

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 captured live captioning, formatted and unedited, of the last meeting. The official record of each meeting, the meeting minutes, is 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.

Please stand by for real-time captions.

>> The meeting will begin shortly.

>> Good morning. This is the meeting of the Judicial Council of California for Friday, December 16, 2016, from the office in Sacramento. The meeting is now in session and either joining us now or soon and you will hear it when the telephone comes on will be our council members Justice Doug Miller and Mr. Pat Kelly. We welcome our viewers and listeners this morning as we have reached the one-year anniversary of live video webcasting of our Judicial Council meeting. Thank you to Justice Miller and to the Judicial Council staff for making possible these webcasts that we have had over a year serve to increase public access to our deliberative processes and to improve the public understanding of the role and responsibilities of the council. The webcast has provided a sort of online forum for our discussion of the issues facing the judicial branch, and the policies that we implement, as we strive to increase access to justice and fairness in our court system. The webcast serves to enhance transparency, understanding, and ultimately, we hope, trust and confidence to the public. Our December business meeting is the meeting that both concludes a year's worth of work by council and also sets our legislative and advocacy agenda such as we know it for the coming year. 2016 has been a busy and challenging year. Our courts continue to recover from the Great Recession and to adapt to a new normal state government, a new normal funding. But as a judicial branch we have made progress on many fronts with our sister branches of government on the benefit of public and the court. We have worked diligently to bring a greater stability to branch funding, to enhance the solid foundation of judicial branch governance, and to address this, confidence, fairness concerns of the public. We have reason to review, practical actions, and open and thoughtful discussions with civility, and I believe we have moved to the branch forward this year, the fourth year in a row. We achieved new state general fund investment in our court; ongoing court innovations were recognized with \$25 million in grant funding to promote initiatives and innovations, efficient programs that better serve our public. We have examined the inequities in our state's fines and fee structure to fund vital services, and the council received a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice to identify issues related to defendants' ability to pay fines and fees. Martin Hoshino, our Administrative Director, has also been named to a national task force on the ongoing impact of court fines, fees, and bail and these practices on economically disadvantaged communities across the United States. Earlier this year, in March, I called for a review of the current bail system to ensure it adequately serves the purpose of protecting the public while assuring a person's appearance in

court, and to that end, the Pretrial Detention Reform Work Group is studying current pretrial detention practices and will provide recommendations to council for potential reform. Also 12 pilot projects in local courts are testing the effectiveness of pretrial release programs. The judicial branch and local courts partnered to open to the public five much-needed courthouses this year to enhance access to justice, and to better serve residents in Kings, Merced, Santa Clara, Sutter, and Tehama Counties; however, fund reductions during the state's fiscal crisis and a decline in funds caused by reduced case filings have forced us to delay and put on hold other worthy construction projects around the state. My thanks to Justice Brad R. Hill, chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee and the impacted courts for the way that they have conducted this process and dealt with some unavoidable outcomes. And also to Justice Jeff Johnson and the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee as they strive to deliver still needed courthouses under this new fiscal reality. The council's Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force, under the leadership of Justice Mariano-Florentine Cuéllar, continued its good work with the development of a pilot project for video remote interpreting and an online toolkit. The Governor recognized this work and the language access needed in our state when he appropriated an additional \$7 million to reimburse trial courts for increased interpreter expenses in civil cases. Public access to judicial proceedings was also enhanced as the Supreme Court of California and the Court of Appeals, Fifth Appellate District in Fresno both began to live webcast our oral argument sessions. The Supreme Court also has real-time captioning for our arguments in English and Spanish, and the captioned video archive, if you care to look up a case and see how it was argued. And finally this year, my Civic Learning Initiative under Judy McConnell and the Power of Democracy Steering Committee is a crucial player in establishing a new, California history social science framework, that now includes education of the judicial branch and the court in a greater focus on civic learning in elementary through high school education. These are just a few examples of Judicial Council policy and government actions this past year. They are available on our website as our annual report on the Judicial Council's California Courts Newsroom. At this time, I turn the meeting over to Judge Marla Anderson to begin public comment.

>> Thank you, Chief. This is the time and the opportunity for members of the public to provide comments on aspects of judicial administration. The Judicial Council welcomes the public comment process, which enables members of the public to express their ideas and state their concerns on policy matters. There are two opportunities for public comment. The first involves general comments on issues relating to judicial administration, comments about matters not specifically on today's council agenda but of general concern. The second involves comments on a particular agenda item, which will be heard at the time we get to that specific part of the agenda, and before we begin hearing from members of the public, I'd like to take a moment to highlight a few important features of the public comment process for those of you who are unfamiliar with the council. The council is a policymaking body for the judicial branch of California and addresses issues of statewide importance such as developing the budget of the judicial branch and the courts, seeking funding for sufficient judicial and administrative staffing, achieving court efficiency, and adopting rules and forms to enhance access to the court. On the agenda for today's council meeting you will see that these are the types of matters about which

the council is concerned and on which it invites comments. The council is not an adjudicatory body and so the Judicial Council does not receive comments and suggestions about individual cases, nor is its staff authorized to distribute materials related to individual cases. Please keep this in mind if you are presenting comments on today's council. The time allotted for each speaker is dependent on the number of speakers. The total number of individuals who have requested to speak at today's meeting is on our general comments, and there are 13, and then we have two in respect to a specific item. The number of minutes allotted on general comments is two minutes, and I will provide you with a one minute remaining time as well as a 30 second remaining speaking time. Please know—so that everyone has a chance and opportunity to provide comment—I ask that you ought of the period that is allotted to your public speaking. What I will do is I will call up a name and I will ask you to step to the microphone and then I will call a second name and then I will have that person go ahead and then also be in the ready our first speaker this morning. Right behind her -- if I can help you in the ready position -- it would be Susan Taylor. Please go into the ready position. And then you will have two minutes. This is May Harbor. You will begin and go ahead and I will call the next person.

>> Good morning. Thank you my name is Heidi but -- I am and El Dorado County resident and a downtown merchant I am here to speak to you about the historic possible courthouse and the proposal to have it moved. I have been a member of the Downtown Association since 2013 and I have regularly attended the Association meetings, monthly meetings, at which time the city manager would present a city report. At no time in the year and a half that I was attending those meetings was there any word about the courthouse moving, until December 4. At that meeting he announced that the period for public comment about the courthouse had closed on December 1. At that time, I looked back through all of the agenda to see if I had missed something and there had been no record of any comment about the courthouse moving. At that time, I went ahead and I did just a poll of my fellow merchants and I went door to door to all of the businesses on Main Street and many had not heard. In fact, in a period of the three days to five days, I got a petition to save the courthouse, which I thought was possible at the time. I had 60 merchants and local community members able to sign that petition. I want to suggest that the impact of moving the courthouse off of Main Street will be dramatic. Businesses recognize between 5 percent and 30 percent, depending on the type of business generated by the traffic that serves the courthouse. I am afraid that moving the courthouse would have a very dramatic effect on our culture as well.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Our next speaker, Miss Susan Taylor in the ready position, with Mr. Kirk next.

>> I am Susan Taylor speaking regarding the courthouse. When El Dorado County was going to develop the courthouse, the city wrote in an extensive letter regarding its concerns about supplying adequate utilities to this site. We don't know whether the concerns have been addressed. These were their concerns about -- this was not analyzed. For the current fire flow be sufficient given the water would be coming from the same reservoir that serves downtown Placerville? With a new impact on the system continuing to be adequate for the new area and downtown if there were to be a fire in the area? Wastewater. The city stated that there were

deficiencies in the wastewater system and the county should be required to repair all known collection system defects located on County facilities that feed into the same collection system. And the sheriff applied for a grant to expand the jail, which is on the same property.

Transportation -- at the city mentioned impacts tonight roadways and the freeway with no discussion of mitigation to those impacts, no method to share the cause, no commitment to participate with the city and deferring or mitigating these impacts.

>> One minute.

>> Six impacts were listed that were not addressed in 2000. The city brought up his concerns to the county, and when the state took over control of this project, the city made none of these comments. It is well known that there are serious concerns with water and sewer and I have first-hand of this but I do not have time to explain it apparently. I thought we had three minutes. The final EIR basically just said that providing the water, sewer, and drainage for the courthouse --

>> 30 seconds.

>> We have serious concerns. There is a lot of mitigation that was not even addressed, impacts that were on this property, and we passed a major case that does not allow for roundabouts without a vote of the public, and the city said that they are going to ignore that and move forward anyway but there is a lot of collusion and different other things and it has been frustrating. We have e-mailed the court several times and never got a response to our concerns.

>> Thank you.

>> And yet the project is continuing to move forward without any addressing of these issues. Thank you.

>> Mr. Smith and in the ready position, this warrior politics but Kirk Smith, the classical preservation league.

>> Distinguished members of the council, I am absolutely sure that none of you had any idea about the long history of corruption associated with this project over the course of 40 years. In 1965 the civil grand jury came up with the report covered in the front page of local paper that said that the courthouse should be torn down and replaced with one and property owned by Senator. At the other end of topic, the public was outraged and they worked hard in public meetings to get the money and save that courthouse. It did not stop the Senator who had acquired the property behind the scenes to continue to move for it. Had the property and his -- you are in a position when you are in -- a senator -- they have the chance to use lots of your money so when he was not there, there was his son was on the Board of Supervisors, and they would meet at every session for lunch with two members of the supervisors. His colleagues Jack Sweeney and John Knight who we later learned were on your committee that are supposed to be advising about public interest but it was behind closed doors.

>> One minute.

>> Will John Briggs came into problems of bankruptcy and he had to bail himself out, he had money loaned it to him, \$2 million from the supervisor -- he turned around -- he gave him \$10,000 in a campaign contribution none of which was discovered until the information was leaked to the public. You cannot borrow money on landlocked property so his supervisors, colleagues, friends helped him and made a switch over two unmarked parcels -- I .2 acres -- he manipulated the study so that they came out exactly equal. In conclusion I wanted to give you the courtesy of outlining in these few precious moments an example of what will be quantified at great length and reported to the Inspector General as well as to the Senate committees that we have been communicating with. Because -- in conclusion, I asked, your honor, to do the inherent equitable authority, that Justices have to do justice. This project it --

>> Thank you.

>> It smells.

>> Next speaker, within the ready position. Roberta Patrick.

>> I am wrapping up with that previous attorney speakers. We ask that you reassess deposit -- the courthouse project in its approval process. There have been so many red flags along the path of this project that it is beyond suspicion. Part of the city has received notification of the draft EIR. Why did the city not share that with its citizens and merchants? The city made extensive comments in 2000 about the lack of utilities and infrastructure for the project. Why did the city not make similar comments on the drafting EIR to alert the Judicial Council of the lack of utilities and infrastructure needed to accommodate this project? Comments on the draft EIR continue to be sent in after the closing date. Did all Judicial Council members have an opportunity to read those public comments? The entire city has been suffering from aging, deteriorating water and sewer pipes. Why is the courthouse being singled out for water contamination when it is a citywide issue? El Dorado County piece of land was successful for an existing roadway. Why did the county rely on a substandard appraisal and accept a land swap for a lesser-valued land-locked piece of property?

>> One minute

>> The history shows that it does not budget to maintain local historical buildings. Why did the county accepted that a blue ribbon committee -- no enforceable authority that it was adequate mitigation to repurpose the historical courthouse to prevent it from falling into a state of dilapidation. The list of questions and concerns goes on and on. Many have got to keep them in the heart of the downtown.

>> 30 seconds.

>> It is clear that it is a vital part of downtown—the vibrancy. However, there were many behind-the-scenes implements in swaying out some of this process. The public was denied an open and transparent process that is essential to an informed outcome. Please consider all of what

was shared with you today and ask that the process of be revisited so that the public is engaged in additional alternative -- they are evaluated. Thank you for the opportunity to bring this matter to your attention.

>> Thank you. This is Roberta Fitzpatrick in the ready position and Marianna Sanchez.

>> Chief Justice and members of the council, excuse me. I hope for each of you the soul deep piece of that is so often spoken of and sung about during the season of meaningful winter holidays. On the news last night, Steve Hartman reported on a man who had designated himself a secret Santa clause and had personally given away person by person over \$1 million over several years to surprised and grateful strangers. When he was asked on his deathbed if he had any regrets, he had only one: that he had not helped more people. Many organizations and individuals work to provide gifts to disadvantaged people, especially children, at this time of the year. You have the power to give a gift much more important than Legos, dolls, or even food.

>> One minute.

>> It is the gift of protection and fairness. It is your job and it is your responsibility to provide the fair and equal administration of justice, as promised in the 14th amendment. Parents who cannot afford representation in the Family Court, they have the deck stacked against them. The laws that permit judges to ignore or disregard allegations, even evidence, --

>> 30 seconds.

>> Of child abuse, including sexual abuse, are biased and do not provide equal protection. Many children have died, including my great-niece, because of judge's egregious errors because of those laws. Please make them a priority. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Our next speaker is Marianna Sanchez. In the ready position, Mr. Matt Martelli.

>> Good morning. I am here to talk a little bit about court interpreters and their treatment. I became certified interpreter and an employee in 2007. I love court interpreting, but I cannot say the same of the court system and its culture. Interpreters are not valued in the state court system. I came after the Court Interpreters Act but I am aware of the history. Court interpreters were denied employment for decades. They were a less valued class of worker and employee without benefit essentially the only through legislation or positions -- they were opened and when the law was implemented courts across the state were Forrester to hire employees they did not want to they tried to put a professional position into a clerical malt without analysis of the skills, knowledge, and abilities of the job or the appropriate classification. Over 10 years later some courts still do not follow the law. They resent our union for trying to enforce it. The region keeps chipping away at working conditions every time that we bargained for even the most basic industry standards such as team interpreting becomes controversial. If this Council really believe that we are valuable, I urge you to please require the courts still hiring a noncertified interpreters regularly to follow the law. Excuse me. Adopt policies that promote and value our profession

instead of devoting and devaluing it by lowering testing standards, average this region to stop singling us out and excluding us from wage increases, and to remedy the disparity that we to give us fairness and equity in compensation and treat us like the specialized professionals we are to get over the past so we can focus on doing our job it wishes to ensure due process of law for peace and to help the court or at the mission of precisely equality and fairness I look forward to the day when that is all that I have to worry about when I come to work. Thank you.

>> Our next speaker is not much heading in the ready position -- Mary Fitzgerald.

>> My name is Matt market, and interpret and I've worked for the California courts for over 16 years, 11 as an employee. I have three children, ages 10, 13, and my wife has health problems that keep her from working but I've been struggling as my family so provided for over 10 years interpreters conversation -- compensation has gone up by less than 1% annually. This is well below the cost of living and much less than raises other court employees have gained in that same period I have lost my home. I've had to move five times in less than five years to find affordable housing. This has been very difficult on my family especially for my children. I work side-by-side with sign language interpreters who make more simply because they are underrepresented and their wages are set locally instead of regionally. I have watched my dear colleagues work until their last days after serving the courts for 30 years. They were never able to retire because they could not afford it I've seen a number of excellent interpreters leave the court employment because it is not financially viable the courts are proposing contract language that makes employment as an interpreter even less viable to we are hearing from the Council -- language access is important to them and yet the reality does not match this statement and interpret employees with years of experience and dedication are undervalued, making the title goal of language access less attainable but I love what I do and service I provide to the courts and the community, sadly if conditions do not improve, I may no longer be able to remain a court employee I urge you to live up to message of increasing language access in the court and to practice what you preach. Thank you.

>> Thank you. The next speaker is Mrs. Fitzgibbons and in the ready position -- Mr. Tyler.

>> Good morning, Chief Justice, councilmembers put my name is Mrs. Gibbons and I'm a state and federally certified interpreter in this account -- and an employee and region..com interpreters have received only 10% in total wage increases since we became employees over a decade ago over that same period, the rest of the court employees and the three largest courts, Sacramento, Kern County, and Fresno have received an average of 30%. Working in Sacramento, we also received emails congratulating us on a raised that we will not be receiving because unlike other employees we are covered by regional contracts. American Sign Language interpreters who work side-by-side with us doing the exact same job and the very same courthouses sometimes even on the same trial -- they make 18% more just because they are underrepresented and they get raises granted locally to other bargaining units. In Kern County, in fact, there is an interpreter making 27% more than his colleagues also just for falling under a different unit clearly, there is a benefit to coming to the bargaining table as anything but a court interpreter represented in the regional system. This is causing a disparate impact on us. We are not asking for a handout we

simply want to catch up and keep up with wage increases. We are asking for fairness and equity in compensation. We are currently not classified, compensated, or perceived as professionals. Our step system -- it is inferior to other employees and provides no increases beyond three years.

>> 30 seconds.

>> The standards of the program have the Lord and wages increased at a lower rate than every other court employee even though the budget is separate and money is and has been available. What message does that send? Are we really a valued asset? A vehicle for equal access? There is a definite dissonance between the Judicial Council ideals and the reality that we face as employees. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Next speaker is Mr. Tyler and in the ready position is Mrs. Neil Sierra.

>> Good morning my name is Tyler, a Vietnamese interpreter in Sacramento County and I'm sure that many of you have heard my colleagues talking about language access and pay disparity but I'm not sure to talk about that language access is the law and pay disparity is a fact my message is simpler. One, the continuing devaluation of the profession and the unfair and unequal treatment of interpreters and a disparate impact on interpreter caused by the aforementioned in 1978, the federal office of personnel management, OPM, was created and the mission is to lay the foundation -- impartial professional service and classification -- qualification based on the merit principle in 2008 OPM recognize that interpreter positions are highly specialized and officially classified interpreters under the judiciary salary plan other positions fall under this classification including all of the executives in the second-in-command of judges, personal staff and a law clerk said that is it keep in mind that the nature of work for federal and state interpreters is exactly the same you get the interpreters continue to be highly recognized --

>> One minute.

>> Value and federal position with -- sacrificing the standard at the state level however there has been a trend promoted by some core decision-makers to lower the standard -- the consortium has no longer required a written portion of the target language the continuing devaluation of the interpreter profession at the state level also reflected in poor working conditions, lack of respect from the administration and a number of counties -- and the overall -- unfair and unequal treatment for interpreters

>> 30 seconds.

>> This -- this will continue to be detrimental to the very mission of the institution the argument -- equipment to equality and fairness for all. Thank you for your attention.

>> Thank you our next speaker is Camille PR effort in the ready position, Mr. Mark Leslie.

>> Good morning my name is Camille I am a full-time English Spanish court interpreter in Alameda County, which is in region 2 and I appreciate the opportunity to address you with my concerns today. The courts have been decrying the shortage of interpreters as language access services expands to cover more types of court matters. Yet failed to ask to safeguard interpreting as a viable profession. It takes many years -- I don't think it's an exaggeration to say that it can take a good decade to attain -- obtain the level of fluency and -- of the language is required to interpret in court. It takes several more years to build the interpreting skills, and we must pass certification exam with one of the lowest pass rates in the state -- if not the nation -- and there is good reason for that. Somehow the political will exist to find funding for technology but not people. The courts are pursuing video remote interpreting for courtroom hearings.

>> One minute.

>> Regardless of its harmful impact on the integrity of judicial fact-finding and on due process. Interpreters are more efficient, provide a broader scope of language access services, and more reliable rendition. As a single woman who works full-time in the courts, I cannot afford to live in a safe neighborhood we have gotten of the third of the raises that other court workers --

>> 30 seconds.

>> In our region we have no salary -- we have people that have worked for 30 years and they make the same as people who are brand-new. There are other ways in which this also pans out as does it is time to close the gap and how interpreters are treated vis-à-vis other court employees and make court interpreting a career worth pursuing. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Next speaker. -- Mr. Mark Leslie in the ready position. This Connie Valentine.

>> Good morning, Chief Justice, and members but my name is Mark and I been interpreting for 42 years and I've been involved in the PCI had as a local chairperson and vice Chair and in bargaining units on the leg. I did want to recognize first, I am also a real-time certified captioner -- I'm delighted that these meetings are accessed and captioning 4 or English speaking -- English individuals, people who read English and also those who read Spanish. It affects not just deaf people but people who do not have a command of the English language. My concern is that my colleagues have pointed out and I am a new employee to Sacramento County Courthouse. Although I have been interpreting in the courts for a number of years. 40. There is a disparity of 17.8%. I make more money than they do and come in fact I work four days a week and I make as much as people who work five days a week I find that this -- this a little bit as well, it is embarrassing. It is hard to deal with when I know that I've --

>> One minute.

>> Working with colleagues who are my equal in cases that involve more than just American Sign Language. The other thing about video relay interpreting, I have to say one comment -- I was called into a courthouse where the judge says, surely, you did not bring a towel. I had no

idea what she was talking about and she said, we had a video relay interpreter who threw a towel over the length and screen is held up court while the Wi-Fi signal got better.

>> 30 seconds.

>> I started to laugh, and so did most of the people in the courtroom two I hope that technology will become a little bit more improved so that it can be useful in the court I do not think presently and I have been trained to be a video relay interpreter, I have about eight years and that experience, at a call center. So I hope that effort will improve vastly and come again, I hope that you will look at the concerns of my colleagues and -- pointed out about the disparity in the paper thank you.

>> Thank you. Connie Valentine, and in the ready position, Kathleen Russell.

>> Thank you. I am Connie Valentine from California protective Association. Madam Chair and members of the Judicial Council, I received yet another call from a protective mother -- last week the California whose teenage son was being threatened by his father , being sent to a real does reunification camp because he wants to live with his mother. California judges are ordering teenagers who do not like living with their abusive parents to go to these camps. To learn to love the parent but -- that they dislike and fear this -- this program -- by the Chinese in the 1950s but fortunately California has a statute, family code section 3026 that prohibits judges from ordering children to go to these camps. It states family reunification services shall not be ordered as a part of a child custody and visitation proceeding. However, it seems that this code is not known to all of the Family Court judges. We would truly appreciate your help in educating judges --

>> One minute

>> To continue to stop the ordering of children into such camps. We also would like to strongly object as we have in the past, about mediators called child custody -- custody recommending counselors -- making recommendations about custody that are almost always adopted by the court. You see -- they should provide facts and information to help the courts in their decision and not provide recommendations.

>> 30 seconds.

>> Delegation of such judicial authority is improper. The hearings into Star chamber proceedings as we have noted in the past since the decision is already made before the litigants that -- present their cases. Thank you and happy holidays.

>> Thank you.

>> Our next speaker, Kathleen Russell.

>> Good morning, Chief Justice, members of the Council. My name is Kathleen Russell with a set of four judicial excellence. Just to give a little bit more detail on Mrs. Valentine's discussion

of these illegal reunification camps, which family for -- court judges from Humboldt County all the way down to orange county are sending teenagers to against their will -- this is going to be exposed in the national media. Very short order. You all can get ahead of the curve by dealing with this issue. The family Bridges program is one that is illegally being ordered by judges and Dr. Randy Randall has a suspended license by the California Board of psychology. He is suspended and unable to practice psychology and yet he is being court ordered by judges in California and other states to take teenagers are against their will from a court of law into hotel rooms in Marin County in Southern California, threaten these teenagers or four days and cut them off from their primary attachment figure -- the parent that has raised them.

>> One minute.

>> Thank you. And this is being done under the offices are parental alienation which the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, they all say that this is junk science and it should not be allowed in the court of law. Kids -- you cannot force children to love a parent that has beaten or raped them and created this horrible situation you cannot force children into loving relationships with a child.

>> 30 seconds.

>> With a parent. So we urge this Council and we -- we are here to educate you that this is happening in California and it needs to stop. And it is very good to see you here, Senator Jackson, and we hope to work with you and the judiciary committee in the coming sessions. Thank you.

>> And thank you to each of our public speakers. I also want to remind you that the Council is also welcoming written comments for those who did not sit -- get a chance. We can accept written comment and that concludes the public comment.

>> Thank you Judge Anderson and I echo your thanks to our speakers. We appreciate hearing about your thoughts. Next on our agenda is the approval of minutes from our last meeting in San Diego October 27 and 28 I will take another opportunity to review those minutes and once you have, I will entertain a motion to approve and a second.

>> Approval.

>> Second.

>> Thank you Judge So, approval, and Judge Feng, second.

>> [Vote Being Called]

>> Thank you Senator Jackson with one abstention and the minutes are approved. Next on our debt is the series of reports we deliver to the Judicial Council based on activity from our last meeting and the first is mind the Supreme Court of California committee on judicial ethics

opinions that you have heard them as CJ EL -- issued some all advice for the judiciary that administering the oath of office to elected officials, including the newly elected district attorney's with authorized by law and I'm grateful for this guidance because as you know, December and January are oath taking months but also because I believe in the importance of our public service oath of office. So during this reporting period, I had the pleasure of administering the oath of office to the Senators elect the California State Senate including Judicial Council member Senator Jackson, and I also administered the oath of our new Sacramento Mayor Eduardo judicial Council member, Darrell Steinberg -- former president pro tem of the Senate and interim Sacramento police chief, my neighbor, chief Brian Louis and while the oath of office can be seen as an oath of constitutional allegiance and fidelity, I would also believe that that they are a public statement, of our personal commitment, many of us have made these are taking personal responsibility for our duties and our actions. My duties on the Supreme Court took me from Sacramento to Los Angeles for our oral argument calendars with Justice Chin and our colleagues, and in Los Angeles before the oral argument we had a special in memoriam program, the recently deceased Chief Justice Malcolm Lucas, also -- and at the current court members justice rigor and a Justice Chin spoke about their colleague as did former colleagues and staff, including retired Chief Justice Ronald George, Justice Edward finale and Mark Baxter, former principal attorney and Chief Justice overlook his son, Greg Lucas, who is also the California State Library and all shared anecdotes about it the wit, wisdom and kindness of Chief Justice Lucas looks like a Chief Justice from central casting. While in Los Angeles the court also participated in two of our long-established annual engagements, the Chancery club of Los Angeles, their annual Supreme Court luncheon and we see many of you and many of former Judicial Council members at that luncheon and also the Italian-American lawyers Association, their annual Supreme Court dinner, Pat Kelly at that dinner, did a rendition of a Beach boys song that escapes me. With a grade orchestra full of lawyers, also with Arthur Gilbert, our presiding justice from the second -- one of the divisions, also played the piano during our Sacramento oral arguments, we connected with the women lawyers of Sacramento with reception at our court, attended by a local judge and attorney -- and at the unity Bar Association of Sacramento, I attended their annual dinner and I participated in the conversation with a wide range of topics, with an attorney, Jerry Chon, and the unity bar dinner in Sacramento brings together eight different Bar Association including state and federal judges, attorneys, law school faculty, staff, and students from three local law schools. George, UC Davis, and link at the event included presentations, student scholarship and community service awards and at the Sacramento County Bar Association all right, a service to recognize volunteers are additive free legal aid clinics and hotlines I presented their foundation access to justice scholarship, and the California Supreme Court historical society, also recognize the upcoming talent of law school students with it Selma Boydell Smith law student writing competition in California legal history of historical society also published a book, long-awaited, over a decade, called constitutional governance and judicial power on the history of California Supreme Court, and for that I participated in a conversation with former Chief Justice George, moderated by Molly Feldman to discuss the history of the court, as a compared to the history and -- growth of California. I was able to bring my experience this year of being called for jury duty and my previous experiences of being a juror on two separate juries to a conversation with former councilmember attorney Mark Robinson, at a save

our jury Townhall, that was organized by the Sacramento chapter of the American board of child advocates the discussion on the seventh amendment right range from my experience as a prosecutor, judge, and juror to the importance of Civic learning and helping people understand the roles and responsibilities in the process. At the same -- this aside of Los Angeles, I was -- with many judges from the Los Angeles area and Southern California were present. I spoke about the importance of the rule of law back, the good conscious modeled by their patron saint of lawyers, judges and politicians, St. Thomas more and interfaith hope to use our skills to heal divisions. To recognize our responsibilities as leaders within our profession and our communities in the upcoming years. I finally had a number of meetings with the administration, including the Department of finance and the legislature, both the assembly and the Senate. We discussed fiscal and policy issues as we go into this budget process and legislative year ended 2017 and that concludes my report to counsel and next we will hear from Martin Hoshino our administrative director.

>> Thank you, chief, members, and in your materials, as part of our custom, is my written report usually by practice, I put out some items, many of them to highlight for you but in the interest of time because I know some of the schedules are pressed with the members, I'm going to be much more brief than usual. You will see in there, however, when you get to the annual summary of all of the legislative activity that occurred, there are about 150 bills or so that are direct impact and interest to the members in this room comment the court, and to the legal community at large. So I will draw your attention to that. Also, owing to the elections of this past November, there are many new members of the legislature by Alarcon, 22, and at least another 8 that are returning from the previous office so we have begun another custom which is too early on try to make introductions -- meet and greet meetings to know the members and their issues and likewise to get them to understand as. In addition to this, we are aware that many of the other courts throughout our land, on a local level have been having the same meetings with the new or existing members and we will encourage that activity and outreach to continue and I'm happy to make the Council aware that a lot of this is happening in coordination so that we are able to harmonize a lot other information and a lot of our messages to this valuable partner in government. Likewise, similar to the election, certain events occurred and so our staff as well as with our courts, developing ways to implement some of the propositions that pass, four that had to direct impact on us, and much of the work right now is focused at least in front of two of the propositions related to parole reform and the second one being legalization of marijuana. More to follow on that as we -- the initiative process plays out and as we get a better understanding of how to actually implement these throughout California in accordance with the will of the voters. In your materials is a list, as usual of all of the activities occurring with the Advisory Committees, 15 total, and eight standing committees, and the work that is really occurring is really preparing for the coming years. So the 2017 annual agenda -- it sets of the course and the priorities for each of those committees. That is being put together. I will stop here because I think perhaps Justice Hull will talk more at length about the committee's in his report as they prepare under the jurisdiction. I want to stop and I appreciate the staff for another fantastic year, 2016 seems like it went by in a blur and it deserves some mention and recognition publicly. I want to take the opportunity to introduce a new member of our executive leadership team, and on

December 1, not only that long ago -- he is here today -- welcome John as the Judicial Council new chief administrative officer but a little bit about John, is that his public service career spans more than 25 years, most recently he served as a chief deputy director of the office of systems integration within the health and human services agency, responsibility for strategic policy and planning the by appointment of the governor he previously served as a deputy director of physical services at the Department of Corrections and rehabilitation, helping folks manage the department \$9 billion budget he cut his faculty that budget management and -- nine years with the Department of finance. He also managed the employment development Department legislative liaison office which involved testifying many times at legislative hearings and working with the capital. As our chief administered officer he will oversee the Council branch accounting and procurement division, Information Technology sections, human resources, administered and support operations, and budget welcome, John.

>> And as you know, right now, it really is all about the budget, and so I think that we are particularly grateful and I know I am personally and professionally to have his assistance as we develop our budget and set our sights on the coming year. The chief referenced in her remarks many of the ongoing budget meetings and outreach and activities that are occurring so I will not repeat them this work will continue between now and the release of the budget which we anticipate to be on or around January 10. Of course, after that time. We all know that it will be another challenging budget cycle. In the words of the chief, when have we not had a challenging budget cycle? But, as we were told in the August meeting, and a little preview from the Department of finance, chief economist, revenues of the state and the state of the economy improves a but it does not on track with the level of growth that folks anticipate or were designed for. We know that there is considerable uncertainty and caution over possible changes that are occurring and federal funding owing to potential federal policy changes at that level. We're working hard to advocate for the budget, as usual, and calling on our partners as well as our branch family members in this particular effort when we get to January 10 and we have the governor's proposed -- was on hand we will begin the next round of advocacy with the legislature. We have been reaching out as we always do with presiding judges, and court executives and to try to identify areas where we can achieve efficiencies through statutory change, for further and enablement and we're going to call on their direct perspective to frame our budget work over the next months. We have got more to do this year. The work is never done. I will conclude my remarks by simply wishing everybody a warm, peaceful, and safe set of holidays.

>> Thank you.

>> And other Judicial Council welcomes you.

>> [Applause]

>> We will hear the reports from the chairs and vice chairs, starting with the executive and planning committee of presiding Judge of Marla Anderson.

>> Thank you. On the behalf of Justice Miller I am providing the update on the committee's activities since the October Council meeting the report is posted on the public website with the meeting materials also the role and duties of the committee are outlined in California Rules of Court 10.11 and that is also posted on the Judicial Council website since the October Council meeting, the committee has met twice by conference call on November 10 and -- in closed session and November 17 in open session and met in person on October 27, which was a close to session the October 27 and November 10 closed the session were held to review and develop recommendations out of cycle appointments to advisory bodies, the committee conducted a three actions by email. On November 22, December 6, and December 7, where the committee reviewed reports for the consent and discussion agendas that would otherwise have been discussed during the open meeting during its November 17 meeting and November 22, December 6, and December 7 email actions, the committee set the agenda for the Council meeting today. Also during the meeting, we got an update regarding the AP 1058 funding allocation joint subcommittee report that will be ready sometime in January or February. On the November 17 meeting of the Council reviewed and approved the request from the Superior Court of Los Angeles to convert three vacant subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships and the committee also approved the request from the Superior Court of San Mateo for a temporary exception to the conversion of two vacant subordinate judicial officer positions and we also reviewed the public notices foreclosures of court office hours and that concludes my report.

>> Thank you, Judge Anderson. Next we will hear from Policy Coordination and Liason Committee judge Kenneth So.

>> Thank you. The committee has met once since the last Council meeting to review one proposal for Judicial Council sponsored -- sponsorship along with the Council 2017 legislative priorities, which are on today's agenda for Council action other items or console sponsored legislation were approved at a prior PCLC meeting and these are on today's agenda as well. As you are aware, the legislator -- will reconvene the first week in January for the first year of the 2017 and 2018 session, and during this holiday season, I am hoping that the PCLC members of rest, recuperate and regenerate because we will soon begin our rigorous meeting schedule that concludes my report.

>> Well taken, Judge So. Thank you. Next we will hear from real-time project committee Justice Hull.

>> Thank you. And good morning ladies and gentlemen. Of the rules and projects committee is - - once by telephone and once a person and has acted by email on one occasion since the Council meeting on October 28 specifically we met by telephone on November 18 and reviewed the proposal, six of which circulated for public -- public comment and the remaining two are first a proposal for technical changes to rules and forms as a proposal that makes a minor revisions to civil jury instructions, positive towards the Council has delegated authority to have been approved which we did we recommend approval of all of the remaining seven proposals which are items 2 -- 207, 212, 226, 243, 251 and 252 on today's consent agenda and 242 on the discussion agenda. But I want to make note so that there is no confusion as to item 226 on the

consent agenda. This item relates to the civil jury instruction committee work on revisions and additions to the civil jury instructions and verdict forms and in the report that supports item 256 on the consent agenda there is a notation that one of the proposed revisions relating to elder abuse cases currently recommended for the discussion agenda. After the event and after EMP approved the item 226, that portion of it relates to elder abuse for the discussion agenda, Justice Miller and I came into -- had information conveyed to us that convinced Justice Miller bed with my agreement, that item relating to elder abuse should be taken off the agenda item for further consideration so the reason that I am making note of this is that the report that supports item 226 makes reference to that elder abuse instruction and by improving item 226, on the consent agenda, we, the Council, would not be a promoting the elder abuse instruction because of that would be further considered and if appropriate bought back to the Council so I did not want to -- there to be confusion on that point. RUPRO met in person yesterday and I would like to thank the judge's -- Judge Eurie for standing in on that meeting and I was involved in other meetings and I was told that she has done such a good job that I may be deposed so anyway, thank you, Judge Eurie. We met yesterday to consider five rules of the promise proposal to circulate for public comment during the winter cycle one proposal with man cave recommends for consideration at the January 20 Judicial Council business meeting you will hear more about because I understand it has to do with propositions recently passed relating to marijuana and matters such as that is that correct? Okay. Thank you one proposal for technical changes that will not circulate for comment. RUPRO approved a proposal to circulate and after circulation and further review by the advisory committees and apparently the proposals are expected to come before you add the May business meeting and finally, as referred to by Mr. Hoshino -- at the meeting yesterday, RUPRO considered and approved the 2017 annual agendas for the elite advisory committees that it overseas. That concludes my report that I would be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Justice Hull. Next the technology committee, Justice Marshall Slough Chair.

>> Thank you. Good morning. I report you on the activities of the Judicial Council technology committee since I last reported in October. We have met three times since our last meeting, two by teleconference and one in person. Meeting in addition, the information technology committee under the leadership of Chair Judge Sheila Hanson from orange County and Vice Chair just as we more of from the third District Court of Appeal has met once. I go to the substance of our meetings, I also want to echo Mr. Hoshino welcome to John as our new judicial Council chief administrative officer and also the young as our new Judicial Council chief information officer. Yesterday I had the opportunity to meet with both of them. We were going to talk for about 15 minutes and about one hour and 15 minutes later we were not even near being finished. It was a great conversation and I welcome you and AI committee looks forward to working with both of you. At October 31 meeting, the committee received an update regarding the potential budget change proposal for the sustained a justice addition case management system replacement. We were also updated on the plastered court hosting consortium of these are two or clinical initiatives that I think you all know that I mentioned at each of these meetings per they are critical to our branch as we move forward as it relates to technology. There has been a

tremendous amount of work on both of these initiatives by the court involved as well as by the staff on the projects. In addition the committee reviewed a proposal for a one-time funding request for the information technology infrastructure of Humboldt County and the deer superior courts. The reason for this proposal is so that we can realize savings from migrating off of the sustained justice addition cords off of the current technology center. As we have reported, the majority of those courts, many are moving with the plastered consortium or to another platform. That leaves County amateur County as the last two courts at the tech center. It is critical that we find the opportunity to move them off of the tech center. Al committee approved those two projects, finding the very consistent with the goals for us moving forward. At our November 14 meeting, we received updates on the work of the Information Technology Advisory Committee. Updates on the tactical plan for technology, on the Tyler use group, on the V3 case management system replacement program, which is moving forward, thanks of the successful budget change proposal out of last year's budget. At yesterday's HAC PC meeting we received updates on all of those projects, in addition we had an informational session to learn about and discuss new ideas and best practices related to the use of virtual courtroom I was -- I was not able to attend the majority of that due to a conflict in a meeting and I thank Judge Buckley for leaving that discussion. I did get in on the fairytale end of it and it was dynamic and thoughtful. And I think that it serves as a beginning for our work on this interesting and somewhat futuristic topic I wish to thank you for bringing it to us as our newest member of JCTC, bringing this issue to our topic. -- To our committee. To discuss. We look forward to presenting to this group more of our thoughts as we move forward next year. The work streams continue to make progress in their respective areas. I'm pleased to report that the data exchange work stream has wrapped up its initial deliverables and will be transitioning its work to Judicial Council A2 supported ongoing project beginning next year. In addition the e-filing work strategy, the next generation, hosting work stream, self represented litigants e-services work stream and the disaster recovery framework work streams continue to work and make progress. The video remote interpreting work stream held a kickoff meeting, oriented all of their members to that project. Earlier this week, JCTC members including a Justice Chin, Justice Buckley, along with IT director Rob Oyung attended the court conference which is a nationwide conference, and in fact, Rob presented on the topic entitled good public policy, for innovation. Chief -- California was well represented with the ITAC Chair and vice Chair along with members of this counsel and various executive officers and information officers from many of the courts up and down the state I want to close by saying to you and to all of this Council, this committee and the great staff that support it has had a very, very active and productive year. We have accomplished much. We have much to accomplish. I look forward to our year ahead with all of our members and reporting to all of you on our ongoing projects. I firmly believe, chief, we are in a healthy path, grounded on a foundation of doing all that we can do to improve service to our court users and to our justice partners and, frankly, chief, honestly, I am proud to be a member and I thank you for giving me the opportunity to work with this committee during a very transformative process. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you. Thank you Justice Slough. Next we will hear from the judicial branch of budget committee, a judge David Rubin, Chair.

>> Thank you, chief, and members of the Council. The budget committee charge is to administer the \$10 million branch emergency fund at the \$25 million innovation grant program, and to coordinate the judicial branch budget request that goes to the state Department of finance and any other budget tasks assigned to the committee. As you know the committee approaches its tasks from a branch wide perspective mirroring an approach of this body of its work the budget committee promotes efficient, fiscally prudent, effective and fair allocation of limited resources reflecting our branch overall statewide interests. Since October meeting the committee met twice on November 28 by telephone, and on December 14 in an all-day session. The last several weeks I have seen the committee focused primarily on the innovation grant program, the governor and the legislature appropriated to the branch \$25 million for use on new and innovative programs aimed at creating efficiencies and bold new efforts to improve service to the public. In the end we will award \$2 million for collaborative courts, \$8 million for self-help family and juvenile programs and \$5 million for all other efficient. The budget committee is aware of how important this program is to both of the public and the branch by the application deadline, the committee had received 118 request, from 42 trial and appellate courts, requesting roughly \$70 million in funds. This amazing response reflects the vitality and creativity of the branch, but it also reflects the profound need for additional resources, so that this branch can adequately serve its 39 million citizens. The budget committee is reviewing carefully each application. So I think I should say a word about the committee grant review process. Prior to our December 14 meeting, budget meeting, committee members red bull not allowed to discuss with each other the request -- discussion itself can only occur at the December 14 meeting. Once our meeting began, though member whose court submitted an application or of his court was part of a group of courts which submitted a request could be in the room when that application was discussed where could that person discuss her or his report request later with another community member and we will continue to follow these rules. The budget committee still has another several days of work to go we expected that by January 10, 2017, we will have completed our review and recommendations for this body and we believe that the public and the branch will be pleased with our final proposal. Chief in closing, let me thank the nine a very hard-working committee members. They have devoted countless hours today's grant project alone pick there were probably 2000, 2500 pages of grants to read at every single member that every single one would have been assisted by an incredibly talented staff without whom I have to tell you that we could not get this work completed thank you again for this opportunity to address the Council and that concludes my report unless there are questions and I will of course toast those.

>> Thank you, Judge Rubin. We look forward to the recommendations on the awards. We move on to our members liaison report, I want to briefly acknowledge one of our presenters this morning. Congratulations to Judge Buckley. On his election as presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Los Angeles.

>> [Pause]

>> [Pause]

>> And a personal thank you for agreeing to stay on the Judicial Council while on -- you are on your role as presiding judge of Los Angeles County.

>> Thank you so much. I am honored and I hope that we are smiling in two years.

>> [Laughter]

>> I know the feeling.

>> [Laughter]

>> Hope is not a strategy.

>> [Laughter]

>> If you are going to move onto the liaison reports. Judge Anderson.

>> Thank you, G -- cheap expect we provide an avenue to justice by enhancing medication and axis between the trial courts and Judicial Council today we have two presenters, and -- first report presented by Judge Buckley and, again, I will say presiding Judge Buckley of one of the largest counties -- of the 58 and his reporting on -- a smaller County and that is the court of Santa Barbara.

>> Thank you so much and I am pleased to make this report. I think that we all know that Santa Barbara is a beautiful County. Is located on the coast that it is north of adventure, South -- it has a population of approximately 4 to 45,000 people it covers 3800 mi.² per I was fortunate to meet with many of the judicial officers but I spent most of my time with the presiding judge Jim Herman, a former member of our counsel and he will be there for a few more weeks. I met with the current a PJ and soon-to-be PJ to Kelly, and the CEO, Darryl Parker as you can see from this map, that may not show up that well on the screen, but the geography of the county -- it creates unique issues for the court. It has mountains in the interior, as well as the West and South coast of the county, which really creates a very clear and divisive -- not divisive -- a decisive position of the county. The courthouses are separated by the mountains and it creates not only trouble getting to and from but it has significant differences in the cultures and economies. In the city of Santa Barbara, the court has three courthouses, while probably one of the prettiest, historic courthouses in our state. Which is referred to as the article 2 courthouse or the historical courthouse. I want to show a few pictures to show how spectacular this courthouses. This is Judge Herman, about ready to walk into his chambers and you can see the sign -- definitely, it has the neatest signage in the state as well. This, again, is not quite as clear when it is showing up on the screen that this is their ceremonial courtroom which has spectacular art on the walls. Here's a typical courtroom in the building it is just quite stunning. And a close-up of the door. Again, just spectacular. Here are the seats. Not in Los Angeles, we are lucky that they do not fall on you when you sit on them and here they are sturdy but also quite beautiful. I was a -- here is a wedding going on in the courtyard outside the courthouse while I was visiting so it is quite an impressive building. The other main courthouse in Santa Barbara is directly across the street,

called the Figueroa division. It handles almost all of the criminal cases in the city of Santa Barbara. A few of the criminal trials are held in the historic courthouse which I will have to talk about in a moment. The third courthouse in the city of Santa Barbara is the juvenile courthouse, which is quite new will talk about some facility issues that are being faced by Santa Barbara but this one is quite new and it has all of the modern technology and it is quite impressive. which obviously is in the northern part of the county, there is a campus, if you will, of courthouse buildings where five criminal courts and then four other courtrooms that deal with other case types are in what they call the Miller division and the clerk division. There is another court housed in Santa Maria where the juvenile cases are heard. Involved hope -- I want to make sure that I get that pronounce correctly -- there is a courthouse that has two courtrooms but only one current sitting judicial officer, criminal, Trevor, limited civil, and family law and then finally there is a small one-room courthouse which hears only traffic matters. Santa Barbara County Superior Court has much to be proud of they are doing very impressive work but -- under a significant financial constraints and other challenges. I was struck have a leadership has really improved val collegiality within the court and that distance I mentioned between Santa Barbara and Santa Maria creates these challenges and it was not too long ago that the groups of judges that they were in two different Superior Court

>> When I met with the judges in both locations, you could see that they are not -- they are embodying the spirit of being one corporate I was touched to hear the judge Kelly say with pride about how the colleague now sees that they are united courts. This collegiality is also found in the individual courthouses. Whether judicial officers tackle extremely high workloads, especially in Santa Maria. I must say that the criminal docket in Santa Maria defies what we heard last meeting about less violence and the work done in Santa Maria is exhibit 1 that our judges are definitely, definitely working with much more work and in the last year and a half, these judges are facing 50% more trials. Than what they had heard before. That work increase is also in civil and family law where, again, increase in number of cases is quite impressive and also they are dealing with higher percentage of self represented litigants. The judges have been creative and changing how they manage the work in order to be more efficient and they have moved to a direct calendar for arraignments and also our sharing the work across case types. Another example of successful Santa Barbara is with technology. Judge Herman has taken knowledge and leadership in technology back home with him. We have benefited from what he did for us in the state now he is doing it -- is doing for Santa Barbara, with e-filing, new case management systems and benches but the judicial officers appear and cited -- excited and engage with their technology and the court mandated e-filing and civil cases, family law and probate. The court had to delay its implementation and criminal and traffic but they will go live on January they will go live on January 17 with criminal, juvenile and traffic on the court is working closely with justice partners to create the proper access to the court. I want to note that there was a great story on how to cross court, Superior Court, we are seeing great cooperation and collegiality when I asked how Santa Barbara is working with its justice partners, I was told how Santa Barbara went to Fresno to see how Fresno does it is no was quite free and showing how they do the certain work with portals and software and Santa Barbara is quite appreciative of how Fresno has helped or moved into technology. Another example of innovation in Santa Barbara is now that they have

telephone access with a live person answering the telephone, all day, during the day, 364 days, and they close down only one day a year where someone can handle all of the traffic matters of through trial. By not leaving their home or their location and calling in. Santa Barbara is definitely making lemonade out of lemons, creating better case management systems and programs. To give you a long list, but one small example is what they call cadre, support administered -- a program for small claims and civil harassment restraining orders and they are using their money to resolve almost all of their own detainer cases. And they have some very effective services in family law where they provide mandated classes for parents so that the children are dealing better during the stress of divorce but unfortunately Santa Barbara is struggling with some issues but the first that I need to discuss is facilities and tied to that security. As I mentioned earlier the court is forced to hire criminal cases in historic courthouse. The plan was to renovate that Figueroa courthouse across the street so that it could expand and deal with some problems. Sort of the irony when I met with Santa Barbara is that there is concern -- their concern was that there was competing large projects in this city and that there are not that many contractors so they were concerned that the construction of the Figueroa courthouse will be delayed. So they are struggling with that as we all know, now, there are no longer any dates to worry about, as construction has stopped in the brand. I need to show you some of the things that they are dealing with and the unfortunate situation when this courthouse cannot be expanded. First of all, keep in mind that in the historical courthouse, there is no security. It is a tourist spot and people can walk right into the courthouse without any security whatsoever. So here is a picture, again, a beautiful courtyard, where the public walks in, and then they just go right into this spot and now they are in the courthouse with courtrooms right down the hallway, absolutely no security. If there is a case where they think that there might be some security issues, they were all -- they will this portable security metal detector and they sort of position a right outside the door so that anyone can go right up to the courtroom itself, but there might be some security going into the courtroom in that case. The Figueroa courthouse has issues. It is extremely tight were about -- they are squeezing by to get into the building. Here at the top left picture, is just a classic -- of these people are looking at custody is that are walking by them to get into the courtroom. The picture on the right is just showing the functional problems of that they have by far very insufficient holding capacity and many times in the picture in the lower right, where they are really being kept during the day, sitting in the courtroom we all have courtrooms where multiple people might be sitting there but this is the way that they actually house them during the day in that situation. To me, this might be -- exhibit 1, dealing with showing the impact -- when there is a trial in the -- historic courthouse, they walk the custody's across the street and that is them and the top two pictures going across in Figueroa where they are -- during the day. I love the picture on the lower left and that is a picture of the custody's walking past a tourist bus that has stopped to visit the historic courthouse. So it is -- there are some of these amazing things and the same problems of security exists in Santa Maria, no secure parking so this is taken right outside the door of one of the courtrooms and that is the parking lot, and judges and staff will park and walk right past everyone and get into the courthouse. The other big issue for Santa Barbara is money, as it is for all of us. They are on the outside of the door that is quite frustrating and they face the struggles that we hear from everyone that is dealing with WAFUM. We can lay out all of the many different things on this

and Justice Humes discussed it with the Santa Clara and so forth. The one thing that I wanted to point out for Santa Barbara and how this issue of WAFUM is impacting them is that they are not able to give raises to their employees and they have gone for years without getting raises and what is happening is that they are losing talented staff to the county and other entities around but also to the counties -- the courts that are surrounding them. That are able to give raises. So it is extremely frustrating for Santa Barbara. The morale, as a result, because of all that is extremely low with their staff that the good, greatly outweighs the bad and judge Kelly wants to emphasize to you that they love to have visitors and they do not want to have Judge Buckley all the time. You are welcome to come and visit them and they can show you the good and not so good. This concludes my report and a copy will be provided to staff to post on the website.

>> Thank you, Judge Buckley and we're grateful that the Senator Jackson was areas Santa Barbara is taking notes. Justice Hull has a question.

>> I do. Thank you, jet -- cheaper Judge Buckley, I was wondering if your discussions with Judge Herman or others test on this subject but as we know the latest statistics are that we have 28 courthouses across the state that are rated at level V seismic risk which is the most risky level which basically means that in any sort of an even relatively minor earthquake those courthouses are going to come down. We hope that if that happens, as it did recently, that is not during business hours and I was wondering if it came up between you and Judge Herman and the others of the court, do you know, are they concerned about seismic matters at that court? I do not have the statistics. It could be that they are rated at a lower level and they are not in that type of danger. Did that come up at all? But it did not and it may have been -- one, I do not know if they have that existing in their County. But they were so focused on that issue of the Figueroa courthouse and crossing the street and their excitement about the work that will be done on that courthouse that we really did not get to that.

>> Thank you. Judge Rubin and Senator Jackson.

>> Judge Buckley you mentioned I think a 15% increase in files.

>> 50%.

>> Did they give you insight into why there are more trials this year?

>> Yes. Increased crime in the area. Dramatic increase in multiple defendant criminal trials so unfortunately I mentioned at the beginning that there is a discrepancy in the economies and certain other things. It just increases -- an increase of crime and very serious crimes.

>> Okay.

>> Thank you.

>> Judge Rubin and Senator Jackson.

>> She asked my question.

>> Thank you. Senator Jackson.

>> Thank you. As a recovering lawyer, I did practice in those courts for many years and I am married to a retired judge and I want to second your observations and I think it is important as you consider this area, you gently touched on the fact that they are two very distinct economic, political areas and I am delighted that they are actually now working together. I think that is critically important for the administration of justice. But I want to second the fact that you do observed in the morning and the evening, a chain gang. Of prisoners, walking across one of the main streets in town. And you noted one tour bus. There are usually eight or nine, and frequently with visitors from other countries. That is what they see when they see our justice system, and it has been that way for 30 years. I would also like to put in a pitch, but my husband was still on the bench, he walked into his courtroom one day in the Figueroa office, which is not the pretty one, it is an old building that -- the funding that we were going to replace. It observed about a quarter of the ceiling on his desk that had literally fallen over the course of the weekend fortunately he was not there were any of the attorneys and litigants in the courtroom and that was at least five years ago so there is a real problem with that courthouse. I did have a question. There was a [Event Concluded] of time particularly in South County and agree that North County we are seeing a lot of gang problems, a lot of the major gangs of the state, trying to move in to the Santa Maria area, a drug dispatch location, and there have been a number of murders -- gangs pitching against each other. But in the south part of the county there has been a real and even as an courtrooms being dark, being properly utilized, and I know that there have been a number of situations where we as -- we have judges sitting on assignment almost perpetually and I wonder if that was an issue that was discussed. It just -- I have observed it over the course of time, and uneven distribution of responsibilities that have resulted in courtrooms being dark for most of an afternoon, while, at the same time, we are calling upon our courts -- I should say the court to provide judges sitting on assignment, which does in fact, I think, the financial well-being -- I don't know if it is the state courts or of the Santa Barbara County courts, having to bring in those judges to sit on assignment when other courts are otherwise dark. Was there any discussion about how they are trying to become more efficient in their use of judicial personnel?

>> No. One, all of the courtrooms in North County are completely

>> I am talking about South County.

>> Right. I thought maybe one of your questions was maybe -- some of the judicial assignments would move up to the North County and that would not be feasible. But to your question, we did not go into much detail as to the spreading of the work and how the daily work is being done in different courtrooms in the south. We did not. But I don't know if that is a problem in other courts, within the state, but it has been -- I don't know if it still is but it has been -- I know that during the not too distant past, the problem where there are parts that are simply dark and judges are not being utilized and we still have judges sitting on assignment during those very same periods of time. But I would assume that it is not happening now because I think that we would

have discussed that. My observation and this court -- but definitely in my court that the assigned judges are brought in only when there is a direct to need and a very significant need and they are all kept busy.

>> I wonder if there is a statewide policy on this.

>> Let me say and speak to them. I could give you greater detail on this later but the assigned judges program is a state funded line item in the judicial branch budget. And we have a Judicial Council staff support the request from the various courts. But there is also, I would say, my best way to describe this -- there is sort of a days of use limitation on the court ability to just regularly use and ask for assigned judges from the program and we keep track of the request as the frequency of use and the reasons for the request. We are happy to share that information with you off-line I know that there are some folks here that are aware of that program and helping us with that.

>> The last comment, the problem with security is a -- a disaster waiting to happen. There is absolutely no security whatsoever. Anybody almost anytime can walk in. It is a beautiful courthouse as you mentioned. A lot of tours come there, a destination spot for weddings. You did not even catch the beautiful part, if anyone has a wedding, the sunken Gardens is absolutely exquisite, a place for a wedding. But there is absolutely no security, and that, I think -- I am not sure how you address it, but it is -- as things become more violent and heated, and the rhetoric becomes -- I am concerned.

>> Thank you very much for that report and the opportunity to speak on that.

>> Thank you very much. We will hear from Judge Bottke.

>> I wanted to reiterate the importance of that issue. Our old courthouse, Justice Hull was just in the dedication of the new courthouse and the old courthouse, 100 years old, department one, had no security. And I think that Judge Heidelberger was very surprised when he came out as part of the facilities group to see the parking lot and the Corning Courthouse where Judge Jennings had someone take a shot at him where there is no secure judicial parking and that courthouse is now closed due to cuts but one of the issues that we had with the chain gang coming up there and things like that -- it was the fact that there was -- access to justice issue is largely overlooked when it comes to security because we had anecdotal information after the fact, et cetera, that several times litigants would not come to court because they were afraid of the people that were there, their friends, their cohorts, et cetera. And I think that is something that gets overlooked because it is always about judicial and staff security which is of course important but if people are not coming to court because of issues regarding security, that is a real impact that needs to be addressed. Thank you.

>> Thank you. I will turn it over to judge Anderson for the remainder of the leaders and reports.

>> Thank you for the report and the second report is from the Honorable Dave Gunn, reporting on two but, on the Superior Court of Modoc as well. I will turn it over to you.

>> Thank you chief, members of the Judicial Council, and I'm going to start with Siskiyou County, the first County that I visited and on August 18 I visited the Superior Court and I met with the judicial officers, CEO and staff and tour the facilities, had a very pleasant lunch meeting. Siskiyou County is in the northernmost part of the state, nor the border shares a border with the state of Oregon. Humboldt County is to the west through the and Shasta County to the South, and Modoc County is to the east the county has a total of 6347 mi.², is the fifth-largest County by area in California. As of January 1, 2015, the county estimated population was 45,119. The county seat is the city of Yreka. The county was founded in 1852, from Shasta County and the now defunct Colleton County -- and the city was founded in 1851, the same year that gold was discovered and incorporated in 1857. The unemployment rate is steady at 12%. There are about 40 attorneys in private practice. In 1941, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors voted to succeed from California and the World War II intervened and the effort was put on hold. On September 3, 2013, the Board of Supervisors voted at 4-1 in favor of succession from California and inclusion in the state of Jefferson. Siskiyou County Superior Court has two physical locations but the main courthouse is in Yreka and the space at the Siskiyou County Sheriff substation indoors California is shared with Modoc County. For monthly small claims and other calendars. There are no permanent staff in the Doris facility for the court has five judicial positions, four judges and one commissioner. The one judge position is vacant and the two fiscal year 2015, 2016 the court used assigned judges for 116 days. The presiding judge is the Honorable William Davis, and is assisted -- assistant private -- and the court executive officer is Mary Frances McCue, and the assistant court executive officer is rename mechanical Maine. This is McCue is retiring December 30 and Mrs. Crane has been appointed to succeed her. The court has had a deficit budget every year, since 2011. And 2016, 2017 the allocations were estimated at about 2.4 million, and expenditures at 4.5. In 2013, court had staff of 43. There are currently 34 staff there are no vacancies as vacant positions are eliminated. The court outsources its IT services to a collaborative contract for Cisco County. There are two extra help -- part-time hourly contract employees since 2009 the court has closed four locations. Tule Lake in 2009, and we in 2013, at happy Camp in 2013, and the Doris reduced to one clerk day per month effective September 1, 2016. The two primary message is that this Siskiyou Superior Court judicial officers and staff would like to share with the Judicial Council are, one, the disappointment over the disruption of the new courthouse project, and concern that played the addressed quickly. The buildings and grounds are deteriorating and presenting a nuisance in the community. Utilities are cut off at the project site and basements are flooding with the onset of the winter rain. And tow, the underestimation of the needs of smaller courts using the WAFUM methodology. At the Siskiyou County court has been planning for a new courthouse since 2005, when it was ranked 14th on the critical immediate needs list for courthouse facilities planning. They have done all that has been required of them on time and under budget the site was acquired in 2012, from the city of -- and local residents. This has truly been a community project no eminent domain proceeding was required as the local residents were able to agree on the conditions. These residents are placed the needs of the community before their own one widow sold her home that

had been built by her husband as a wedding present another young couple agreed to sell and move, despite expecting another child stories of this nature abound. The original courthouse was built in 1857 and is now shared with the county and the court uses about 16% of that additions were added until 1954, when a rectangular building was built a directly in front of the courthouse and connected by an internal but historical note, the original courthouse was built in the center of the city block, and the reason that it survived is because the city fires -- every time that it earned them, the fire did not get to the courthouse because it was in the middle of the block. That is an interesting tidbit. There is an area between the two courthouses -- that is unsecured and not covered by security cameras major issues are security, overcrowding, use of common hallways and bathrooms by the public, jurors -- common hallways and bathrooms use by the public, jurors, shackled prisoners, staff, and judicial officers, the elevator in the building was inoperable during my visit due to repairs but it is far from being ADA compliant. The asbestos warnings have been given to staff that is a way -- Brett Sutter regularly spotted. In 2000 a shooting occurred within the courthouse when a handgun was smuggled in, resulting in two persons injured and one death. In 2000 through the basement including a courtroom, judges chambers, jury room and storage was flooded with raw sewage. And 2012, a historic gold collection was stolen and interest -- entrance was through the windows between the two courthouse building this slide is -- this is interesting but I have not -- I don't think I have seen a situation like this on the second floor of the courthouse -- sodas for handicapped people. I guess it is so broad ADA compliant but if the courthouse were to catch fire, they are supposed to sit in that room that room is to be used for nothing else except in the case of a fire to the courthouse. I have never heard of such a thing before. The courthouse has one. Needless to say, there has been a lot of concern about the delay of this project by the court, the community and the citizens and it is felt that the needs of their strong -- small remote County are not being recognized and Matt and I was given a lot of information about the courthouse project and the effect of the current WAFUM structure. I will deposit it with this report and I invite anyone concerned to review it on a positive note the court does recognize that there are budget -- budgetary constraints and they have been developing programs to help solve the situation. They share the one remaining outlying core location with Modoc County. The family law facility -- facilitator and self-help office collaborates with other agencies including the Child support office, legal services of Northern California, mental health agencies, family resource Center, domestic violence advocates and others, to travel to happy Camp, Tule Lake, Mount Shasta, Scott Valley, and other outlying communities to bring services to the citizens but they have undertaken a number of reorganizations, remodels, programs, system upgrades, et cetera, in an effort to accomplish their mission to their citizens but unlike Santa Barbara County, I did not take pictures of shackled prisoners but this is a public hallway. Shackled prisoners are taken through here. The bathrooms are all -- bathrooms for everybody are off of this hallway. This is the stairwell where the shackled prisoners are led from the vans up to the courtroom and the various floors. The view from the bottom of the stairwells. This is the window through which Access was gained by the people that stole the gold. This is the window between the two courthouses. There is the unsecured area. On the left is the old courthouse and on the right is the new edition in 1954. That is just an area that you can climb over the gate and get in there and go through the windows. This is one of the houses that was sold the county. On the pink house on the left is the Windows house that her husband built for her when they got

married this is the house from the young couple that was -- she was expecting when they sold. All and no -- all in all, the sixth you County -- they understand the budgetary constraint despite his apartment and concerns. They continue to be willing to work with the Judicial Council to arrive at solutions with -- Siskiyou County citizens should be proud of their court this concludes my report which will be deposited with the staff along with all of the other information that I received.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you Judge Gunn and Judge Buckley for making these visits and bringing these courts to us and sharing information. It is very helpful to us and thank you Judge Anderson for running of the liaison report.

>> I have got one more.

>> You have got one more? There we go. I spoke too soon.

>> [Laughter]

>> I visited these two counties on successive days so when I finished at Siskiyou County I asked the staff how to get over to Modoc County which is to the east of Siskiyou County and Google maps had me drop-down to writing and drive back up well, of course, they had back roads. The back roads in this part of the state are incredible. These two counties and they are small counties -- they are a part of the state are probably most of us do not get to I urge anyone, if you have a desire to see some gorgeous areas, you can drive up there. It will take a full day to get up there but it is well worth it. In between Cisco County and Modoc County, between the city and -- there is a bunch of natural sites, a lot of wildlife, and they have the tubes were the Captain Jack held out in the lobby to board, at the turn of the last century. They have an internment camp from World War II, and I understand it is the only reconstituted rebuild internment camp so that you can see what the conditions were like just an incredible journey. Of course, on my trip over, I kind of took my time and got in and finally checked into a motel and I got out on the street and I was looking for dinner after 9:00 well, Alturas closes at nine clock. The subway was not even open. I ate dinner at the dollar store.

>> [Laughter]

>> This is probably the cheapest dinner that the judicial counter ever had to reimburse in the history of liaison report, under five dollars, and at least I was faltered and looking for breakfast the next morning. On August 19, this year, I visited Modoc County. I met with the two judges and the CEO and we tour the facilities and had a very pleasant lunch meeting Modoc County is in the Northeast and County -- court of the state, the border shares a border with Oregon, and another side note, the road that goes between Cisco County and Modoc County is right on the border. If you were to go off of the roadway on the northern side, you would be in the state of Oregon it is literally right on the border. And the eastern border short -- it shares a border with

Nevada, Lassen County to the South, Shasta County to the southwest and Siskiyou counties to the west. The county has a total of 4203 mi.², as of January 1, 2015, the population -- the county estimate a population was 9399 and 2005 the median price of a house in Alturas actually breached \$100,000. For the first time. The county seat is the city of Alturas. County was founded in 1874 after the conclusion of the Modoc County -- with the war of 1872, 1873 and the resolution of competing claims by Utah and Nevada -- and this area is incredible. And really fascinating the city of Alturas was formed in 1901 and is the only incorporated city in the county. The unemployment rate is approximately 7.2%. There are less than five attorneys in private practice. In 2013 the Board of Supervisors voted for the-0 in favor of succeeding from California and forming the state of Jefferson. Modoc County Superior Court has an occasion -- one location in Alturas and shares a space in the Siskiyou County substation, in the Cisco County monthly traffic and small claims calendars. There are no permanent staff in the Doris facility. Of the court has two judges and no vacancies but it has not exceeded its allocation of assigned judges. The presiding judge is the Honorable Francis Barkley and the assistant presiding judge is the Honorable David Mason and the court executive officer is Rhonda Tyson. 2015, 2060 revenues are estimated at about \$1.3 million and expenditures at \$1.36 million. The WAFUM that relocation adjustment for this year is a \$-15,665, and a funding adjustment of \$309. On a percentage basis, the WAFUM formula is devastating to the small court the staff has been reduced from 14 to 9 and a 36% reduction. All courtroom clerks are crosstrained to clerk all calendars a major concern is the amount of clerk time to prepare the various reports required by the Judicial Council. While a necessity of the reports is understood, it may come down to the question of which is more important, preparing the reports were court operations. Wiley court has been able to maintain its programs and services, with the reduction to the WAFUM floor, layoffs and furloughs may again be necessary for furloughs were last listed in 2015. At the court facility in Alturas, the main court functions are in a single-story building to the rear of the historical copper dome courthouse but they do have an MOU with the county to use the old courtroom in historical courthouse. However, the historical courthouse has no chambers and the judge need to walk between the two buildings with robes flowing, accompanied by staff, which was a shock when I drove up because the judge Mason was running between the two buildings, and his robes were flowing out behind him and he ducked into a doorway and I walked into the historical courthouse and I thought, man, this is great stained glass. It has all been redone. Only to find out that there was no court facilities there except one courtroom. I was brought to the back to this building. It is nice. It is adequate but it gets the job done but it sure does not have an upper dome on the top of it. There is only one court reporter in the county but so only mandated reporting is available. There are no registered or certified interpreters in Modoc County. They do want DRI and they would like to be on any pilot program. As they cannot otherwise meet the requirements. The staff salaries are based upon statewide abstracts and exceed the BLS of WAFUM and reimbursement for the Judicial Council is included in the 1% fund balance, even though there has been three month delays in the receipt of the reimbursement at one point in 2015, the court checking account was down to \$5000. Less than the payroll needs. The only outsourcing is janitorial. They are very appreciative of the facilities, maintenance, after the Judicial Council took over the responsibility. The industries is a good choice and the other responsive to the court needs, providing youth, security cameras, and plumbing facilities thrown

away from other projects which upgrade the current -- courthouse. Despite budgetary issues, the judges and staff seem to be very positive. They were all very friendly and accommodating. They are quite willing to cooperate with the Judicial Council, to meet their goals within the budget constraints. They had participated in the former CMS pilot project and are part of the new program hosted by the report that they want to be part of any of the VRI pilot and they are dedicated professionals and the citizens of Modoc County should be proud of them. These last things are just signs in the lobby of the courthouse. It is just kind of interesting. I have never heard the judge supposed to get a receipt for money received that there is the sign and lastly, we are mentioned up there. Right in the lobby. Thank you and this concludes my report put it will be deposited along with the other materials that I receive with the staff.

>> Thank you.

>> Does that conclude?

>> I am done.

>> You are done? We have been trying to interrupt you. Thank you so very much for your report. For the liaison report expect I know that next on the agenda is a break up I'm going to say to please feel free to use that as you need as we move through the items because I'm cognizant that folks have flight scheduled so I am going to move into the consent agenda. I want to take a brief opportunity to thank all of the Judicial Council you -- Council advisory staff that -- an enormous amount of work goes into this and I've read their scope, their scholarship, necessity is truly extraordinary and I thank you for all of this work as you know, being on a consent agenda items does it is not diminish is important so at this time, I will entertain a motion to move the over 30 items on our consent agenda.

>> Thank you. Justice Chin moves approval and Judge Nadler seconds and all in favor --

>> [Vote Being Called]

>> Thank you. Abstention.

>> Legislative items on the agenda, they probably will be coming to my committee so I want to maintain that objectivity.

>> I appreciate that many proposals and reports. Thank you. Wheeler moved to the discussion agenda. We will move to section 16, -- 16-221. I invite the presenters at the table, presenter -- welcome and 14. This is an action item.

>> Good morning, members of the Council I want to bring the next items generally routine for the Council, but since they involve the allocation of funds want to make sure that you are aware of those actions but, again, there was -- represent what has become routine. The first issue relates to statutory requirements and to the 1% fund balance -- you have heard that issue discussed statute requires that any funds above the 1% are to be reduced from the subsequent fiscal year

allocation for the trial courts. We are required in July to make a preliminary allocation of those adjustments and that is the counselor -- they have done that and we do a final reconciliation based on the financials -- of the statements submitted by the trial courts to make a final adjustment. This adjustment to the July amount is about \$657,000 bringing the total reductions to \$8.8 million. So the recommendation is that you adopted that adjustment allocations but it is -- do not be alarmed if the perception of the \$8 million reduction allocations because the next item is the process related to the funds held on behalf of trial courts that adjusted those. So you can keep them separate that they are interrelated.

>> Thank you. Thank you, Zlatko. I do not see any hands raised at this time for questions. Given the materials in your binder and I will entertain a motion to approve the recommendation and a second if Council is appear -- prepared to do so.

>> So moved Judge Rubin and seconded by Judge Eurie.

>> [Vote Being Called]

>> The matter carries. Thank you, Zlatko and you will take us to the next matter, 16-222.

>> This relates to the process of the Council, approved dose regarding funds held on behalf of the trial courts at the Trial Court Trust Fund. This is the product of the work of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to provide greater fiscal management tool to the trial court in light of the 1% fund balance. This is an update of the Santa Barbara Superior Court request December 30 \$2000, to be carried forward for use to continue the implementation of the case management systems. This brings up the total number of request to 18 and a total dollars of \$8.3 million, that the Council will be carrying forward and for relocation out to those trial courts through this requested -- the approval process. This is important to keep those moving forward on their implementation of the case management systems.

>> Thank you, Zlatko. Again, this matter is covered in your binder of information. This is something that we read regularly and so at this time if Council is ready, I will entertain a motion and a second.

>> Judge Bottke moves. Thank you, Judge Nadler, second. Any discussion, observations, comment regarding this recommendation? Seeing no hands raised --

>> [Vote Being Called]

>> The motion carries. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Zlatko. Next is item number 16-228, the judicial branch budget, budget change proposal process, also an action item. We welcome the judge David Rubin, the Chair of the J BDT, Justice Jim Humes, Vice Chair, and again, Zlatko.

>> Thank you, chief, and members of the Council. So when the judicial branch budget committee was started in July, we had three charges, main charges, one, as we said earlier, the \$10 million emergency fund about which we spoke. Some time ago. The \$25 million innovation grant which we discussed earlier today and the processes were put in place. Earlier. Finally we have the budget change proposals and this is the last part of the three parts of the Council assigned this committee. Before we go any further, I did want to come again, to thank -- the committee handled this -- I assigned a subgroup to report back to the committee to make recommendations so that we as a committee could discuss it the committee was led by the Justice Humes to my left and then also the Judge Barton -- and Judge Slough and I want to thank all of them for their hard work on this. In particular, we have a -- having Justice Humes insight as having worked in the governor's office to tell us how they were perceived and use and also the years and service of Zlatko -- I wanted to especially thank them. As you can see from the report, that we live in what is known as an incremental budgeting environment so that we start with last year's budget and many dose the main vehicle that we used to augment budgeting is the budget change proposal and I think that the process is outlined in the report for you. I'm not going to go too much more into it the power and strength of having budget change proposals come to the judiciary branch -- the budget committee does all of the branches -- they will be in one place for evaluation, and the community will be able to look at them for duplication, or ways that we can be more -- maybe more efficiently combine them so making sure that the committee's and advisory bodies and interested parties that should have a say in the proposal will have that say obviously, we will then, as you can see from the schedule, be able to present the budget change proposals -- presented to this body July in plenty of time for discussion and then submission to the Department of finance. By the due date in September. The report lays out in more detail and actually fairly clearly -- anything else about it I would take questions or Justice Humes or Zlatko can answer any questions you might have.

>> Thank you.

>> I do not see any hands raised but I do want to say that I'm grateful for it JVC taking on the process and it seems in my 16 years it has been -- the BCP process has been always completed but a little bit unwieldy. And so by having it in the budget committee, subject to the process, so that everyone knows the time of the day, especially as we have to remember, not only in leadership at the PJ level but also CEOs does it is helpful to have a process and committee so thankful -- so thank you for this thoughtful response and if there are no questions regarding this recommendation, I will entertain a motion to move.

>> Settlement.

>>

>> [Vote Being Called]

>> The motion carries.

>> Thank you.

>> Next we will have the Judicial Council 2017 a legislative priorities, 16-240 as an action item and we welcome the Judicial Council Governmental Affairs.

>> Thank you. Good morning, chief, and members of the Council. Judge So, did you want to say anything first?

>> Okay. You have the memo in your materials and I'm happy to answer any questions. I will just go over the main points. As we do each year, about this time, in the December, January, cycle, the PCLC chaired by Judge So considers requires legislation from all of the Council Advisory Committees, in other of those individual proposals were approved on the consent calendar earlier today. And this item is sort of the more general proposal that did not come from the specific Advisory Committee that is recommended by TCL see adoption by the Council today for our 2017 priorities as we get ready to kick off the new legislative session in January when the legislature returns. Basically the recommendation here are in no particular order but I grouped them together number one would be to continue as we have for the last several years to advocate for increased investment in the judicial branch and that would include a method for stable and reliable funding for the courts to address annual cost increases and baseline operations as well as allow the courts to plan for the future. That would also include any additional resources, most of which would be covered in the BCP's that were handed to the budget committee process and are being considered by the administration but in general to support any additional resources to improve, increase, expand access to the court, whether that be to physical access or the use of technology or other services that would increase access to court users that would also include advocacy to try to continue restoring those programs and services that have been reduced in the prior years, specifically wanted to include a mention of other counsel funding which has been a priority for the last few years and it has gotten quite a bit of attention in the legislature that it has not yet received the additional funding that is required. This request would also include to extend the sunset document 2011, 2012 budget cycle, to offset some of the general fund rate -- reductions, the legislature increased a number of civil motion and filing fees to bring in some additional revenue. Package of these that is listed in the bullets is a more detail chart and further on in the memo -- in the last year is brought in \$32 million of additional funding for the court and it is on a three-year sunset cycle and so if no action is taken, in the legislature, those fees would sunset and that \$32 million of revenue would go away leaving the operational old so there is an -- a recommendation to push that out and -- another three years. The second item is in the area of judgeships and judicial officers, and this is also in keeping with the advocacy for the past several years that the recommendation is to continue to seek funding for 12 of the 15 previously authorized judgeships back in 2007. The legislature did in fact authorize 50 judgeships but they have not been funded and on this particular item, legislation has already been introduced -- on the first day of the legislative session -- introduced SB 38, which would provide funding for those 12 judgeships as well as an additional justice in Riverside. It would be to continue to legislate for ratification of the Council authority to convert vacant subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships. This has been several years process. Several

years ago the legislature adopted legislation that would allow up to 162 as jail positions to be converted over a 10 year period of time, and so over the last several years, court said that are eligible and it is a permissive -- so the courts that are eligible and want to convert a vacant STL position have been doing that. We are mostly through I think, as of the conversions that were mentioned earlier, the three additional conversions in Los Angeles and the two in San Mateo and that brings us up to 121 positions that have been converted so the 20 -- 25 or so remaining for those courts that are eligible. The conversions take place in two pieces of legislation. We have to re-up our authority to convert 16 STL positions that happens in the budget act and then there were separate legislation a few years after that where the legislature wanted to provide additional conversions if the conversion resulted in a judge sitting in a family or juvenile court and that has to be done in a separate piece of legislation so that we get authorization for 16 in the budget and then stand-alone legislation -- we can authorize an additional 10 if the result is is a judge in a family or juvenile court so that would be included and then, finally, 2 D, continue to work with that legislature to address the governor's veto message from a couple of years ago when he vetoed the bonding -- the funding for the additional judgeships and the governor suggested that those courts that have judgeships in excess of their judicial need -- that some of those positions, when they become vacant, should be reallocated to those courts that have fewer judges then they are assessed judicial need a -- there was activity on this in the legislature and the governor proposed it in the budget and the Senate approved it and ultimately the assembly did not and it fell out of the budget and the Judicial Council sponsor legislation and -- that was also approved in the Senate Judiciary committee but it was subsequently held in the Senate Appropriations Committee. So we will continue to work on that issue, Senator Roth also on the first day of session introduced a second bill on this topic, SB 39, which would implement the reallocation of access they can judgeships from courts with more judges then they are assessed in need to those courts with fewer judges in their assessed in need and so that is part of the recommendation here today finally, number three, in addition to the funding for operations, there is also a need for sufficient funding for our courthouse construction project so that would be part of the advocacy this year as well. Number four, you will recall last year that Judicial Council sponsored A.B. 1900 which authorized the disposition of the San Pedro Courthouse in Los Angeles. A couple of key things about that legislation, one, that was a first property disposition that the Judicial Council has sought and received authorization from the legislature and the second key point of that legislature is that the legislation specifically directs the proceeds of the sale of the San Pedro Courthouse to our construction fund so that was kind of the test case that went to the governor signed it -- that has -- it is a model that we pursue in the subsequent dispositions of the court property so there are a number of properties, Chico, Corning, San Diego, a few courthouses in Fresno as well as Kings County, so the recommendation is that using the language in A.B. 1900, that those additional properties will be placed in the legislation for approval to dispose and for the proceeds to go into the construction account. We would also -- recommendation number 5 is to continue to sponsor or support legislation that would approve the judicial branch operational efficiencies, including cost savings and cost recovery measures, and at the end of the memo there are several pages and we have been working on this for a few years, had about a dozen individual pieces of legislation that in the cost recovery area -- we have been successful in getting signed into lot. We have about 20 or so proposals that have been unsuccessful in the

legislature. So we will continue to revisit any of those proposals as well as any new proposals that may come up in the legislative session that would improve our efficiencies and cost recovery in the courts. We would also continue to advocate for a three branch solution to ensure the fairness and efficiency of the fine, fee, penalty and assessment structure. If there were a few pieces of legislation the last couple of years on this topic in the traffic area. We think that there will be continued legislation in this area and we would advocate for a three branch solution. As we have in the last couple of years. Finally, recommendation to continue to delegate to TCLC, the authority to take legislation on behalf of the Council on legislation as well as any propose, state, or federal administrative rules, regulations and of course that is always done after evaluating the input from a Council subject matter Advisory Committee. Those are the specific recommendations. And I am happy to answer any questions.

>> Thank you, Corey. Any questions? Senator Jackson.

>> Yes. I am interested in what the definition of the three branch solution is.

>> It would require the legislature and the executive branch as well as the court -- I do not think that there is any particular solution -- but it needs to be the involvement of all three branches to make sure that it works and I think that, as you know, the last year or so in the legislature there have been several policy builds on this topic but they have largely ignored the fiscal impact. It would be to address the policy, funding and the needs of the courts as well as the legislature and the other entities, cities, counties, other state programs that all receive revenue from the fine, fee, penalty structure.

>> Justice Hull, and then Judge Buckley.

>> Thank you, chief. Just a quick question to follow up with the question. I understand that much of what goes on with fees and fines and such, are a function of statute and that part of the three branch solution would be to get the statutory changes that need to take place in order to meet the needs of the changing atmosphere, if you will, of the fees and fines in the court. Is that correct?

>> Absolute but I think that many of you have seen the chart that we produce that have 67 boxes honored of the distribution of all of the fines and fees and it hits every level of government, cities, counties, the court, court operations, construction as well as a large number of state programs and I think over 50 state-level programs are also funded through the fine, the revenue structure and it is all statutory.

>> Thank you. Judge Buckley. And then Martin Hoshino.

>> I wanted to add to part of the answer for Senator Jackson, part of it is us trying to make an expression that the judicial branch needs to have a bigger say or participate, frankly, and the discussions if there's going to be changes to the fines and fee structures because one of the unique attributes about the California funding formula for the judicial branch is that compared to

the rest of the nation, we are heavily reliant on the fine and see and service structure that we have in place. Our percentage of general funds, funding for this branch, is really only half of the money, really, coming from the general fund and half is coming from other sources and it is within the other sources bucket that there is a big, big tilt towards fines and fees and so any discussion on the policy level statewide to alter that has a real affect or potential ramifications to do harm to the funding of the court which will in turn do harm to the access of justice and our ability to provide meaningful court services to the public so part is our expression to say that all three branches should be, more cognizant, more aware and we should participate more in that discussion to make sure that policymakers like yourself as well as the administration are aware of the entanglement of what has developed over two, three decades. So we want to have that discussion to be more global and folks to be more aware and sensitive as you might want to consider this particular -- of the victim restitution -- to adjust the state penalty and the DNA identification -- a myriad of things that have built up one at a time all worthy causes that have produced this very elaborate funding structure in California so that is kind of a broad term on how we try to frame it. And participate.

>> I would just add that we are really concerned that, if certain legislation is adopted, it is going to have a direct effect on, for example, LA does it they might have to -- the label law because they do not have enough money for operations and we want everybody at least to be aware of the potential of that to happen when you are having your discussions.

>> If I may just --

>> Yes.

>> I think the reason for my question, not quite tongue-in-cheek but it is going to be a big problem for the courts. We have seen legislation introduced this year dealing with some of the changes in this whole system so a three branch solution is almost too benign it is the funding for the court to -- if it is so reliant on this and we are starting to talk about reducing fines, a conversation that has been going on for a while but it is clearly picking up some momentum I would think that this has to be -- I would suggest that one of your top priorities because we are looking at this, the legislature, in general, as more of a policy issue rather than a fiscal issue. You need to bring the fiscal to the forefront because a lot of funding is dependent upon this. You mentioned the consequences. So somehow, three branch solution seems like too benign of a definition of what it is you are looking at with these changes and that was my only point.

>> Thank you. And I would like to stay, Senator Jackson, it is a general description but we have been in the legislature, with finance, talking about changes like this and you have to know what it means to the branch in terms of operations and the bucket -- I think it is at least 70 bucket and there are very diverse groups of entities that are being funded by -- comprised of quite a few folks to find out what entities are receiving money from court collection on fines and fees so we appreciate your highlighting that and we look forward to working with you on the matter. Judge Buckley.

>> Core, and reading the report on the conversion of the commissioners, of the SJOs, it reads unlike what I thought -- it reads as if we are allowed to convert the commissioner response to judgeships rather than it being mandated. In other words, we could not seek legislation and not convert the STL.

>> Right.

>> Because I strongly believe that a number -- if not a majority of trial courts feel that they have converted enough and would want to just stay with a number of commissioners that they have, and not convert them to judgeships for many reasons, but primarily because the spots of small claims and others that might be traditional -- they do not have enough commissioners and now they are being filled by judges so I would actually urge that we need not seek the legislation and not convert and at a minimum, send it to the advisory committee -- and have them analyze that and maybe give an opinion as to whether I am right or wrong everything that they would probably want to not ask to convert anymore.

>> [Captioners Transitioning] A number of courts have use their authority to convert because it's also based on will -- whether they are eligible or not on the number of losses. At this point there are only six courts that have remaining positions if they could convert if they wanted to. Some courts take a pass and they haven't been converting the last two years, but other courts are still designed to convert so the authority is permissive.

>> What is interesting is the fact and Judge Anderson made

>> To being key is granting permission to a court not to do a conversion. I do think the trial court's believe it is mandated. Therefore, we can see clarification, but I see that Judge Barton had his hand up as well.

>> Let me ask a Judge Anderson you have something to say and then Judge Barton.

>> Not necessarily to throw water on the fire there is a process through planning that deals with this issue, so the concerns you have are handled by executive planning with respect to conversions are not conversions because what you would do if you don't pursue this, there are some courts who do want to convert. What happens is to those courts to do want to convert, then if you don't have this is a priority then they are left out in the cold. You have some courts that don't want to convert however, they do have a process available to them so they don't have to. I don't know just off the top of my head from the last meeting I believe there are only 16 positions left so we're not talking about a lot of numbers so if we are only down to 16 positions left convert, and most of them I believe are the larger counties, and I believe there are only a couple of with the smaller counties, the conversion is but it -- budget driven as opposed to a desire. When I say budget driven it means they would like to convert to a judgeship that they don't have the money and staffing so they leave at the commission level with the Commissioner is because it's a better budgetary decision then it would be a position. It is relatively complex, rather than simple, I think it would be like Senator. Jackson is referring to the three branch

solution that is a little bit more complex than simple and this is the same and since we do have a process and procedure to handle it with the respect to the 16 positions I suggest it remains where it is and allow us to handle it internally and be able to deal with it not only from the budget perspective but also from the staffing and the need perspective as well. It would be similar to the judicial officer issue that Senator Jackson also mentioned with respect to perception that there are dark courts versus the courts. When you drill down into it you will see that sometimes it appears that a court is dark but they really aren't because their door is not open because someone is not in there because there are not people coming in and out. It doesn't mean they aren't working and that there is in preparation. There is a vast majority -- a vast variety of things we need to consider and while I do understand the concerns as vice chair of BMP I requested stay with us.

>> What I am saying is if we not seek this legislation we don't have to worry about ANP be involved I suspect again that courts do think they have to convert and get permission not to. So I would just ask that this be sent to the trial court presiding advisory committee our suggest that in order for this to be clarified. If nothing else, to educate the trial court that they don't have to do these conversions.

>> Let me clarify. Judge Buckley, are you moving that separate from the entire recommendation that item to CB removed from the seven recommendations and that the assigned to the trial court presiding judges advisory committee to review and report to E&P to report to counsel?

>> Yes.

>> Is there a second to that. I am not hearing a second and I will proceed with the original and ask Judge Barton to speak.

>> As a nonvoting member it is appropriate for me to second correct?

>> You can second.

>> Okay then I will second. And my comment was that I think it is an opportune time to have the trial court presiding judges committee look at the issue. I think there is an educational component that is necessary so that these issues are understood by the presiding judges. Second copy have a large incoming crop of new presiding judges. We could entertain this issue as early as our February 1 and two meeting and report back after.

>> Okay. Let me say, there is a motion, but we always take comments as you know when there is a motion on the floor and I will hear from [Indiscernible]. I guess the question I would have or raise is if it's an issue of educating the courts as to what they need to do or don't new is prudent to remove it versus moving forward with the education.

>> I say yes because it's asking the we are allowed to convert and I am wondering whether one of the presiding judges considered they would not seek that and not ask that anymore Commissioner spots be converted.

>> Okay. Judge Brodie.

>> If it is in fact only seeking or enabling permissive legislation, I would be reluctant, and given the lengthy process of having legislation proposed turned into a bill and enacted and even find, it seems to me that if we are seeking only to give courts permission to do it and they would choose not to, I don't know what harm the legislation would do.

>> Judge Stout and Justice Miller?

>> I think you said it well. I agree there is a need for educational pieces. I do think a lot of courts thought it was mandatory not permissive. But I don't see the harm in going ahead with the legislation. It's still permissive on a court by court basis.

>> [Indiscernible-low volume]

>> Thank you and I understand Leo Rose Goodwin is on the line and she has information on this matter.

>> Are you there?

>> She may have a listen only. Can you send her that phone number immediately?

>> I could share the numbers. In the first four years, 2007 2008 2009 and 2010 then the courts converted all 16 positions that were authorized. And then in 2011 and 2012, the authority to convert the 16 provisions was in the budget and the Legislature enacted an additional bill that allowed 10 extra positions for a total of 26. If those 10 conversions resulted in a family or juvenile judge. Since 2011 and 2012, the courts have not used all of the authority that they could have. So in 2011 and 2012 we converted 20 positions and in 12 and 13, 13 positions, 11 positions and 1314 and nine positions and 14 and 15 and 16 positions so far and 2015 and 2016. So they are not using and we have heard from several courts that were eligible that could have converted that decided they didn't want to for whatever their local reasons are and at this point, Contra Costa LA Napa plaster San Diego orange in Sacramento have remained in authority. The other courts have already used their eligibility.

>> Thank you Corey.

>> Can you explain, Corey, I have an understanding of why we do this, but can you explain why courts would choose to convert, isn't it financial?

>> Welcome I think that the legislative history on this was that the population growth and the workload growth in the state had far outpaced the growth in the number of judgeships. Just trying to get the additional 50 that were authorized by the legislator from 27 -- 2007 was incoming. So courts to make up for the workload in the 90s and the 2000s, because only the legislature can authorize a judgeships, courts instead were hiring commissioners to work at -- as judicial officers to take on the work of.

>> That comes out of the court budget to pay for the Commissioner?

>> That's right. The ratio was a concern in the original legislation that there should be more judges and not have any -- as many court commissioners so that was a solution to gradually provide authority to the courts if they wanted to and if they were eligible that they could convert only on a vacancy. Then on the conversion happens, of course, it converts to a judicial position and that is funded through the separate line item in the budget for judicial officer where the commissioners funded out of the local court budget.

>> That is what I understood it to be. I can't wait for Leah. We have another matter and so since we have not been able to get her on We have a motion and it has been seconded and as a reminder it is to exempt item to C from the recommendation of seven on this item and also then to direct to C to the trial court presiding judges advisory committee for education and an action. Judge Buckley?

>> Given the comments, the fact that we can get started with the legislation and maybe the presiding judges decide along the line that I said, we can ask that it be delayed or slow down. I withdraw the right word. I will withdraw the motion.

>> Okay. Thank you. So here we are. The motion is withdrawn that we do all acknowledge the need for education so we can see that this could come back and we are open that through the agenda item on the E&P most certainly and at this time I will entertain a motion for the seven recommendations. Judge Back demos. Judge Feng seconds and judge the Lila seconds. All in favor, knowing that to C may come back, please say I. Any opposition? Any abstentions?

>> Abstained. Thank you Senator. Jackson. 127 are adopted. Thank you.

>> [Indiscernible-low volume]

>> Thank you, Justice Miller. Now what I believe is our last action item. We have several speakers who want to speak to these. So I will turn it over the Judge Anderson for the speakers and then we will invite the presenters to the table.

>> I believe only one person has checked in for public speaking on item 16 dash 242. We have Mr. Michael Harold. Step forward. Is he still present? You will have approximately [Indiscernible]. The microphone is behind you. Thank you so very much for your public comment with respect to the traffic and criminal procedure. You have three minutes. I will give you a one minute warning and a 32nd morning.

>> Thank you my name is Michael Harold. I am a legislative advocate with the Western Center on Law and poverty and am here today to address the issue about the proposed courtroom regarding the traffic rules. First, I want to acknowledge the substantial work that the judicial Council has done since we first brought this issue to use some two or three years ago. The legislation and the prior sets of rules that have been adopted over time, it has been a long process. It has been a worthy process. The implementation of the current amnesty program

around the state has already resulted in over 150,000 people getting their drivers licenses back and being able to get back on their feet. But we have more work to do. We acknowledged today that the set of court rules takes another substantial step in the direction that we have been encouraging you to do over the last few years. And in the meantime as we submitted our prior letters, we acknowledge the numerous steps that have occurred. I will just address two remaining issues that we have today. And I know we will have more work to do in the next year as we go forward. So to concerns. One is First of all we appreciate the deleting of the consideration of defendant's criminal history that is in the current rule. That is a change we encourage you to do and we adopted it. Second, we continue to be concerned that the rule that instructs courts that they may not waive mandatory fees, we would still encourage you to change that ruling. We think that is contrary to case law is. As we pointed out in our letter to you, we would encourage the judicial Council to review this again and to provide instruction to the courts that they may indeed waive those mandatory fees. Lastly, the proposed rule is set to go into effect on May 1, 2017. Because the rules do go a good way -- a good way in the direction of allowing our clients to be able to get relief if they had a failure to pay or to appear, amnesty ends on April 1. The court rules take effect on May 1. So there is going to be a one-month gap where our clients don't have a remedy. We would strongly urge and we know it is difficult to move the machinery quickly, but we urge you to do so by April 1. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you. The other person did not check in. So that includes the public comment.

>> We invite to the presenter table judge J Richard Cousins and also Hon. Gail Dekreon and Hon. J. Richard Couzens is the vice chair of the criminal advisory committee. Welcome.

>> Thank you . Good morning and thank you for having us. So the traffic advisory committee and the criminal law advisory committee recommending will [Indiscernible] and adopting rules for .106 and four point for .106 and 4.0335 of the California Rules of Court. The committees develop these proposals in response to the judicial Council's directive to consider recommendations to promote access to justice in all infraction cases. The proposed rules are designed to promote procedural fairness for infraction cases to enhance guidance for defendant in the courts and to approve notice to the defendant and to clarify procedures regarding ability to pay determination. They also minimize the need for court appearances of providing written petitions if possible. With this proposal, committees have attempted to strike a balance by providing due process without overburdening the courts. Proposed amendments to rule 4.105 would improve notice to defendants of court procedures for infraction cases while requiring that the trial court websites include a link to the statewide traffic help information posted on the California courts website. Proposed 4.106 would standardize and improve core procedures. And notice to defendants Regarding failure to appear and failures to pay for infraction offenses. In converting judicial administration standard for point for one into a standing rule of court, the proposed rule would require that trial courts send reminder notices -- reminder notices to traffic defendants before their initial [Indiscernible] and would specify what information must be provided in those notices. Most courts do currently provide these notices and the new proposed rule [Indiscernible] options for providing this notice electronically. Lastcraft proposed rule 4.335

would standardize and improve for procedures and notice to infraction defendants related to ability to pay determination. So we're happy to answer any questions.

>> Thank you. Any questions or comments? I thank you for the hard work and for the work the traffic advisory committee does working on these rules that most affect so many people and especially those who are underserved or disadvantaged with the aid of the criminal law advisory. I am happy how promptly and thoroughly these rules have come before us. Thank you. Without any hands raised, I will entertain a motion to adopt these recommendations, numbers one through five. Judge So moves and seconded. Can I ask a question

>> [Indiscernible-low volume]

>> Justice Miller, we discussed the six-month window because various courts were various stages of development. It was a situation where some courts really had advanced computer systems and could jump right in and really some had to reinvent the wheel. We thought the six-month period was reasonable. I think we are prepared to save you would like to make an advance on the one month on that that is something I think the courts could adjust to and we would happy to concede it.

>> Thank you. This matter was considered twice and the timing issue was a concern to many of the courts. I think the original recommendation draws a good compromise between what the courts were initially seeking and what is actually possible. There is wide variation among the courts in terms of where they are in this process and what can be done. I think the committees initial recommendation carries today at least in my view and provides all courts the opportunity to comply so we don't end up with some courts in an uncomfortable position.

>> Thank you.

>> [Indiscernible-low volume]

>> Two things. First, we will ask the panel to answer that question and memorable hear from Judge Chin unless you can answer the question .

>> Let's wait. Do you have -- there is a Munn wants [Indiscernible] that exists and we know there is reason for it. So Justice Miller, you are asking what is a person to do in that one month lag?

>> Right is there some significant prejudice [Indiscernible-low volume].

>> I can't think of anything either. When amnesty ends the courts will turn the faucet off and it's over with. There are still pending cases and their still working with the same collection agencies and they know that these rules, if they are approved today will go into effect in May will be working on putting them into effect. I don't see that a one-month delay would cause any prejudice.

>> Did you hear that, Justice Miller?

>> Yes, okay.

>> This has nothing to do with this proposal and I applaud you for your work and I note the comment in the bottom of the summary. That you are trying to minimize the need for court appearances. We have just come from the national Center for State courts technology conference. Many courts across the country are adopting online procedures for handling traffic citations, and accident citations. Would you please give that some thought?

>> I might say, Judge Chin that the futures commission is out there and is high on their hit parade. It's very much on the radar screen for all of us working in this area.

>> A lot of courts are working on developing state-of-the-art Kate's management systems that can accommodate those needs but not everybody is on board yet.

>> Thank you.

>> My only comment is a number of the changes in the rules are about providing notice what is Aarti available so although the world won't go into effect in May one is courts are able to update the reminder notices before that date this wouldn't prohibit them from implementing it at a local level in advance.

>> Not only not prohibited. We want the courts as soon as they are able to go online to do so.

>> I think we recommended it would go into effect January 1 cup at the courts must also all be putting into effect no later than May 1 two accommodate courts that are not quite up to speed.

>> No later than May 1.

>> That is right.

>> Thank you. A motion has been made and seconded as to these recommendations. All in favor please say I. And he opposition? Any abstention. Matter carries. Thank you very much and we appreciate your explaining that and getting this work done.

>> We conclude today's meeting as sadly we often do with the remembrance of judicial officers recently deceased. Judge Kenneth Concha superior -- just Benjamin Deas of Sacramento County, Michael Farrell Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Joe Gray Sackman of Connie, William IV superior -- [Indiscernible] Los Angeles County judge Byron McMillan orange county, Judge Howard Schwab Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Judge Spencer Court of Appeals second appellate district Los Angeles, Judge Lawrence Storch Superior Court of Ventura County Judge Douglas whether Superior Court of Riverside County, all retired from the bench and we all knew them for their service to the courts and the people of California and to the cause of justice. The next regularly scheduled business meeting for the judicial Council will be next year. It will be

January 19 in January 20 in San Francisco. Happy holidays to all of you. Thank you for coming and safe travels. We stand adjourned.

>> [Event concluded]