making sure that we had a tight linkage to our customers is very very important. So again as a member of the IT community, we are listening to what the needs are and making sure that the new services that are being created address all those needs. So what I have been telling our team and I have been telling the courts is that this transformation of judicial Council IT is not going to be happening all in one fell swoop. It happens one interaction at a time. And so as we roll out our business plan, as we interact with all of the courts, we act as a trusted IT advisor. I think you'll see a change in the way JC IT interacts. So that transformation is going to happen -- happen over time one interaction at a time. That is a quick update on judicial Council IT. Any questions before we go on to the case does -- case management system?

>> I just wanted to express appreciation for the small quartz Summit. It was wonderful and the ongoing staff support and being readily available to assist particularly small quartz and consultation is very beneficial. Thank you.

>> I will provide you with a brief update on case management systems. We do have limited time today and there is a tremendous amount of detail and we have a lot of data around different courts and different systems and counts and things like that. I won't go into that level of detail today due to the amount of time. However, if you are interested in such a report, I am happy to

come back at a future date to provide that level of detail. At this time we thought it would be important to provide a high level update so that you have a good idea of strategically where we are headed with case management systems across the branch. As a quick overview, and the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal, they used the appellate court case management system and that is a custom developed and supported system that is maintained by the judicial Council. It's electronic filing and it is in progress for that system. For the superior courts they use a variety of custom developed County shared an off-the-shelf solutions. And that is where the majority of my update will focus on. I am going to provide a quick timeline update so you have a sense of some of the events that have brought us to our current status. In 2002, we started the develop meant of the management system and at that same time we launched an interim case management system program to deploy interim case management system to the small quartz and in 2006, CCM S version 3 deployment began and then in 2012, the project was canceled and that same year, the information technology managers form built basically with a set of courts came together and published a case management request for proposal so that we could establish a Master services agreement for case management systems. Master of services agreement basically allows any court within the branch to acquire one of the three vendors that were selected for the Master services agreement and that eliminates the need for an individual court to need to go through the full process which is typically a very lengthy process and can last up to six or nine months potentially. We wanted to establish this so that it was easy for the courts to be able to select case management systems. In 2014, there was a plan that was initiated to migrate the courts using the and term case management system to a more modern one and that same year the judicial branch strategic plan was published and in 2016, we received a budget change proposal to migrate the four courts using the CMS version 3 to a modern platform and this year we received a budget change proposal to migrate the nine courts on the interim case management system to a more modern platform. That is just a quick timeline to bring you up to speed on where we have been and to give you a little bit of context in the two BCPs we have received. In terms of the overall monetization -- modernization we are in phase 1. This is the foundation save replacing all of our older case management systems with more modern case management systems. The first wave of that phase was with court funded replacements so were courts have their own funding available cut I went ahead and they leverage to the Master services agreement and they acquired new case management systems and started to implement that. Courts are in the process of doing that in some courts are complete. Most courts are in the middle of their implementation and we expect that will go on for a few more years. Just started with the version 3 replacements as a result of the receipt of the BCP and this year we have received the BCP for replacing the enter from case management systems. We just had a lunch meeting for the nine courts who are going to be replacing those systems. The last wave of this phase, are really than the courts have not yet upgraded any of their systems. So we have courts to have funded their own and we have the version 3 replacements and the interim CMS replacements and then there are a set of courts, about 10 at this point who have not yet upgraded any of their systems. So over time, we have seen, is that the number of case management products, so these are the number of actual individual products, not implementations but products in use has actually gone down. Historically, we have had almost 25 different products, and each court on average had about two different case

management systems and currently we have just over 15 products now within the branch and we anticipate that over time this will go down to just over five. And that consolidation is basically the strategy of the individual courts. There is no overall mandate for courts to reduce the number of systems that we have Cobbett over time, what courts are finding is that from an operational perspective, it is more efficient to reduce the number of systems that they need to manage at a local level and to consolidate those. What we are also seeing, as with groups of courts as they consolidate to a common platform there is a lot more leverage and a lot more collaboration that can happen. And so I talked a little bit about the IT community. There is a great community focused now on the individual case management systems where they are innovating on those individual platforms. As we get fewer and fewer systems, or more of that innovation can be shared across the branch. So we have that benefit. Again, not due to any mandate, but due to just natural business decisions and consolidation, we expect that number will shrink down. Overall we have had 30 courts that have actually taken advantage and utilized the master service agreement to upgrade their case management systems. In terms of next steps you want to continue the development and execution of the case management roadmap. Again, we are in the foundation phase. Once we get all of the courts at least up on some sort of modern case management system we would like to the beginning expanding on those services to then promote the digital court services and so we will continue down that road and in a second step is really to prepare a budget change proposal to replace those case management systems at those courts that have not upgraded any systems today. That is that fourth wave that I showed you on that roadmap. That is on your agenda today for approval. That concludes my update. If you have any questions, I will answer them.

>>Just assumes.

>>You mentioned we are reducing the number of case management products being used and that sounds good to me and you project there will be about six at the end of -- in the period. I assume or maybe I shouldn't assume that all of those six management systems will be able to talk to each other and and a great and integrate with the AC CMS?

>>The intent is all monist -- modern system should have some sort of data exchange in its they so they can exchange information between them. We don't have a strategy down the road where all case management systems are going to talk to all of the systems. So for example you would not be able to get onto a system in Tehama and see all the cases in Sacramento for example but because of the standard interfaces we would expect that we would have a common way to exchange information with our justice partners for example the DMV or the Department of Justice and that also gives us the ability to create more value added services on top of the case management system so that we can have better scheduling systems and make case information more available to the public and be able to generate more reports as well as a result of that so the intent is for the modern case management systems to have more interface capabilities so we can exchange data more readily.

>> Thank you, Rob. So just in conclusion, you have to listen really fast when you work with Rob. [Laughter]. He works and talks fast and as you can see he has a lot of energy so thank you Rob. And thank you judge for your comment about the small court summit technology Summit that was produced. Justice Chin joined us as did Justice Buckley and Judge Brodie and there were over 80 members present and I will talk a little bit more about it tomorrow, but it also sets us up nicely for our branch wide technology Summit which is upcoming in August. I think it's a testament to progress and need and the intersection of those two topics that we have a maximum capacity of 150 people to join us at that branch wide technology Summit and within a matter of days we were over 140. So there is a lot of energy and a lot of good work and we have presented on work streams and other issues and ideas and thank you to all the members who participated at JC TC as well as member -- all of the members who work on the various work streams. Thank you. I really appreciate the history that you condensed into the years where you indicated the work and an outline of the work and I know a great deal of the came from the trial courts and that is when you were in the trial court's. We are in a far different place and so I thank you for that.

>>Thank you.

>>The next item is our trial courts update of resource assessment study model. This is an action item and you will find it, as you know, in your materials. It is 17-077. We welcomed Lia Rose Goodman -- Leah Rose-Goodwin. A great topic to talk about his numbers when you are very hot and running behind.

>>I have lots of slides. We did something different this time.

>>Right. Thank you for having us today and thank you for inviting us. Everyone here knows what this is an what RAS is and we have gone over this many times with all of you. I am the chair of the advisory committee and for reference we do two things, study how many judges the state of California needs and how many managers the employees and the court needs. Today where only talking about the workload of our staff and managers and we're not talking about judges. That is another report to happen at a future date. We did a workload study in 2016 and we got 20 courts or so to participate and we had Amador Contra Costa El Dorado and Fresno and Humboldt Lake and Los Angeles and Merced and orange and Sacramento and San Diego and San Francisco and then to her and [Indiscernible] to give us two weeks of their staff time. And we did a study which we will go into in more detail what we took the compilation of that data, millions of points of data and came up with case weights and what we will talk about today is having all of you consider our case weights and adopting our model. The things I want you to know, because I know the report was detailed and I know that all of you burned the midnight oil last night in detail reading it because all of us love number so much. At this time when we were looking at the Delphi, which is a focus group. After we get them look at all the documentation in the minutes, we go back and do checks afterwards and make sure to validate and verify our data. In the past we have added minutes to the case weights. This is based on information that we have received and this time the group had a very vigorous discussion about

modifying the actual data and felt that our data was collected in a way we're getting good at it. We are doing it completely and house and there was no reason to add anything from the focus groups. It was more of a check and didn't need to modify the material. Number two, the other change that you will see that I wanted to point out and highlight for all of you is that we change the number of minutes or what I like to do is talk about the number of days per year that we are allocating to each worker. The Department of finance uses days of 232 days and what our study shows is that our workers work about 219 days but what we couldn't tell you that is an average, that is that it is different. Depending on the size of your County or some of the things that the presentations that talked about the different courts that have different locations in jails etc., things can change in the number of days and how your employees are working and we had an old workforce and maybe they have repetitive motion and I have a lot of vacation accrued versus the new workforce within have as much vacation so to standardize it, we have now adopt to the Department of finance number of days per year of 232. So what we will be asking you today is to approve the updated model components of RAS and those are shown on attachment three in column C. And Leah will go into more detail and I just wanted to give you an overview knowing that you -- we are behind schedule and it is hot in here. If you guys don't have a lot of questions, we will just get right to the point.

>>Thank you. So I want to back up for a little bit and mentioned that RAS comes up for the Council really into context every year. We use the three most recent years of filing data to estimate a workload need which is then converted into final allocation using [Indiscernible-low volume]. Then approximately every five years we update the RAS model to double check or to update the workload measures that are used to estimate staffing, and it is the latter that is the purpose of today's report, so we had just concluded a study to update the way we measure court workload and we come to you with these updated measures. So now I will talk more specifically about RAS. It's a weighted caseload methodology. Over 25 states use this method to measure court workload and as Judge Alksne pointed out it only estimates the time needed by court staff. If you can imagine, the judges expand different amounts of time depending on the type of matter being heard so we study those two population separately. The basis of weighted caseload is just that from types of cases require different resource levels. If you think about the workload required in an and fractions case versus a felony, those are very different patterns of work. So we can't treat of filing like a filing like a filing. We differentiate. Attachment one gives a more detailed overview of how we compute the need for staff using RAS and it explains all the various components that go into it. But at its most basic, it takes a three-year average of filings and it multiplies those the case weights and divide by the number of minutes were days available to staff. And that value is the value that she mentioned previously. Today's report is an update of a model that was first approved by the Council in July previously. Today's report is an update of a model that was first approved by the Council in July 2005 and it was later updated in 2013 and also we had made an interim adjustment to the RAS model to measure complex civil workload approved in 2005. It is important fundamentally for the branch to periodically update the workload measures to capture changes in the law and technology" practice. The measures that we are asking the council to approve today include changes in workloads such as property seven and the increase of programs for

juveniles which changes the remaining caseload of juvenile delinquency and recommendations passed by the Elkins task force and criminal realignment and those are some of the issues that have come up since the city -- study was last updated in 2013. One thing I want to point out is we are familiar with trends in court filings overall, and I think many of us might think that the trend in court filings has been on a decline. I do want to point out that the volume of workload is measured by filings. But the actual workload of the case is the depth of work or the amount of resources needed and it seems to have gone up and in some case type since the last time we did the study. Very basically, the time study that Judge Alksne alluded to, we conducted it in a group of the courts working 60 percent of workloads Kate -- statewide in these range from Los Angeles to [Indiscernible] and I try to capture a range of size and geographic location and funding levels and over 4000 court staff participated in the study and everyone from clerks to record management staff to legal research attorneys and they participated by providing detailed information on the types of tasks that they perform in the course of their workday. And I want to give a special thanks to those court who participated. It's really an all hands on deck effort to make the study work and we have to have 100 percent participation and I want to say that the feedback we received, it mirrors something that Commissioner Don said earlier. They said they are glad to be part of the process and thankful for be involved in this aspect of the work so we heard a lot of things like that and it also happens with the support of court leadership, both on the administrative side of the judges and so I just want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to work with the courts on this. So we talked about the time study itself and how it's used to establish these various weights that measure the quantity of resources or the amount of time needed to process various matters. We did see changes in weights as a mentioned before the trend in filings goes one direction and the workload trends follow a different pattern. We so many efficiencies realized and infractions and traffic workload and we would expect those are areas that benefit greatly from things like scanning or automated processes. We did see that for some case types the amount of time needed was greater than in previous and we can give you an example. We saw higher weights in small claims and unlawful detainer cases and we are -- our data we try to click from other sources show there is more fee waivers being requested and more continuances in these cases and now a record sealing requirement in the unlawful container that does offer better protection to attend and seeking housing but it does add some steps for staff. These cases are also predominantly or exclusively brought by self represented litigants and anecdotal data that we gather in the court suggests that there are more demands for assistance in these cases than the resources we have available.

>> So with that, I think we discussed that the staff value, that is the amount of time that staff have available for courts and staff to work on those cases. We had a discussion about that and there is a recommendation. The recommendation is contained is that we used the year value that aligns with what the Department of finance abuses, the assumptions that they use and it brings the branch consistent with those other models. I think we have covered all that we were going to lay out. But we do have some time for questions if there is any questions about methodology.

>> This is hard work. And I want to thank Leah and her team. Thank you. I think Justice Humes has a question.

>>I recognize how hard this work is. It seems almost impossible to me. My first question is about three Delphi issue and these case weights you are recommending the adoption of three Delphi case weights. So if I understand that correctly, that means, unless I am wrong, that case backlogs don't get counted as part of forming a calculation so the court that might have a whole lot of backlog want get any increase in their proportionate funding because of that backlog. Is that right?

>>Well, partially. It could be. It could be they were working on that backlog money -- we did the time study. The work would have been calculated. One of the issues we saw with backlog is it didn't consider -- occur consistently in the same volume and in the same places. So I think of it as more -- it's not something that we can include comprehensively into a case weight because it doesn't occur uniformly enough among the courts. It wouldn't necessarily be true that by adopting this pre-Delphi proposal that courts with bigger backlogs would necessarily be less in terms of their percentage or formula calculation. It would be what happened during the survey study. All right. One other question. This is on the work they value. So I understand that you are recommending that we go with the current finances work devalues and I understand ours are different. Is there any actual real-life consequence for going with one or the other in terms of -- because using their workday value, won't that and up with essentially the same formula and percentages for each court whether they use their formula or are formula?

>>Right. Every court is affected the same way. What is changing is the total amount of need tickets computed. This is the denominator is the same for everybody, no one court benefits over the other. I think one point I forgot to make regarding the value is in looking at court workload, although we did see very and -- variation as Judge Alksne mentioned, we didn't see within court workload sufficient differentiation from how the state uses a work your value to say that court workload is somehow different. I think like in the corrections world you can argue that you have to staff facilities 24 seven, and that would require a different calculation from what the state administrative manual lays out. But the basic bones of the hours of service and what not are essentially consistent. The reason I ask is it seems to me like -- it bothers me a little bit that the Department of finance is telling us what it thinks are workload is and what our time value should be when we have done our own analysis and we have come up with something different. It seems to me that it is more solid than what they are proposing. My being bothered by that, I guess, doesn't matter if it ends up not having any real-life consequence in terms of reforming our allocations.

>>Yes. And I do think because it is applied uniformly that it doesn't impose some sort of standard on the court. But it is one of these items that we did say this might be something we want to look at down the road with more time and you really delve into different leave policies at the courts have. But my sense is because we are applying that uniformly that we are not adversely affecting 1 quart or another. It's changing the overall calculation.

>>Thank you, Leah I will be quick. It's hot. Leah, the program 10, 10, and 90, for the formula called the denominator is the same for everyone. But the average filings, Commissioner gone when he was in Tama doing his site visit and thank you again for that report, talked about the difference for example like the counties the DA may file with codefendants in Bute versus Tahema. Is there anything factored in for standard deviation or anything like that where you can say we know it's not the same in every county that we have to factor something in that is an offset. Does that ever come up or is that factored in?

>> We try as much as possible to standardize how courts are reporting the filings and other information. There is a working group of advocates that have established and refined some of the ways that these different matters are filed. I think there is always a little bit of like a factor that assesses workload that is not directly tied to any particular case. For example, and felony matters can we also presume that there are other types of work that other court staff is doing that is not tied to a felony but that we still have to account for and in some ways the filing acts as a proxy for workload including some of these other factors. It's also an average of processes across the city courts. So while it is not laserlike in its precision, it does try to capture the universe of possible outcomes. I just wanted to clarify Justice Humes question. The question on the backlog is whether or not we are measuring and studying all the work being done at that moment. It doesn't matter whether a court has a backlog or it doesn't. They don't get credit are not one where the other. It's just about to the capture all the work that was done during the study period. So if the court is developing a large backlog and their not keeping pace, they are not capturing the time spending for the Delphi was originally seen as capturing some of that by estimation is that make sense.

>>It does. And I guess my only follow-up is do we know if any courts have extreme backlogs.

>>They do. The other side is true that some courts may have been processing through backlog and so you -- you are capturing that for those. You will never get that perfect. Similarly on the staff there is a real impact and there is no proportional impact from court to court and it's the same denominator. But if you have people that if you are not recognizing [Indiscernible] people are taking then you are saying we expect people to be are 239 days and we will assume 240 or something and you don't have those days to do work which means the definition that will be worth the wait or you deal with it over time. And I think if you read the materials, the group felt like part of this is getting people to accept the tool you are using and using Department of financing numbers as a way to get them to accept even if what it does is underestimate a little bit what are need might actually be. It sounds to me like what we are doing is we're coming up with this average [Indiscernible] to divide the money and that is great and you have done a great job. But my issue is in doing that we are providing money that is coming in and that will be distributed in the future. And doing that, based on those averages including averages that account for backlog, generally, will that satisfy the needs of any particular court if it has an extreme backlog because this demand will be higher than even the average of the current moment. And maybe that is not a question.

So Justice Humes, because every court has different case management systems, they have different dynamic and some courts have one location in some courts have multiple locations and there are variables that have to be -- go into how all of her courts function and as a result of that every court has different processes so unless you have consistency across the board, I think using the averages is the best way, one of the only ways I think from a statistical perspective, we have to capture this type of information and have it apply branch wide. Absent doing a special study for every single court, if that makes sense.

>>It does. Not only backlog but all kinds of different variations and how they operate and it may be true that courts have big backlogs are not getting an adjustment for that but it's also true that courts that may have other singular problems are not hitting an adjustment for that. To address your TOF, just one comment. They are not imposing those hours or workdays on our branch. It's part of the state administrative manual that those are the days that DOMS applies -- DLF that applies to every state entity in the state so this allows when we submit BCPs it allows them to be consistent with the other request that they see and they can relate to.

>> That is good even if they are wrong. [Laughter] You know what, I think Sam is from the 80s and has not been updated since I was a budget officer back in the 80s. But it is what is used statewide.

>>Judge Buckley?

>>I move that we approve the two recommendations on page one of the report.

>> I hear a second by Judge Nadler. Anymore questions or comments? All in favor of the recommendations please say I. And he knows or any abstentions? Thank you very much for your hard work on this very complicated matter and we look forward again to the other report having to do with judges workload. Thank you very much.

>>I appreciate it and would be remiss in not repeating that I have the privilege of sitting here and addressing the group but this is definitely an all hands on deck effort among the court research staff as well as our partners in IT criminal justice and Center for families and so it's definitely something that I can't do alone so I appreciate the recognition. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Leah Our second discussion agenda item is a Judicial Council report to the Legislature, Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act. This is an action item, 17-104. We welcome the panelists and I ask them all the please introduce themselves.

>>I am Bonnie Rose Hough.

>>I am Dr. Kelly Jarvis with [Indiscernible] research. I am Earl Johnson and I am chair of the Sargent Shriver committee. And I am [Indiscernible] vice chair.

>>Thank you for being here.

>> I can start by introducing myself a little bit further. My name is Dr. Kelly Jarvis and a work for this research firm based in Portland Oregon. I have been the principal investigator for the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act for the last three years so I'm delighted to be here this afternoon to talk about what we have learned. By way of recap, there were 10 pilot projects funded in seven counties in 2011. And six of them focused on unlawful detainer cases or housing cases and three of them focused on child custody and one focused on probate cases specifically guardianship and conservatorship. So the goal here, the broader Shriver goal was to assist low income individuals and families sources -- facing critical issues involving basic needs in each of these pilot programs involved in this collaboration between legal aid agency in the local Superior Court and the project components were legal aid services including sample representation to some litigants and a range of unbridled -- unbundled no -- [Indiscernible-low volume]. The evaluation began in 2012. The evaluation also focused on four primary areas of inquiry and so the first had to do with implementation and essentially what was done and what happened with the funding. Here we have information on the context and service structure and also service summary so who receive services and to what end and a second third and fourth areas pertain more to the impact and we were fortunate enough to conduct a random assignment over three projects oversubscribed and this is rigorous and it lends credence to the findings. We had selected comparison studies at two custody sites and the probate site and the assignment was impossible there because there wasn't enough litigants presenting for service. We also looked at impacts of the program beyond what was possible in the case of file for this included litigant perceptions and housing in custody projects and the perceptions of court and legal eight -- aid staff. We looked at cost like investment. A much does it actually cost to provide the services and then some potential cost savings that were generally a result of deficiencies that happened as a result of the service provision. Now, this evaluation, the Shriver evaluation is one of the largest access to justice evaluations undertaken to date so it employed a mixed method design which I just very quickly described. And it also utilize information across multiple diverse sources and so this data collection effort involved a program services database that had data on client characteristics and services provided on 20,000 litigants and these files were reviewed from over 700 cases in telephone interviews were conducted with over 150 litigants and interviews were conducted with legal aid and the court staff and dozens of them over the past five years and administrative data was collected on several different courts pertaining to summary statistics in terms of case filings in the number of defaults and that sort of thing and also about processing for the resources needed to process certain types of cases which helped us work out some cost estimates. I will walk you through a high-level overview of the findings and we will take a look at the specific findings for the housing projects the custody projects, and then the guardianship project. So this is actually three evaluations and one cow which is why the report, if you had a chance to see it is that giant thing and it's about 600 pages so there are a lot of numbers and there. so first we have the service reached so through the end of last year copper December 2016, the housing pilot project served over 25,000 individuals and the services impacted over 73,000 members like the child custody project and it served over 5000 parents and impacted over 1800 children and the guardianship project served

over 300 cases and importantly these are the services provided by legal aid in eastern involved. And some received some service who were the Shriver service recipients? The majority of them were women and the majority of them are not white and primarily Latino and African-American although the exact ratio and breakdown very by project and most of them had minors in their homes which is important in talking about addiction cases and all of them had very low incomes and if you remember, the statutory approach the statute laid out the eligibility criteria that people didn't have it with over \$1000 a month so they were under the several poverty level and 3000 of these clients were according to HUD standards severely cost burdened which means they spent for the 50 percent of their monthly income on rent and they had severe risk factors. Over half of the cases involved a mastic violence and guardianship cases typically involved severe issues of mental health problems substance abuse incarceration and general abandonment the general lack of affordable housing and the lack of it in California. Eviction is a critical for everyone particular for low income people and unlawful detainer cases require quick and knowledgeable action by the tenant so they have a limited amount of time to respond so that access to justice depends on their ability to file an answer in a short period and their inability to do this actually results in a default judgment for the landlords of the tenant that only loses their housing but their opportunity to represent your case. So another important thing to point out is because of that defaults are very common. So historically the rates of default have been very high and low income tenants are nearly always underrepresented whereas landlords don't have counsel. I think the estimates are upwards of 90 percent so there is historically an imbalance and the Shriver housing projects that to level the playing field and increase access to justice for low income tenants and we found that did happen. The majority of Shriver cases labeled to file and answer on time and they were far less likely to default. As you see here, these are some results from the random assignment study and you can see that of the Shriver representation cases 8 percent represented as ended up in default and 26 percent and in default. We think actually that some of the Shriver client projects took the cases that had already defaulted and so their job was to set the default aside and so that is plain old a present there. and the comparison cases, an order for the little Kent had a present a legal aid for service. So we thinking unrepresented litigants the default rate would be more high. Most cases settled. For the infusion so in fact two thirds of Shriver full representation cases settled versus one third of cases for supper presented and fewer cases ended in trial and self represented defendants. The vast majority of tenants still had to move. And remember that all of these people had been served an eviction notice that only 6 percent of them are actually formally evicted for providing somebody with an attorney actually help people avoid teen subject to an actual lockout which is important. The vast majority of clients moved as part of the settlement and attorneys were able to find workable settlement agreements that balance the needs of low income tenants being forced to relocate with the needs of landlord to regain possession of the property. And so these terms supported the tenant longer-term housing stability so things like more time to move out and having a reduction in the rental that and credit protection and masking the case from public registries this would be helpful in finding replacement housing but several of those combined made a real impact. We spoke to a small subsample of litigants about one year after their case is closed and indeed we found that 71 percent of Shriver clients had been able to move to a new rental unit whereas only about 43 percent of self represented litigants have been able to do that.

So this support for the longer-term has there's housing stability has been effective. Also they felt they were supported in this process and they thought it was devastating and traumatic and had negative impact on their family. However cut a reported higher satisfaction with their case outcomes if they had an attorney. So even though the majority of these people still needed to move out of their homes, with help from the attorney actually allow them to feel not so lost in the system and it was actually they were able to present their side in court and they were more satisfied. The higher they were more satisfied. The higher rate of settlement and trials also increased court efficiency and so thank you very much to the women that were presenting. Indeed they are hearing that unlawful detainer cases are taking up a lot of time for court step. We heard the same thing and we heard that not only having the court inhibitions like expanded self-help and things like that but having both sides represented made everything move smoother. They had sole custody of the children that issue and so these cases tended to be highly contentious and have other risk factors like domestic violence and other risk factors. They also tend to be emotionally charge and they could be complicated dynamics that spillover from the relationship into the court room and which compound and already adversarial process. And what we found is it had several benefits and they educated the people on the process and help she of the shape reasonable expectations. Off the bat that may not sound like a major accomplishment. But it had some major impacts. It eased tensions between the parties and it didn't increase collaborations of people are more likely so they felt more comfortable in a negotiating it also reduced burden in the court and they didn't have to spend as much time about what was coming next and attorneys could prepare their clients for the process and streamline case it to these so it took burden off. It tended to mean fewer hearings and fewer continuances to overall court efficiency. At one project the combination of Shriver representation and judge facilitated conferences increase the rate considerably so in that project over half of the custody cases were resolved by settlement versus less than one third of comparison cases and needed a hearing to resolve versus two thirds of comparison cases a little bit more about the custody projects. We spoke to them they felt very supported and grateful and appreciative they were for the help of their attorney. And they felt better about the process even when they were disappointed with how their case turned out and ironically we found out that these people perceive them, the judicial process, as unfair when they didn't like other case ended but if they thought it was unfair and if they [Indiscernible-low volume]. However we asked them about their thoughts and the attorney it did not matter how the case ended because they were very appreciative of the service and overwhelmingly positive about their experiences and an attorney of all men on both sides and it also yielded more comprehensive information for the court and importantly the custody orders derived from the cases that had both Shriver representation were more durable so they had about those things happening in over the course of two years can one out of 10 Shriver cases so 11 cases had refiled to modify the existing orders versus one out of three comparison cases so 11 percent versus 32 percent, which is a substantial difference. More durable orders had lots of different benefits and increased family stability so this is an important thing for children and a decreased court congestion because people are not just cycling through the court repeatedly and they saved resources.

A couple of highlights about the project. Historically, guardianship positions are -- have been in probate court because they are there because a parent is deceased. In our sample, there were less than 10 percent of the cases involved in deceased parents and the vast majority involve parents who are either unable or unavailable to care for their children for a variety of severe and other factors like substance use and health and abandonment and [Indiscernible] and so these children and adults were also at risk for becoming involved in other public systems. So child welfare services and the public Guardian in foster care and that sort of thing. And also probate cases are technically complex and may involve fines of people does paperwork that are difficult to get through and very specific procedures about notification and things and these are barriers for any self represented litigant and they are insurmountable for anybody with limited English or literacy abilities. These cases are tough and the stakes are high. And what we found here -- I should mention that because of the barriers collapse of people never successfully filed so they may show up and want to put a guardianship position through and never be actually able to file and give up somewhere in the interim because the process is too frustrating and exhausting. So we ended up finding is that cases that receive full representation by a Shriver attorney are helped by facilitator were successfully filed more often than not. I think only 6 percent of the cases that were served by legal aid and up not filing a petition but several of them actually ended up pursuing some other arrangement that was slightly less restrictive. The probate facilitator which was newly established as part of the project was notable and helping filing succeed and we spoke to the staff that we worked with and they estimated that with her help, self represented litigants could file in their first attempt prior to her role in it would take them three times and some people would give up and never come back and it also meant that some of the court staff would review the paperwork in minutes instead of an hours. Because things would be done accurately and complete. So she made a big difference. Litigants were often more fully able to participate in the judicial system for those with an attorney were more likely to call witnesses or enter declarations. So that along with the better paperwork meant that the court had more information to base decisions. So cases with Shriver counsel were more efficient generally, so they had fewer continuances and they also were more likely to resolve with just one hearing in the resolved faster. Over half of them resolved within 60 days. So the efficiencies in terms of Shriver Council, the fewer continuances and with the resolution and efficiencies from the facilitator in terms of streamlining information and better completion of paperwork translated into cost savings for the court and those combined benefits from those two services could reduce the average court cost to producing -- to process the case by 30 percent. I am aware we are late and I really want us to move so you don't have to stay longer than you are. I am on fire. [Laughter] we are glad it is good news. It's exciting as well. Feel free to tell me to pipe down or ask questions. For those two combined services could reduce the cost of processing the case significantly so by 30 percent. In general cost across all three court types, we found that balanced representation facilitated settlements so attorneys help litigants understand when terms are reasonable and they reduce emotional tensions and they negotiate settlements that enable more stable transition for all parties. That was true for custody as well as for housing. We also found that the court based settlement practices showed strong promise so there were a few courts, one housing in one custody in particular of Family Court that had these early dispute resolution practices that both yielded high settlement rates with really durable

orders. So that was promising. And we heard from everyone that the court received for comprehensive and relative information in which to base decisions and everything felt more thorough and litigants are more educated about an prepared for proceedings the judges had to entertain and educate lesson clerks had the correct paperwork last and everything moved a bit more smoothly. And so when the cases proceeded more efficiently, over the course of time that saves resources. And also having counsel prevent this prevented the loss of legal rights of more tenants were able to file answers and raise affirmative defenses and more parents could submit responsive declaration's to their custody pleadings and request additional orders that may be in support of their family like parenting classes are that sort of thing and more would be guardians are able to file petitions and follow through with the resolution. It was important. And general, we found that the provision of counsel to low income individuals who would have otherwise been self represented rendered the system more beneficial. I feel like we answered a lot of questions but certain questions still remain and so some areas of further investigation include for example the list is longer than this. The impact of court-based early dispute resolution practices. There were a few this time that emerged as promising but we laughed the data and the structure to be able to compare them to out such practices to measure the impact. So that would be a great line of going forward and outcomes related to limited scope legal services. So as I mentioned, all of the project offered representation to some proportion of litigants that some sort of unbundled services and the dish we didn't have data on state outcomes so we weren't able to see how do you decide and how do you know that self-help works or a day of trial representation program would work and that sort of thing. So that is fast. Right. Related to that is better definition of the elements of effective triage protocols. How do you determine when a case really only needs extended self-help versus somebody who needs full representation by an attorney. And must say, disentangling the complexity of custody paces would be helpful. Those are tough. We can talk about how they ended. So whether or not they settled or if they went to resolve the a hearing and how the process worked but actually determining when the custody decision was good for lack of a better word was hard because there are so many factors that go into these decisions and not all of those things are tracked and recorded reliably encase file so that is hard. We feel there is certainly some investigation to do there because it is important. I think I hit my 15 minute mark. I am happy to answer any questions or to repeat something at a slower pace if you missed it when it went by you the first time.

>> Thank you for the report. In San Diego I have had experience with our housing component of the Shriver program and I confirm what you have indicated regarding the substantial improvement and access to meaningful justice in our housing court. And also somewhat surprisingly in the efficiency, which was a collateral and perhaps unintended or unanticipated benefit. One of the other things that we have seen is with a level playing field and housing court when the initial cases were coming in with awards coming back against landlords which was what a somewhat new experience in our housing courts, that behavior was modified, and landlords started putting attorney fee limitation clauses into their lease agreements. Not to exceed \$500. I was wondering if experiences like that were measured and or if anecdotally assessed what the impact was across the state with the grants.

>>That is a great question. In terms of the financial award, so attorneys fees and that kind of thing, it's tricky because things are not articulated as you want them to be in a case file so disentangling some of what money belong to which pot, often there would be a lump sum judgment and their dish it would be hard to tell what went where and we did try to break some of that apart. In terms of the general behavior, we anecdotally heard a lot of stories about landlords shifting their strategy or the courtroom the core of or the culture of the court changing some. Although those were more difficult things for us to measure. In terms of whether or not what was listed on the notice changed over time, we didn't actually look at that. But we have that data and that would not be a difficult thing to go back and review. With Los Angeles project, access to legal services in family law is so needed and the program is very appreciated by litigants and walking the hall you can see it. The evidence is clear and is standing in the hall.

>> Chief Justice, is it premature for me to make a motion because I would like to.

>>Never. I am not just saying this because there are some old friends on the panel. [Laughter]. I have supported them throughout my entire career. I would move that the Council adopt the recommendations set forth by the committee as follows, first with regard to number one, I move that we approve the submission the evaluation, the Sargent Shriver civil act along with the findings and recommendations of the project. I also move, number two, that we direct the Judicial Council staff to transmit the evaluation as well as the findings and recommendations to the legislature. And I move adoption of 3A which is to continue the Shriver civil counsel pilot project to build on the positive results reflected in the evaluation with our thanks and complements. With regard to 3B3I, I move that we adopt those in principle and asked the committee to provide further definition to the Council as to what they would recommend with regard to each of those areas.

>>I see [Indiscernible] shaking had so that is a good sign as far as coming back with more specifics.

>>Do I hear a second?

>> I second.

>>Let me say one observation. I recall when this act passed and it was groundbreaking in the United States and only one other state had considered adopting something like this and that was New York. And it took a little time to actually fund the projects. And once the projects were funded, there was great interest in this report that you have mentioned. I have been asked countless times about when is the data on the Shriver report coming because this is going to be the report I believe that provides the data for greater asks for the legislature and for legal aid and now we know a little bit more about how the dollar should be stretched and where it should go and how it is being best used with real-life stories. This is a valuable report and I am grateful that it is here and I thank you for your hard work and the metrics you gave us only go in front of the legislature. All in favor of the motion and the recommendation please say I.

>>I.

>>Any opposition or abstentions? It unanimously carries. Thank you for your fine work.

>>Thank you. It has been a privilege.

>>I have a personal comment to make. 50 years ago exactly I was part of Sargent Shriver's senior staff. I was the director of the legal services program which was the legal arm of the war on poverty. A few years later, many years later, actually, Sargent Shriver was asked what was your favorite program of all the programs you started and there were a lot of them during his career. And he said, a favorite program was Headstart because it was my idea. [Laughter]. But the one that I have the greatest face in is the legal services program. This will be the one that will have the most impact in the lives of the poor. You have taken a great step forward here in California by passing this resolution.

>>Thank you Justice Johnson. Let me say one story I heard. When chief George negotiated the signature, he went to the governor at that time, Governor. Schwarzenegger and he proposes concept and I heard the story the story that Governor. Schwarzenegger paused and said we will name it after your father-in-law. That sealed the deal.

>>Two-story.

>>Thank you for your fine work.

>> On behalf of the entire committee, the thanks to the Council for interesting is with this. This is real work that involves real people's lives, and it makes an enormous difference and it has been a privilege for all of us to be involved in it and we thank you for that.

>>Thank you for your leadership.

>>Next of course is the next item and it's also an action item in this is the selection of the pilot project.

>>I will be brief on this. The committee received a request for sponsors to our request for proposal on the renewed funding for the project going forward and as you know the funding available now is less than the funding that was available. The recommendation process was detailed and I will spend time on it and the committee met and consider the processes and details. Our recommendation to you is unanimous. And we are recommending that existing programs in [Indiscernible] County and Los Angeles and San Diego and northern Santa Barbara and San Francisco and yellow be continued. If you would like, I can give you details on those projects. I am happy to give you summaries if you would like a not too. I would be happy to move on. We are recommending the funding of a new project which is in Fresno. It's the only

new project we are considering and it is a housing project and it has a relatively modest budget for an area of extremely high need in Fresno. Central California legal services is the legal services partner in Fresno and they will be providing housing assistance and also working on early settlement of cases. And as the data that Kelly was going through showed, early settlement procedures that is a key factor this is both to take care of the reduced level of funding and to accommodate the fact the custody projects can only account for 20 percent of the funding. That is available as this slide shows we divided the reduction among the custody projects by 26 percent and that left the housing probate projects with 19 percent. We are asking that you give us the ability to work with the project and to approve their budget so based on the reduced numbers that we are recommending to you.

>> Judge Stout?

>>I would move that we adopt the recommended selection of projects and funding including Fresno and with the discretion to the committee.

>>I second that. Any questions or comments or observations as to this motion. All in favor say I I A question. I wanted to clarify recommendation number two. It says that given the program, no program receive the entire amount received in opposition with the committee to request a revised budget. What is the procedure once that is received? We come back to the Council after?

>> We are asking for the Council to authorize the implementation committee to approve the revised budgets. That would be consistent with the numbers that you are proving today.

>>The total amounts would be the same as you are proving today. It's the matter of reconfiguring their budgets in order to accommodate.

>>>One thing I would add is based on the budget trailer bill, a portion of the [Indiscernible] funds in the state is now capable of being allocated to Shriver projects, and so the project may be able to supplement their budgets with that. In addition, because of the equal access fund increase by \$10 million, there is an additional million dollars available for partnership grants across the states. Many of the Shriver projects have components that would be suitable for applying for partnership grants. So individual projects may be able to supplement the funds that we're asking you to approve through those two mechanisms.

>>>That would affect the sums you are proving.

>>>I was going to say for clarity, my motion regarding the discretion to the committee was as stated by Justice Elon.

>>>> The request for that kind of discretion at the committee level has been done by this body for the judicial branch budget community already so this will allow them to be more nimble in

their response and it's probably as we look at it particularly practical for them to come back every single time because you can imagine it will be a fair number of adjustments that will have to be made.

>> Thank you. I appreciate that with that in mind all in favor as understood please say I I.

>> Thank you it passes unanimously. I appreciate your good work and look forward to seeing more of it.

>> Thank you, cheap. A brief advisory for you all is that the CHP would like all members and new members to convene in the anteroom at the conclusion of this meeting. It's not a security scare you moment. It is we want to assemble you an escort you to your next location. Thank you. We stand in recess until tomorrow morning.

>> [Event concluded]