

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

>> Please stand by for real-time captions.

>> Good morning everyone, this is the business meeting of the Judicial Council of California for Friday, May 17, 2019. We are now in session. As you can tell by our agenda, we intend to close our meeting at approximately 12:40 p.m. We are very specific. I understand Patrick Kelly is joining us by phone. Are you there?

>> Yes, Your Honor.

>> Good morning. Before we begin our regular business meeting agenda, I would like to give a shout out to our California jurors. As all of you know, this is Juror Appreciation Week. It ends today, but all of us couldn't do our work without jurors and we thank you for being jurors year-round. As you know, the council over the years has taken many actions to improve the jury service experience. The one day or one trial service, one postponement, and plain language jury instructions. I know and I am hearing that many courts are doing what they can to show their appreciation for jurors and their courts, so I say again to all jurors and all of us who serve as jurors, thank you for your service. Now I want to acknowledge some very special guests and later, celebrate a very positive revision to the budget for the branch. First, our guests. I am pleased of the faculty and new judges and commissioners join us today in Judicial Council. I have had the pleasure of meeting them all and speaking with them over the week. A long week, I've been told. But very interesting and educational. As part of the program, they are attending our opening segment of the Judicial Council meeting, so welcome to all of you. I will ask the program's eight faculty members who share their knowledge, experience, and time, to stand as their names are called. I will ask everyone to hold applause until the end, because I have a lot of people to introduce and I know you know them. We will start with the faculty from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Judge David Cunningham. Judge Laura Priver. And a former Judicial Council member, thank you. From the Superior Court of San Diego County we have Judge Sandy Davis and Judge Terry Roberts. From the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County, we have faculty Judge Janine Guy and Judge Monica Wiley. Thank you for your service, thank you for your volunteerism and enthusiasm for teaching. I know many of you have been teaching for years. Thank you.

>> [Applause]

>> I will now call on the 28 new judges and commissioners participating in the New Judge Orientation program to please stand when your names are called. I know you have lots of fans and you know many folks. I will ask you to hold your applause until we have all 28 standing. Here they are. Judge Karen Schwartz. From Contra Costa County, Judge John Devine. From

Fresno County, Judge Amy Gavin. From the Superior Court of Glenn County, Judge Alicia Eklund. From the Superior Court of Kern County, Commissioner Don Mendelson. And Judge Therese Foley. From the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Judge Mario Barrera. Judge Joseph Burghardt. Judge Lisa Cohen. Judge Jeffrey Lori. Judge Daniel Crowley. Judge Jill Feeney. Judge Scott Heron. Judge David Reinhardt. Judge Ann Richardson. Judge Janice Saying. Judge Holly Thomas. And Judge Jessica -- how do I say that? Thank you. You know earlier at Judicial Council, not at Judicial Council, in my chambers, I heard L.A. is in the house. Yes, L.A. is in the house. But we have more. From the Superior Court of Orange County, Judge H. Sheena Tolliver. From Riverside County, Judge -- Superior Court of San Joaquin County, Commissioner Castillo. From the Superior Court of Santa Clara County, Judge Charles Adams, Judge Frederick Chong, and Judge Nicole Reisinger. From the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County, Commissioner Emily Trachsel. From the Superior Court of Sutter County, Judge Laura Davis and from the Superior Court of Yolo County, Judge Tom Dyer and Judge Peter Williams. Thank you so much for your work. Your work now, your work in the future. This is really such a combination of all of us learning from each other, making friends and working together for the great state of the judiciary in California. Thank you.

>> [Applause]

>> As I indicated, not only did I want to welcome our guests, but I also want to speak about the May Revision to the state budget. During my tenure as Chief Justice, my budget statements have ranged from in the early years, dismay and grave concern at austere budgets and cuts, to in recent years welcoming and appreciating both prudent and strong budgets that will provide equal access to justice for Californians in our courts. This year I said Governor Newsom's budget proposal will help maintain our momentum on initiatives designed for justice. Following our May Revision, it shows a deep support for our goal of achieving equal access to justice for all Californians, something we at Judicial Council strive to do every day. And I've always acknowledged this isn't even possible without the dedication of judicial officers, court executives, staff, Judicial Council staff, attorneys and system partners who doggedly advocate for equal funding for the judicial branch. I am doing the same this year. We have achieved these results only by speaking with many harmonized voices that are focused on our access, our goals, real data and the need for stable, ongoing funding for equal access to justice. And I say this again, the principal architect has been Martin Hoshino, who hates to be thanked for anything, but, thank you Martin.

>> [Applause]

>> Our next order of business is the regular opportunity for in person public comment, in addition to the written comments we regularly receive. For new judges and commissioners in the audience, this is a relatively new facet of Judicial Council, where we have public comment period where we allow in the first part, to speak to any matter in the judiciary. Then as the agenda forms up, public comment can come in and we reserve that comment for when the agenda item is called, as we have later on this morning and issued just like that. But at this time I turn over public comment to Justice Miller.

>> Thank you. We have two individuals here today and I will call both of them. If the first could come forward to the lectern and then the other way tried behind the swinging door. The first is -- and as you approach, please remember this is general judicial administration public comments. We are not an adjudicatory body, we cannot make decisions, and we respectfully request you do not talk about individual facts of your case. Talk about general administration, so welcome and thank you and you have three minutes and will receive notice by the light. Again, welcome and thank you for being here.

>> Thank you so much for having me, Your Honor and members of the council. My name is R.A. Lawson and I am a senior attorney at the Family Violence Project. The Family Violence Project is one of the only organizations in California dedicated to providing appellate representation for survivors of domestic violence and their children, particularly low-income survivors. I want to thank the council also for taking seriously and for reviewing the comments that we submitted along with 16 other organizations on the proposal regarding non-courtroom language access services, specifically item 19-104, which discusses adopting California Rules of Court, rule 1.300 and improving forms LA-350, LA-400, LA-450. So I have four points that I want to quickly make here. The California courts, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, are required to provide meaningful access as part of their obligations for language access. So what does meaningful access to a courtroom program for a limited English proficient survivor of domestic violence? It means that they are not being ordered to our program without the knowledge that they will have the language services available for them to take that program. It means that they will know ahead of time that they have the option if there isn't a program in their language, to inform the court of that option, of that problem and get some kind of change. It means that courts all have to collect data about available programs and the data that they collect is similar in that a person should not be adversely affected, simply because they happen to be accessing programs in one county versus another county, because the data collection and monitoring of those programs is different.

>> One minute.

>> Courts need to know the programs and provide the information to the litigants at the time of making the order. That is the essence of the basis of this proposal. The court discussed that it was the failure to craft a plan that did not have language difficulties. The court should inquire into the LEP court user's ability to complete a program. I urge the Judicial Council to both require at the minimum, notice of these forms be made available to all litigants once those orders are made. That the form that is being used to describe programs is standardized across the state so data collection is uniform and information can be used to properly assess language access programs. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. Next we will hear from Katherine Campbell and again, good morning and welcome.

>> Thank you, good morning Chief Justice and council members. I want to thank you for having us because we started here just being able to be downstairs, so we are excited we are now able to come to speak to you and we have been coming for years now as advocates for family court, because children's cries for help are being unheard. 58,000 children across the U.S. are forced to

live with their abuser, which means in the West 500,000 children are currently living under court order with their abuser. We came to this council that abuse is being dismissed in our courts across the country, but it is happening in California. I am not sure what we could do here with this council, so we went to Sacramento and we said, 90% of the complaints that go to the CJP are being dismissed and children are being forced to live with their abuser. Some children are actually dying. You have heard from parents who come to this council and told you that their child was murdered because they were believed that their child needed protection and this continues to happen throughout California. We asked for an audit. The audit, you know was approved. Then, the CJP sued the auditor and last fall the audit moved forward. The results came out April 25. The CJP investigators failed to pursue allegations throughout and ignored warning signs of ongoing misconduct. These are what came out of the audit. CJP structure and disciplinary procedures are not aligned with the judicial discipline best practices. CJP has not taken important steps to improve accessibility and transparency to the public. Significant changes are needed to improve the process for disciplining judges. We also moved forward with a federal resolution last year, Concurrent Resolution 72, to make child safety a priority, because this is a crisis. It is a state matter, but the federal level took this on, because it is a crisis. We were able in California to pass Pinkie's Resolution last year. Pinky is a child who was murdered by his father in Los Angeles. With that, we were supposed to receive, the chief clerk was supposed to make copies of the resolution and I hope this council has received that, but it calls for child safety as a first priority and we hope we can take care of our children. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. That concludes public comment at this time. We do have public comment later, with regards to specific agenda item, thank you.

>> Next on our calendar we have the review from March 15, 2019 meeting minutes. They are in your binder. I know you had a chance to look at them. We are ready to entertain a motion to adopt.

>> Motion to adopt.

>> Second.

>> Thank you. All in favor of adopting the minutes, please say aye. Any opposition or abstentions? We adopt the minutes. Next on the agenda is my regular report to council summarizing some of our agenda and ongoing action since her last meeting. The week after our last council meeting I had the great pleasure of delivering my annual state of the judiciary address to the Legislature. It was a new venue, the Senate chambers, where their motto is to guard the liberty of the people. We had guests, Governor Newsom and the Lieutenant Governor. I am also thankful to the many council and judicial branch representatives who attended. It is always good to see friendly faces in the audience. And to our long-term partners, the Bench-Bar Coalition. In their second year, I met with Sara Rosen and the leadership of the California Lawyers Association. They are the trade entity that broke off from the State Bar. One of their main goals is to promote diversity and inclusion in the legal profession. We discussed support for pro bono litigants. Diversity was also the theme of the Bar Association of San Francisco's Justice and Diversity Center outstanding volunteer appreciation awards, where they celebrate individuals and firms for their amazing pro bono work in their services to the homeless, the vets,

immigrants and low income families. My colleagues on the Supreme Court and I, we attended the Lawyers Club of San Francisco's Inn of Court, where the Dean Erwin Chemerinsky was our guest speaker. We also attended the Los Angeles County Bar Association, Appellate Court Section luncheon from the Court of Appeal Second Appellate District. Our colleagues there attended as well. In Sacramento I attended the California Asian Pacific American Bar Association 2018 dinner and gala, with Assembly members -- and the Los Angeles chapter. I also anticipated in a fireside chat where we discussed diversity in the legal profession. Additionally, Martin and I had a very positive meeting with Presiding Judge Lydia Vieri Al, council member Anderson and their colleagues and staff at Monterey Superior Court. The court shared information on the transition to a paperless court. They bragged about being a paperless court, an update on their mobile app, also how to pay a ticket, which they presented at our November council meeting and their expansion of self-help services through a collaboration with the Monterey College of Law. It is an excellent court, people work together and seem to greatly enjoy each other. They cover for each other in terms of assignments and tasks. Martin and I also presented service awards to the Judicial Council staff in San Francisco and Sacramento. These are public servants who work for us. The service ranges from five years to 30 years. Thank you Charlie De Mar for all of your years of wisdom and service. We are joined by chairs to review the 2019 Judicial Council nominations, also known as volunteers for a second unpaid job. I am very pleased to say we received 463 nominations throughout the state for 431 vacancies on 23 committees and I really see this as proof that in our branch there is an ongoing commitment to volunteer public service for the betterment of access to justice. I also had the pleasure of presenting awards of excellence to three schools down south out of the 92 that received this year's Civic Learning Award. I commend schools and teachers for their creativity and commitment to civic education, which now has a strong judicial component, with the involvement of lawyers and the discussion of trials and appeals in important cases. Since the awards, we have recognized more than 300 schools in California in 30 counties and this year four new counties participated. The theme for Law Day 2019 as you know was Free Speech, Free Press, Free Society, and I participated in another fireside chat with the Operation Protect and Defend annual Law Day celebration in Sacramento. This is a civics program for high schoolers established by a retired federal judge where they take a theme and this year the theme was voting rights. And through essays and are, the students express how they feel about the current state or current events or history or a particular case. And with the theme of, quote, building the future, I was the guest speaker at the joint legislative conference of the California Labor Association and State Building and Construction Trades Council where I shared my family story as farmworkers and how they helped build our future. In San Diego, civic engagement and civility were key themes for the eighth annual Restoring Respect conference. It is hosted by the Institute for Civic Engagement. Justice Judy McConnell played a major role. She participated in a panel discussion on civic education and also Dean Stephen Furlow, also part of the judicial branch Power of Democracy Steering Committee, provided opening remarks. This is a partnership between the University of San Diego, the City of San Diego and Miramar and Mesa community colleges. Judge Joan Weber also from San Diego moderated a conversation with Senate President pro tem Tony Atkins and myself on another topic important to women in California. I was happy to see the cochair of our group there with Justice Brad Hill on the

prevention of harassment and discrimination. This event also included a panel discussion of that subject and was presented by the National Association of Women Judges, with California Women Lawyers and the California Legislative Womens Caucus. So you are seeing two branches of government and women's organizations coming together to talk about a national, important topic. Empowerment was also the theme and I gave my keynote address to 7,000 attendees at the 30th anniversary of the Professional Businesswomen of California conference. The theme was "Unstoppable" and I was able to share my personal story and the importance of the judiciary of being inclusive, courageous, and act with integrity. In Monterey, Martin and I attended the 125th annual conference installation banquet of the California State Sheriffs Association. I swore in the new leadership. The sheriff is David Livingstone of Contra Costa County. Interestingly, also a lawyer. Sheriffs, as you know, provide bailiff and security services in 36 counties and our superior courts. Finally, most recently I was honored to join family and law enforcement officers at the annual memorial ceremony at the California Peace Officers' Memorial Foundation. It honors the 2018 officers who have been killed in the line of duty. They call it end of watch. Joining Governor Newsom, the Lieutenant Governor, the Attorney General, and the foundation's president Kevin Mickelson and executive director Wayne Quint, Jr., both law enforcement officers, we did honor and recognize California peace officers and their surviving families who came to the celebration who lost their lives in the line of duty. That concludes my report. I turn this over to Martin Hoshino.

>> Thank you, Chief, members. I think for the first time ever, but probably never again, I will defer my speaking and reporting time owing to the fact that it is a one day meeting and it could be a heavy agenda as you go forward. I would merely only attempt to deflect and share your kind words related to budget advocacy and budget work, because it truly is a team effort. We are blessed with a terrific team here at the council. They are all over there, standing there, so I won't name them, but it is also the point you made, Chief, about harmonizing a lot of the energy and efforts and expertise that are distributed all over this branch at every level of justice. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Martin. Then I will turn this over to the chair of E&P.

>> Thank you, I will also shorten my report. My written report will be posted online. I did want to make a couple of comments. I appreciate you mentioning that Executive and Planning reviewed 463 nominations for 131 vacancies. I want to thank E&P members. It takes weeks for them to vet these individuals and it takes all of a day to talk about them and make recommendations. You will be receiving those in the upcoming weeks. I did also want to mention that starting today and for the next month, we will be soliciting nominations for our annual Distinguished Service Award, which recognizes those who have demonstrated extraordinary leadership and made significant contributions to the administration of justice, and the nomination forms can be found online. I encourage you to talk to those in your courts and nominate those you feel would fit with those awards. They are very significant and they will be honored at the council meeting in November. Thank you, Chief, that concludes my report.

>> Thank you Justice Miller.

>> Our report is posted as well, so I will make this brief. We met four times since the last council meeting and we have taken positions on 13 separate pieces of legislation and approved

five legislative proposals. A couple of the bills we took positions on, we enacted to propose a provision in AB 310 relating to category let exemptions for peace officers. The remaining bills wearily supported and they include, of course, bills such as AB 1737 which repeals the 1% cap on trial court funding balances. Implicit bias training. And mental health services. After the Chief's State of the Judiciary address, we had a meet and greet with legislators and guests and the benchmark coalition day was on that same day, where of course we support the content with the legislators. I will keep you informed of bills of interest as they percolate through the system. Thank you, Chief.

>> Thank you, Judge. Next I call on Judge Bacigalupo. I apologize, Paul.

>> Chief, members of council, the committee met twice, and acted once on March 15. On April 10, the group met by telephone to consider six rules and forms, proposals for public comment. Two technical amendment reports were not subject to comment and 41 rules and forms proposals for the spring cycle. The group recommends the approval of the rules and form proposals circulated for comment and a technical amendment. The consent agenda has items 19-88, 91, 111 and 113 on today's consent agenda. Circulation of new rules and form proposals which are posted for public comment. Following public circulation they were reviewed by the committees. Those are expected to come before the council on the September 24 business meeting. On May 6 we met by phone to consider minor revisions to jury instructions and a proposal for council's delegated authority and technical changes to rules of court. We recommend the approval of new and revised jury instructions and technical changes on items 19-87 and 19 on the consent agenda. In addition, we were proactive by e-mail on April 15, we did some minor revisions for clarity of rules and forms that were posted there April 10.

>> Thank you, Judge Gordon. Next is the Judicial Council technology report.

>> Thank you, Chief. I am happy to give this report on behalf of the justice who is not able to be with us here today. Are you on the phone? Oh good, I can do whatever I want. I first want to comment that the Chief has thanked Martin and his terrific staff, as well as our budget people. But in my 23 years of going to the State of the Judiciary address, this is the first time, the very first time that the Governor has attended and that is not an accident. The Chief has formed a close relationship with the Governor and his staff and this major revision is largely the result of that relationship, so we all owe the Chief a debt of gratitude. I am particularly gratified by the Governor's May Revision and its commitment to funding technology, finally. The investment puts public access to justice at center stage and that is where the Chief has wanted it, with her Access 3D. And its emphasis on using technology to help the people that need it most. Since our last council meeting, the committee has met twice and held an education session yesterday. The Information Technology Advisory Committee has also met twice. On April 8, the committee received a report from the chair of ITAC on the activities of the committee and its workstreams and an update on the pilot project surrounding e-delivery between one prison in San Francisco and the Third District Court of Appeal. The committee also reviewed and approved the final results of the Phase 1 Digital Evidence Workstream, as well as the Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-2020, which is on the council's agenda this morning. At our meeting yesterday, the committee received a report on ITAC activities and joint proposals from the Appellate Advisory

Committee to amend rules of court, to update court procedures to promote e-filing in the appellate courts. I just want to make a comment on something that was not part of the public agenda yesterday. We had an educational session presented by the digital self-help pilots efforts. Their efforts to approve the end-to-end experience of self-represented litigants. This will be a very important part of what this council does and I just wanted to comment on the remarkable progress that that pilot is already accomplishing. It is going to be incredible. We are going to be able to help people who are self-represented. The people in our system that need the help most. I am not in this public session going to go into detail about the progress they made, I just want to thank Jack Madden, Bonnie Howe and Mark Zlad for their terrific work and I hope to bring it to this chamber shortly. ITAC met on April 2 and 8 and at the second meeting they voted to recommend acceptance of the Tactical Plan for Technology for 2019-2020. On April 8 at the in-person meeting, ITAC received updates on the status of the proposed technology budget change proposal. The funding request for the fiscal year 2021. The Privacy Resource Guide, the spotlights on intelligent chat, remote video appearances and the ITAC community development workstreams. They are quite busy on our behalf. The ITAC workstreams continue to be engaged and productive. Members include judicial officers, court executives, IT professionals, those in court operations, as well as council staff. Participants are working together to develop solutions to effectively address statewide technology issues, consistent with the Chief's initiative. Teams are exploring ways to extend collaboration across the branch. For instance, several workstreams are partnering with the Court Innovations Grant Program, some of which we already heard from, to develop projects and pilots assessing findings and sharing information. For instance, the Disaster Recovery Workstream Phase 2 is partnering with the Superior Court of Monterey to test framework development by phase 1 of the workstream using the court's grant as a pilot. I would like to congratulate the ITAC workstreams charged with updating the tactical plan, which we will hear later in this meeting. In closing, I want to thank the Chief for her outstanding leadership and vision, not just for the operation and improvement of the branch, but particularly in the area of technology. I also want to thank the IT community, court staff, judicial officers, Judicial Council staff for their commitment in supporting the many initiatives. I am truly impressed by their commitment to leveraging efforts to ensure that we are able to use technology as an important tool in increasing access to justice. Thank you.

>> Thank you Justice Chin.

>> Good morning, Chief Justice and ladies and gentlemen of the council. In the interest of time and understanding that our schedule is going to be impacted, my report will be posted, a couple of comments and highlights. We met four times since our last meeting in the report was posted online listing the details of that. We have reviewed BCPs for 2021 which are ready to be presented at the July meeting. We also had an opportunity to go over the grants, enhanced spending program, and we will be talking about that at the next meeting and introducing another grant later on today. I also want to add on behalf of the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, our kudos to the Chief, to Martin and the Budget Services team for the outstanding work on the upcoming budget. Thank you for that.

>> Thank you Judge Rubin. I will turn it over to Justice Miller for liaison reports.

>> We have two reports today.

>> Thank you, Justice Miller. It was my honor to visit with San Francisco's court on March 8 of this year. I met with Presiding Judge Garrett Long and the executive officer, Michael Yuen. They spent a lot of time with me and I learned a lot about the court. The court has 52 judges and as the time of the visit, they had all been filled. We talk about filing trends and it was different in San Francisco than statewide. Filings are up in misdemeanors, felonies, civil unlimited and juvenile dependency. Down in juvenile delinquency. Interesting, with respect to jury trials and the local culture, the disposition of misdemeanor jury trial statewide is .48%, but it is 19 times higher in San Francisco at 9.02%. There are presently four courthouses. The Hall of Justice, the Civic Center Courthouse, the Polk Street annex and the Juvenile Justice Center. I visited all but the Juvenile Justice Center, which I know is the subject of some discussion locally. Starting with the Civic Center Courthouse, it was completed in 1998 and is a very nice courthouse. There are 44 courtrooms and administrative functions. It is across the street from where we are right now. A very nice facility. Going into the courthouse you become immediately aware of two things. One is signage. Throughout this courthouse and in fact throughout the other courthouses, there is fabulous signage which tells you about the departments, which cases are going, very clear and obvious. Also impressive was a children's waiting room that looked to be quite beautiful. I didn't go into it because I was too old, but they use it as a first-day center for jurors. Not a day care center, because it is not licensed for that. As well as witnesses who sometimes need to bring their children or otherwise provide care. In San Francisco, every case is assigned to a courtroom. It is very rare that a case is assigned to trial and does not get out to trial, which I think is an amazing statistic and a testament to the operation of the San Francisco court. The trial date is assigned. Parties are required to phone in before the trial date, before the master calendar date and again, the court does use a master calendar system that assigns cases to open courtrooms. If there is not an open courtroom, the cases are assigned to trail and those almost always get assigned as well. The San Francisco court uses a mandatory e-filing system and it has been very effective to help reduce administrative load in the court. The first paper can be filed over the counter in San Francisco and after that it is all mandatory e-filing. This is in the probate arena right now. I understand it should be working in the family law arena sometime next year. According again to the CEO, it has made great efficiencies in the court and reduced what was otherwise a tremendous backlog requirement. The Hall of Justice is perhaps a little bit less beautiful than the Civic Center Courthouse. It has been around since 1958, I believe. Yeah, 1958. There are difficulties with this courthouse. The court is trying to deal with those difficulties. The elevators were not working well for a long period of time, and that affected the custody and transportation. Instead of being brought up through the elevators, often they had to be brought through the hallways, which created the security issues one would expect. However, repairs have been made to these elevators and Mr. Yuen and Mr. Wong asked that I thank the Judicial Council for approving \$2.7 million to repair or refurbish the elevators. They said it made a tremendous difference. I know we have these and other parts of the state such as Los Angeles where parts are not available to fix them and have to be fashioned separately. So the money that was spent apparently made a huge difference in the transportation of inmates and the operation of the Hall of Justice. There are difficulties with the courtrooms, similar to the elevators. A lot of the chairs

in the courtrooms had signs on them that prohibited people from sitting, because the chairs are as old as the courthouse and there are no parts to fix the chairs. They are dealing with that. San Francisco converted several rooms and courtrooms, which may make it difficult because of the size, but again they are doing it to accommodate the issues and I think they are doing a fabulous job. In the Hall of Justice, in the basement area, which is a judicial parking area, there is flooding. It is apparently built on fill and some pumps sometimes don't work as efficiently as they should, but again, all working out. Next, is perhaps the most interesting slide in this deck, which is an actual shot of our councilmember, Judge Feng. I will say this, I watched Feng call cases and I was nervous listening to him.

>> [Laughter]

>> When I say he was moving cases quickly, it is probably the greatest understatement you will hear today, but he did a fabulous job. There were a lot of people who came in and he got right to the heart of the matter. Judge Feng, it was a pleasure watching you. I'm glad I was able to walk out and not have to face you. Perhaps really one of the most impressive parts of my tour was the Polk Street annex. This is about a block away from the Civic Center Courthouse. It was built in conjunction with the City and County of San Francisco. It was a fabulous collaboration. Downstairs is the courtroom. Upstairs is all the training facilities groups and case managers. Collaborative courts are called for the most part downstairs. There are a few called in the Hall of Justice. What is amazing is that those of you who have experience with the collaborative courts, we often find that when someone is told to go test, they never make it to the testing area. When someone is told to speak to the case manager, they just don't make it. It is very common. Here, they just have to go upstairs. The City and County have provided fabulous resources, from what I could tell. Again, clearly impressive. We will be hearing more later this morning. I watch some of these courts operate and I thought San Francisco court had some great emphasis on some amazing things with the court. They have something called an intensive treatment court, which I found to be really interesting. It is almost like the collaborative court of last resort. People who sort of don't make it through the regular collaborative courts, whatever the issues are. Life issues, family issues. Health issues. Whatever it is that prevented them from succeeding in the other courts, might lead them to this intensive treatment court. They get greater services, perhaps even more personal attention. I was able to watch the operation of this court and frankly it was one of the best things I've seen in the collaborative court arena. There are of course Drug Court, Community Justice Center and the Veterans Justice Court, which again, we will be covering later today. It was a great visit. I think the judges and the CEO and I think the presiding judge of that court. I learned a lot.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you Judge Nadler.

>> Thank you. I need the clicker. All right. So, on behalf of Judge Bynes and myself we visited the Ventura County court and we had a great visit. We had numerous preparations to conduct our report. We were accompanied by a judge from Santa Cruz County who is the district date California Judges Association representative. So he took the opportunity to visit with us. So, Ventura County you could say has two geographic anchors. There is the West, which is in the

city of Ventura, which is where we conducted our visit. And not far from there is Oxnard, the coastal area. Then in the East is Simi Valley. A very different cultural and geographic area. The Juvenile Justice Center, where there are six courtrooms, is in Oxnard. Simi Valley now has four courtrooms, although only two days a week were they holding hearings for traffic and domestic violence. And in Ventura, where it is part of the Ventura County Civic Center, there are 32 courtrooms in that building. So the population of Ventura county has about 850,000 people and there are 29 judges and four commissioners in Ventura County. Here you see the court executive officer on the left, Michael Plant, who has been with the court for up to 18 years as the CEO, and Presiding Judge Kent Kellegrew. I put in a quote that I heard Judge Kellegrew say that Ventura court is efficient and productive. You will hear about that in this presentation. Ventura ranks among the 58 superior courts in the following ways. With those judges, they are tied for 14th in terms of size. Ranked fourth, in terms of the number of filings per judge. It is close to 4600 filings. In terms of disposition per judge, ranked fifth in the state, close to 3800. They conducted 266 jury trials last year, which ranks them ninth in the state. And close to 11,000 court trials, ranking them ninth in the state. I was very impressed about the fact that the civil bench has inventory of close to 1000 cases, each judge. That includes complex cases, smaller cases, but that is a big inventory and they are able to conclude 90% of those cases within 18 months. Right now they are looking at about a 3.3 ratio, where they need some additional judges and they are concerned, because a number of judges are eligible to retire next year. In terms of their court operations, 327 individuals and I will get into this in a moment, but they have a collections unit and they have 75 people working in that operation. So, collection operations. Very interesting. Ventura Superior Court contracts with other counties, Amador, Plumas, Santa Clara and Tulare counties, to provide collection assistance. Close to \$35 million collected by this unit. 160,000 inbound telephone calls handled by the collections team. The automated system last year had 6 million voicemail messages on behalf of this unit. Ventura County is concerned about the prospect of losing income if there is a reduction of fees and fines, because they recovered close to \$13 million in the victim restitution fees last year. If you were to say 10% of that only were to survive, that is \$1.3 million. That is a big impact on that county. Case management technology, they have replaced their V3 system. It has been completed in small claims and they are moving forward with other departments that will go online in 2020. I love that picture, the old picture of the files. And moving on. Innovations grant funding successes. Legal self-help. They have a fabulous in-house webinar, technical department. And they have online family law and civil webinars. I will just slide forward. There I have put this slide that depicts what would happen if you were to go to their website. There you can see, for example, what to expected an eviction trial. How to obtain or modify a court order. And people can find those resources both in English and Spanish. So it has been a real success. With the help of funding from the 2018 budget act, they were able to hire additional staff to assist them. Another innovations grant funding success is the Ability to Pay Pilot Project. They are one of five counties participating in this project to test the use of online adjudication technology and traffic cases. They are grateful to the Judicial Council for resources on this project. Focus on access. Video remote interpretation. One of three counties participating in what is called the VRI pilot project. They have been able to hire two staff court reporters with funding from the 2018 budget act to expand services into family law. Let's go on to juvenile justice. Funding through this grant has allowed the juvenile justice family

engagement workshops which are aimed at educating parents and legal guardians who have youths entering the juvenile justice system for the first time. And again, online products that are there. It is hard to see that, but what you are looking at our delinquency court resources and guides to inform parents and guardians, for example, the webinar, when your child needs to appear in juvenile court. This project has produced orientation videos in English and in Spanish, they have a YouTube channel and they have developed a handbook and resource guides. Just some fabulous products available to the community. Next, interpreting services. As part of the expansion and component of the language access plan. Every party or witness of every courtroom in any of the three locations I mentioned have access to an interpreter at no cost. Here we have concluding our visit. We are grateful for all the hard work that the bench and Ventura County due on behalf of the administration of justice. Thank you, Chief Justice, for the opportunity to make this report.

>> This concludes the liaison reports for today.

>> Thank you. I think both Judge Nadler and Judge Bacigalupo and also Judge Lyons for this report. We are beginning to see the investment the branch has made, was received by partner branches and it is now being applied in the courts. The technological advancements is something we couldn't fathom for five years ago and it is amazing to see the grant funds utilized not only in technology, but to provide better access and service to the public we serve and hearing from court leaders that it is becoming more and more efficient, so thank you for that. It is different from the liaison reports we used to here. Let me also say I know that the calendar says recess, but at this point I am going to invite you to take your own recesses as needed and warn you that I am thinking of a formal recess break after our sixth item, which is 19-063. At this point, I will ask you to please turn your attention to the consent agenda. We have 14 items on consent, as you know. But under rule 10.5(f)(2), I am moving the consent items to the discussion agenda. That is any member's prerogative to do so. I am doing that now to move 19-119 from the consent agenda to the discussion agenda. Your amended agenda will show that this will be the first item of discussion for us after consent. Putting that aside for the moment. Regarding the remaining consent agenda items, I will entertain a motion.

>> I would like to make the motion --

>> Thank you, Justice Corrigan. Seconded by Judge Brodie. All in favor, please say aye. Any opposition? Any abstentions? The items are adopted. That moves us for our first discussion agenda item, 19-119, rules and forms, civil practice and procedure, waivers of court fees for court reporters and interpreters. Justice Miller, we have public comment. I turn this over to you and I do understand that Judge and Jones, chair of our Civil And Small Claims Advisory Committee will be joining us, as well as Susan McMullen, Legal Services, but I turn this over to you.

>> Thank you. Judge Jones, are you on the phone?

>> Yes I am.

>> Thank you. We have eight individuals for public comment. I will call you. Each of you have three minutes. The light on the podium will turn yellow. That indicates that you have one minute

left and at the end I will tell you when you are finished. The first is Kera Brodeur. And if I could have Darren or approach the swinging door. Thank you and good morning and welcome. We appreciate you being here and you have three minutes.

>> Thank you, we appreciate you moving this to discussion because we think it is an important issue. I am a staff attorney at the National Housing Law Project and we are a support center for legal services organizations and folks representing low-income tenants across California. I also represented low income tenants for many years and legal services, particularly unlawful detainer cases. I think, you know, this makes me uniquely situated I guess, to give you our thoughts on this item, particularly, I worked a lot with pro se tenants, both in the capacity of giving them advice, but also being at the court a lot and doing unlawful detainer defense. As I am sure you are aware, one thing we are concerned about is pro se tenants already have a difficult time just filing the paperwork and they don't know to request things, like a court reporter. They don't know to request a jury trial even if they want that. I think it is really important and we did submit comments earlier. Because they don't know to request a court reporter, I don't think they would receive the benefit of what the *Jameson* decision is asking for and received the benefit of what the Judicial Council, I believe, is trying to do, which is to allow them to have a court reporter or electronic recording. I think given the disparity of pro se litigants not having legal advice and representing themselves, I think in order to protect their due process and writes it is important for the Judicial Council to consider automatically giving them access to a court reporter. I also want to say that we really think the Judicial Council should make it very clear that people who are pro se not only have the right to request a court reporter, but have the right to have a fee waiver for a court reporter. I think this is an important distinction and many of my colleagues who I believe will be speaking today on the same issue will address that issue, but I do think it is an important distinction, because we want to make sure that folks who are pro se will be able to get a court reporter, not just request one. Finally, and I think this is an easier fix, but we just want to make sure that the Judicial Council considers also requiring a copy of an electronic recording, not just with appeals, but with other matters as well. In representing tenants that, when I talked to them after the fact and considered appealing the cases, often there wasn't a record. The court while I was there stopped providing court reporters in unlawful detainer trials and there wouldn't be a recording. It was very difficult if not impossible to represent a tenant under those circumstances. I think the Judicial Council once all litigants to be on the same footing and I think these changes are necessary for that reason. Thank you so much for your time.

>> Thank you. Next we will hear from Darren Orr and if I could have Madeline Howard next. Good morning and you will get notice with the yellow light when one minute is left. Thank you.

>> Good morning, I am a staff attorney at Bay Area Legal Aid. We provide free, civil legal services to low and very low income individuals throughout seven Bay Area counties. Our services span a range of several practice areas, including housing, economic justice, family law and domestic violence prevention, immigration health access and consumer protection. Our programs are tailored to serve particular client communities such as people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, people of color, veterans and formerly incarcerated. The practice I work and focuses on the reservation and expansion of affordable housing in the Bay Area. Prior to my work at bay legal, I work in a collaborative which provides assistance,

providing 98% of the responses to residential defendants in unlawful detainer. Thus, virtually all of our clients qualify for fee waivers or group qualify for fee waivers and virtually all of our clients would not be able to afford private representation. Therefore we are uniquely situated to understand the challenges that fee waiver recipient space in obtaining meaningful access to justice. I would urge this council to reconsider the comments that we signed on to and provided by our colleagues at Western Center, to provide automatically a court reporter or recording of hearings for fee waiver recipient's or in the alternative, to make it on the fee waiver form, an option to request that. Because *Jameson* was not reinventing the wheel. *Jameson* was reinforcing -- I think *Jameson* articulated this best at 606 when it said the policy of affording litigants meaningful access to the judicial process establishes restrictions not only on potential barriers created by legislatively imposed fees or procedures, but also upon court devised policies and practices that have the effect of denying to qualified indigent litigants the equal access to justice that the doctrine was designed to provide. Quite simply, by not making it clear to litigants that they need to request the court reporter, the effect will be that those who can afford a private attorney will receive a court reporter and those who cannot will not. Every time I explained to clients the court reporters are not provided, they are shocked, just as they would be shocked to learn that a bailiff or court clerk is not automatically provided and quite frankly it does not put them on equal grounds.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you Your Honor.

>> Next we will hear from Madeline Howard and is Matthew Warren here?

>> I will be speaking on behalf dash

>> Okay then if we could have -- thank you, good morning.

>> Thank you, good morning. Good morning Chief Justice. Thank you for moving this to the discussion calendar and thank you to the council. We are a statewide legal services support center. I speak to attorneys across California representing defendants in unlawful detainers. I have a bird's eye view of what is happening in courtrooms, particularly with unlawful detainer litigation. We are in a housing crisis right now, so low income people we represent, often the unlawful detainer is the beginning of a fast process that leads to homelessness. When someone is kicked out of their home, they cannot afford in these days with control, if they lose that apartment there is nowhere else they will go. There is no housing for people. This is tremendously important. It's not just a procedural issue. Procedure is the key that protects people from these great harms. That's why we really care about this and we thank the council for their attention to this issue. In unlawful detainers, things move very quickly so if someone is served and very frequently going to court without the benefit of counsel, as previous commenters have mentioned. As we also mentioned, people just don't know. They aren't going to know to fill out another form. It is hard enough to figure out the forms they have in front of them. So we are very concerned that the current approach is not really meeting the mandate that was set out in the *Jameson* decision. That decision, we were happy to have it come out because it recognizes that access to proceedings is a fundamental justice issue and if all that is said to someone can request

a court reporter and the courts have authority to make an individual system for making that request, what will happen is that litigants will not know how to make a request. They will usually not make one and then when they make their way to a legal services office, maybe after having a bad decision of the trial against them, we won't know whether we can appeal, because we have no record of what happened and that is really the issue that the position talks about, that people need this meaningful right to appeal. I think this current approach is not going to provide that, so we encourage the council to reconsider its approach and to make this be something people can actually use. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you very much. Next we will hear from -- and then Rebecca Buckley Stein.

>> Good morning and welcome back.

>> I am from the Family Violence Appellate Project. Again, thank you to the council and staff for your careful consideration of our initial comments and our subsequent comments, with all of our colleagues here. I think the main point is that full implementation of *Jameson* requires providing a court reporter, period. I realize *Jameson* has that line this is upon request, but *Jameson* is not a case about what happens when someone asks for a court reporter and they don't get one. *Jameson* is a case about why transcripts and providing a court reporter, to quote the case, are essential for actual protection of civil legal rights, not just in appeals, but civil legal rights in general. It is about due process and equal protection and it is about California public policy. Implementation of California public policy is not reserved to those who are sophisticated enough to know in advance why they need a court reporter, what a court reporter is, what is the benefit of a transcript where that they may want to appeal their case. Public policy is not only for those who are willing to have an attorney or who are able to self-educate. As the California Commission on Access to Justice rightly pointed out, this proposal basically transfers a financial penalty to an educational penalty. We fully agree with the California commission when it says that *Jameson* is not a caveat, but it is a mandate to provide court reporters. Meaningful access and cost savings should not rely on a lack of procedural knowledge to not have to provide a court reporter. This also needs to be statewide and not ad hoc. As I've mentioned before, particularly for survivors of domestic violence, having cases in multiple counties, cases that have to be transferred to other counties because that is where their shelter is where that is where they are able to find transitional housing is a common part. It is also incredibly common for a family law client with a case that goes on for years. Custody cases go on until children are 18, most of the time. During that time they may experience four or five judges and several different courtrooms. The lack of a transcript in those situations is such an impediment and it is an impediment to the judges, as well. This is not just a fringe benefit that litigants need. It is an impediment for a judge who is unable to accept evidence about what happened in a previous court hearing, because a litigant is not able to provide the transcript. So we ask that you make this about what it is, which is judicial inquiry and provision and not undue burden --

>> Thank you very much. Next we will hear from Rebecca Buckley Stein. Good morning and welcome.

>> Good morning. My name is Rebecca Buckley Stein and I am the directing attorney for California Rural Legal Assistance's Delano office, which is in Kern County. California Rural

Legal Assistance provides free legal service to low income people in California's most rural areas and the Delano office, we serve all of northern Kern County, which is a large area. I am the only licensed attorney in that office. So what that means is that with only one legal aid lawyer in all of northern Kern County, it is impossible for every low income tenant facing an eviction to receive the legal services that they need and deserve. Many individuals facing an eviction must represent themselves and without a lawyer to help them navigate the process, many defendants would have valid legal defenses to wrongful evictions and would lose their home. After the *Jameson* decision, tenants with a fee waiver have a right to the record of their hearings, however, most litigants without legal representation don't know about this right to record and may not know how to request the recording of their hearings. So, what value is a right if individuals cannot exercise it? Low income tenants need and deserve adequate notice of their right to request a recording of their unlawful detainer hearings and without proper notice and sufficient legal representation, which we have in Kern, many indigent litigants will have no practical way of exercising their rights under *Jameson*. If the Judicial Council institutes a rule mandating as a matter of course, recordings of all unlawful detainer hearings where a litigant has a fee waiver, low income tenants will have meaningful access to the right to appeal when the legal system fails them. Without the mandatory provision of recordings dwell litigants with fee waivers as a matter of course, many tenants will not successfully request a recording and there will be no record of the court proceedings. Without a recording, tenants will lose their ability to file a meaningful appeal and there will be no way to review any alleged improprieties or to ensure the proceedings are held to the high standards that we expect. To ensure that all litigants have access to their rights and not just a write on paper, but a right that can actually be exercised, this Judicial Council should institute a rule that all indigent litigants be provided with either an electronic recording or a court reporter where electronic recordings are not available. Thank you so much.

>> Think you very much. Next we will hear from Saville Lundgren. Good morning and nice to see you.

>> Good morning members of the council. My name is Saville Lundgren and I am here on behalf of East Bay Community Law Center. We provide legal representation and policy advocacy on behalf of indigent litigants in cooperation with the University of California Berkeley in their clinical program. First of all, thank you for moving this agenda item to the discussion calendar. I do want to echo the sentiments of my colleagues in regard to the importance of access to a court reporter for access to justice for litigants. I surveyed a number of county websites last night, superior court websites, to see how easy it would be for me to figure out how to obtain a court reporter for a hearing if I were to have one and in most cases it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, for me as a licensed attorney to figure out how I would go about requesting a licensed reporter. That is not acceptable because the majority of our clients don't have college degrees. They sometimes have language barrier issues where they are disabled and may not have Internet access. These are the clients we represent. There are a number of clients were not able to serve who don't know to come to us, so they will not be informed of the right to access a court reporter. To make this meaningful, we need universal access to a court reporter when there is a fee waiver in place, not just housing cases. I am in the housing unit. But for consumer matters or other civil cases, as well. In addition, I want to point

out that it is important if there is an oral recording, I don't want rule 355 as it has not been adjusted, it is very important for fee waiver litigants to have access to those oral recordings. As an attorney, for me to evaluate whether a fee waiver litigant has the ability to appeal, meritorious appeal, it would be helpful to have that recording to make that evaluation. A lot of time clients do not know how to articulate the legal error involved in their case. They just feel a decision was unfair, but they don't know how to articulate why. There are also collateral reasons to have access to an oral recording outside the context of an appeal. I want to point to one of my early cases in Orange County, where our client, who was a tenant, actually won his case in court, but he needed that transcript, because in the proceedings was sworn testimony that pointed out that the landlord had fraudulently obtained the property from the client. So we were able to regain client to the property for this indigent litigant, because there was an oral recording and he happened to have a friend willing to pay for that for him. But if he had to come up with it out of his own money, this elderly, disabled, indigent client would've lost his home. So, thank you for your time.

>> Thank you very much. Next we hear from Lauren Klein. Good morning and welcome.

>> Good morning. My name is Lauren Klein. I am the directing attorney at the Legal Aid Association of California. We are a statewide association of legal services nonprofits. We represent 100 nonprofit organizations that provide free civil legal services to low income people. It is important to note that currently in California there is one legal aid attorney for almost 8000 low income people that need representation. The Jameson decision was in the spirit of providing equal access to justice for all people, not just those who can afford it. We are very pleased to see the council examining and updating several rules and forms to reflect *Jameson*, but revisions as they stand now stop short of meaningfully implementing the decision. Their proposed rule 9.256 language simply says that litigants may request a reporter, it does not indicate that there is a mandate that a court reporter must be provided. Additionally, these provisions require litigants to take the additional step, often by filling out a form or formulating a request to file, to request that reporter. Also, there is currently no proposal for a uniform procedure statewide for requesting a reporter. All of these things effectively place a real barrier in the way of executing the right of *Jameson*. Attorneys and staff at our member organizations serve people in every corner of California. They practice in every county. I'm talking to these folks, I can tell you since the Jameson decision it is already very clear that the power of the decision is not being felt in many places, because low income people are still not getting a reporter or a record of their case, to which they are entitled. Whether that is because they are unrepresented and can't navigate the process, or because the procedure is unclear or inconsistently applied. The practical effect is that people are still not getting the court reporter to which they are entitled. While we would argue that a court reporter should automatically be provided to fee waiver litigants, if this is not possible, we suggested in our comments that this request could be made as part of the fee waiver request form. We urge the council to find a way to inform litigants of their right to a reporter and remove unnecessary barriers that are still in place that prevent people from exercising their right. Thank you.

>> Thank you. This concludes public comment.

>> Thank you. I appreciate the comments from those who came today. Judge Jones, I know you are on the line. Did you care to respond or make some remarks before I turn this over?

>> Yes, thank you Chief Justice and members of the council for giving me an opportunity to respond and hopefully clarify what this proposal intends to do and what the committee has in mind with regards to future actions. The rules are simply to align our existing rules and forms to comply with the express language of *Jameson*, which was a case filed as long ago as last July. In *Jameson* the Supreme Court concluded the Superior Court must generally make available to fee waiver recipients an official court reporter or other means to create an official verbatim record for purposes of appeal and upon request. Page 599 of that decision. This proposal before the council today is not and was not intended for all counsel fee waiver forms. It simply recommends revising the forms that are currently inaccurate or could be confusing in light of the opinion. They are on the information sheet of the fee and waiver cost forms, which will inform litigants that they qualify, that the court will waive the court reporter fees for attending the hearing or trial. The court is not electronically recording the hearings and the person requested the court to provide a reporter. The proposal also recommends amendments to be consistent with *Jameson* with 2.596, which covers court reporting in civil cases with the amendment to read as set forth in the packet provided, but most significantly, there has been concern about the defendant clause in front of the word request and compliance with local court rules. The request that the court provide an official reporter. It was the intention of the committee that it simply reflect the fact that different courts have different rules for requesting a reporter, not that one would not be provided. And also court fees and costs included in all official fee waivers, to delete certain language to say that reporter's fees are waived only if the reporter is provided by the court and courts must now provide reporters if the fee waiver recipient asks for one and to delete language that it is not intended to mandate that the court reporter be provided for fee waiver recipients and that the intent to provide a reporter or other means to make an official record available on appeal upon request. The speakers today have asked for changes that would expand beyond what *Jameson* requires for providing court reporter services to fee waiver recipients. They asked the court to provide court reporters and other mechanisms for verbatim recording of proceedings for all litigants without requiring a request from the litigant or that the request be added to the original fee waiver form and it is granted, a court reporter would be available for a hearing or trial. It asks for changes to the court reporter request form, which the committee will consider developing next year. One commenters suggested that the proposed amendment would allow the court to deny a fee waiver because of their concern that we have qualified the requesting of the reporter to be in compliance with local court rules. The committee certainly did not think the rule could be read this way, but added this provision to address the fact that courts currently have different ways of asking for court reporters. Some online, some with local rules, et cetera. The committee will consider further amending this rule in the future. Other suggestions to expand the scope of waiver and fees to provide a transcript or a copy of electronic reporting beyond the use on appeal. This is beyond what was required by *Jameson* and was circulated for comment, but obviously the committee will consider the suggestion next year. Before making any further changes to providing court reporters to fee waiver recipients, the issues raised in comments by today's speakers, both in written comments and speaking today,

should go to the committee to consider. My concern, however, is we would not move forward with the current proposal in the meantime to ensure that the rules and forms currently conform to the Jameson holding. The committee already agreed to put the item on statewide forms for requesting a court reporter on the agenda next year. The other suggestions made by the commenters, including those that recommend expanding the rules for court reporters and electronic reporting, beyond what is required in Jameson and can gather public comment specifically on those suggestions. If council approves this proposal today, it would take effect from September 1 and it was developed so it could be effective in January. Approving it now will let litigants with fee waivers know that they may request a court reporter at no charge. It will remind courts of their responsibilities under *Jameson*, which has been the law since last July. Those were my remarks. Susan McMullan, the staff attorney, is also in the room. I don't know if you have anything to add.

>> I have one thing to add about rule 2.956, which you addressed Judge Jones, the commenters have pointed out that it is framed in terms of the party making the request for the court reporter and suggesting that courts may deny it. It was not intended that way. Of course *Jameson* requires if criteria are met, a court reporter would be provided to a fee waiver recipient. It was created that way because the existing rule, pre-*Jameson*, was worded in terms of what a party has to do. It says a party may arrange for a certified court reporter and the committee decided to add to that, the circumstance where a person has a fee waiver and may request it from the court, but not intended to allow the court to deny it. I just wanted to clarify that.

>> Thank you Susan and also thank you to and Anne Ronan for being here. Judge, thank you for your remarks. Thank you for your availability here, explaining what has happened and putting this matter out for comment, as we do and as we want, substantive comments, and these are steps along the way. I appreciate this. Before I hand this over to Justice Hull, Rules and Projects, did you want to say anything more before I did that?

>> I would really just underscore that this is the beginning and at the conclusion of our work in this area and it is the intention of the committee to come back around and look at all of these very sound and legitimate concerns and comments expressed today. Our concern is that currently out there and circulating our rules and forms are incorrect. There was a certain desire just to get the four corners of *Jameson* addressed and covered.

>> I want to say I appreciate your hard work on this and I know we have cycles of comment and cycles of proposal. This is a case that required those changes and it sounds, frankly, it was inclusive, democratic, you operated quickly and I understand the need to operate in the circumstances. Delay would serve no one. Justice Hull.

>> Thank you Chief, good morning. I would like to thank Judge Jones from joining the meeting by telephone on small notice and thank you to the small claims advisory committee, for their work on the proposal before us. I also thank the speakers today who commented on this item and thank you them for their time, which go somewhat beyond the proposal we consider on our agenda today. And I would like to thank Ms. McMullan and Ms. Ronan, staff attorneys, for their time today. As noted, the Judicial Council has a structure for consideration of all recommendations made to us, such as those offered today by our speakers. Before those

suggestions are considered by council I would simply like to say that as chair of the Rules and Projects Committee, I would propose that we refer these recommendations and suggestions to the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee for its consideration on its annual agenda for the upcoming year for their careful study and consideration. The Rules and Projects Committee will oversee the work of the Civil and Small Claims Committee as it considers these ideas and ultimately move that committee's work to the rules and projects committee and finally, to the Judicial Council. With that understanding, Chief, I would move that the council approved the Civil And Small Claims Advisory Committee recommendations found on page 2 of the Judicial Council report for item 19-119.

>> Second.

>> Seconded, thank you. Not seeing hands raised. Yes?

>> Based on what Justice Hull said, I assume you mean they would look at their annual agenda and either amend it or add something to it next year, to incorporate what they believe they need to do to further work on this.

>> I don't have their annual agenda before me right now. Judge Jones referred to some things they would consider, which if they are not on the agenda, there is representing to the council that --

>> -- If I can address that. The comments made in this report have indicated that the committee intends to add ongoing work in the coming year. So that is intended to be part of next year's agenda and we can expand that to include considering the idea of providing court reporters uniformly.

>> I would add that the process of preparing our annual agendas for next year begins in July, so we will be working on that in the next few months.

>> Thank you. And it goes to Justice Hull -- yes, Ms. Nelson.

>> This might be a little bit odd, but is there a way in implementing these that there will be some direction to courts, that they consider when they have a person requesting a fee waiver to hand them the form for requesting the court reporter or something that is sort of a stop gait? Some of the comments I thought were very compelling, that an inch and people wouldn't know to ask. I forget to do it all the time in civil, so --

>> Yes, Justice Hull.

>> Thank you. Comments are well taken. Again this would be part of what the Civil And Small Claims Committee would undertake and consider in the upcoming annual agenda.

>> I understand that and I also understand that there is the interest and drive to provide that information, but right now it may not be uniform. As a result of that, we need to look at uniformity and the ease of offering something that will be vetted through civil and small claims and to the public comment period. And proposal, much as this has been through, frankly. I know and understand that the comments we are hearing today are not new. That they were part of the public process for the development of what we have now, that is responsive to Jameson and

corrects outdated forms. So our choice is either delay or accept and move on, knowing the record has been made. So I think that is the motion before us today. All these things will be and should be righteously considered and will be considered, and Susan says, in the next couple months.

>> That is my motion, thank you Chief.

>> I had a second. Yes.

>> I'm sorry, I did have one question. I don't know if it is appropriate to deal with it now or if it is best reserved for the future work anticipated, but it seemed to me from what some of the commenters were stating and what Ms. McMullan stated, that there was some confusion as to whether or not this rule permitted the judge to decline to grant a court reporter upon request, so I don't know if it would be appropriate at this point, to consider an amendment that might say something to the effect of, if requested, the court shall provide a court reporter?

>> I leave it --

>> I understand there are different interpretations on this form and this rule and I loathe, at this point, frankly amending it after it's been studied for a year, but I'm not saying it shouldn't be. I am saying it can be clarified and in its next iteration -- but I hesitate, given what Judge Jones has said and the committee's views and the public comment we have had thus far, I know it needs work, I just don't know how much and where exactly.

>> It might help to know that the information sheet on fee waivers, the first form that litigants should see that instructs them how to fill out a fee waiver form, will include the next language that if they qualify the court will waive the reporters fee for a hearing or trial, so they should be getting that information.

>> Any other comments at this time? All in favor of adopting this rule with full knowledge that it is going to be looked at again in July on the agenda, please say aye. Any opposition? Any abstentions? The motion carries. We adopt this. I think all the speakers for letting us know how this would not work in practice and the commitment to you is to work through this with you. Thank you.

>> The next item is 19-065, an action item. It is the trial court budget 2018-2019, the \$10 million emergency reserve funding request, request from the Superior Court of Humboldt County. Welcome Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic and Judge David Rubin, chair of the budget committee.

>> Good morning ladies and gentlemen, we are here on behalf of Humboldt County. I think this is our first request we are coming to you with since the creation of the \$10 million emergency fund. If you recall, the Judicial Branch Budget Committee oversees several projects, one of which is the innovations grant that we will talk a little more about this morning. Budget change proposals for July on this, the \$10 million emergency fund. The fund is accessible by all of the courts under certain situations. This situation, Humboldt County court is requesting money to digitize records that are on microfiche, that are disintegrating at a rapid pace. This of course goes to the heart of the Superior Court of California court of record. Part of our process at the budget committee is to have our CEO on the committee convene with a couple of other CEOs, go over the application with the applicant court, see if there are other alternatives and then make a

recommendation to the committee. That was done here, as you can see by the report. There are some idiosyncrasies. It is the unanimous recommendation of the budget committee that the council approved the emergency money for Humboldt County and Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic and I stand by to answer any questions you might have. I should ask, Mr. Theodorovic, do you have any comments?

>> Good morning, I do not have anything to add at this moment and I am here to answer questions.

>> I see you have two recommendations.

>> Chief, I will move the recommendation.

>> Thank you Judge Gordon. Seconded. All in favor of approving this request as recommended in items one and two, please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any opposition? Any abstentions? We adopt and carry, thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Item number three is 19-064, judicial branch budget 2018. We welcome Judge Jonathan Conklin, and of course, Mr. Theodorovic. This is no action, this is informational.

>> [Indiscernible - low volume]

>> The outcomes of what we describe and hope to be very positive transfer of budget for this branch. Those are set out in the report. [Indiscernible - low volume]

>> That one works.

>> [Laughter]

>> So we are done. No. So, the report does provide you the outcomes that we have been able to collect so far. What happened is they formed a small subcommittee to send out a survey and use that survey tool to develop this information for you. As you know, funding basically comes to us in three different pieces and that is the \$47.8 million for those courts under the statewide average. \$19.1 million related to interpreter services and \$75 million that was described in one sense is discretionary. That \$75 million is broke up in the \$65 million and \$10 million and that \$10 million going specifically, I am generalizing, but for family law court reporters. The report that you have, I don't think I need to read it all specifically to you, except I do think it is interesting and important to note that of all those courts, 44, which is not an insignificant number, were able to use that money to increase staffing. There were other benefits to the courts including management, service hours and technological improvements within those funds. I think they were put to good use. I think this is an interesting place we are in, because quite candidly, and this is my comment as the chair of TCBAC, we haven't been in this position before. We are looking at funds coming to us that are well-meaning and well-intended and put to good use. It is a nice way to report now, rather than an empty handout, perhaps a hand, that has some substance to it to report how that information is being used. Again, the only other thing I wanted to touch upon as far as specifics for the court reporters, I think it dovetails nicely to what

we heard. I think this will be a challenging issue for this body as we move forward. Courts I think were very responsible in utilizing this money and setting it out, but I think there will be a challenge. A significant challenge as to the available assets. For those reporters.

>> If I may add how it's helped our budget advocacy this spring, I think it was wise of the council to ask for this information last year when it approved the legislation. Judge Nadler and Nancy Eberhardt were present and we were being asked by legislative staff about what was happening with the money and it was great that we had this information readily available to give them an understanding, because it really dovetailed from the budget snapshots that were developed the fall prior that were then used to support the requests made last year that was ultimately in the budget and then when you get to the next year's budget, they ask what did you do with this investment? We had sort of what has been happening or what is expected to happen, so that has been very important for advocacy. For courts and the resources. With actual outcomes, at least anticipated outcomes from the finding. There is discussion in the hearings about in particular the \$10 million that we were reporting of all of the outcomes in terms of benefits to improving access to justice.

>> Any questions?

>> I have a comment, which is that the 2018-2019 budget give us an opportunity in the trial courts to get back on that road to access and recovery and we owe a debt of gratitude to you, Chief Justice, to Martin, to Mr. Theodorovic and also the committee. In speaking anecdotally to other CEOs, to the advisory committee, it very much mimics the report the Judge Conklin was offering to the council today and we are seeing an increase in staffing access to courts that were not available before, especially in the self-help area, so we are very thankful for that.

>> Thank you, that is good news. I know a lot of the questions about the funding in this current fiscal year was actually final with how will you use it? So I think CEOs, Nancy, I think all of you for giving us the information that was concrete. Where the legislature seemed to know we had been in this position of deficit and to know where we were going and also, because it was used for example, for more staffing and much-needed salaries and benefits and also extended service, because so many of those folks are the constituents of the legislature. It has really been able to prove full circle that this is about access to the public. Thank you.

>> And looking forward I think it is a strategy we should be looking at in terms of always having that information readily available to support our requests.

>> Thank you.

>> I know you will remain seated, because the next item, number four, Court Interpreters: Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: Allocation Methodology for Court Interpreters Program Shortfall, 19-102, action item.

>> There is just that little one stuck in between, we could flip it if you like Chief.

>> No, please, I have that next. Please go ahead.

>> So this is the \$250,000 adjustment to address jury funding and we will give you the technicalities of that.

>> The modernization fund, specifically for jury improvement systems. The TCBAC, Judicial Council Technology Committee and Trial Court Advisory Committee unanimously recommend a current year adjustment from the IMF of \$252,000 to improve systems that for courts and 17 systems to continue our modernization of those critical systems.

>> And this is an action item, thank you.

>> Thank you, I see your recommendation for the \$252,000.

>> Set forward specifically to recommend to the court that the body recommend this augmentation request from the IMF for the modernization, \$252,000 for the program and that is the unanimous request of the advisory committee.

>> Thank you. So moved and seconded by Justice Chin -- all in favor, please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any opposition? Or abstentions? Matter adopted.

>> [Captioners transitioning] 19-102. The trial court -- one-time allocation in the amount of \$13.5 billion to address the 19-20 projected shortfall of the court reporter program. That was 10 days ago. Based again from the work that was done here and I should have acknowledged that excellent work and we'll continue to do that and exemplified in accomplishments for the interpreters, but it has now changed in the sense that and exemplified in accomplishments for the interpreters, but it has now changed in the sense that 13.4 is significantly impacted by what is optimistically \$9.6 million budget item in the revise that will fill that hole significantly. The size of that whole is what remains in flux, candidly, and Zlatko can address the technicalities of will fill that hole significantly. The size of that whole is what remains in flux, candidly, and Zlatko can address the technicalities of that, so we're modifying the recommendation slightly to simply ask that, and, perhaps, rather than specific numbers that up to the \$13.5 billion used to address it but would obviously be offset by if the budget remains, so these are all moving pieces. Anything could happen. We hope the by if the budget remains, so these are all moving pieces. Anything could happen. We hope the trend continues, and if the \$9.6 million remains, as of the interpreter fund of the interpreter fund that would not need to come out of the TCTF, Trial Court Trust Fund. There was still be a gap, however, and I turn to Zlatko for his thoughts on the size of the gap and how we phrase that.

>> In brief though, the identified gap was -- had certain assumptions about what might be caused in the 19-20 fiscal year when Department of Finance evaluated our request. They our request. They did not want to recognize the anticipated cost increases as related to salary adjustments, and so they only funded that which they were known and agreed upon salary basis, and the workload growth funded that which they were known and agreed upon salary basis, and the workload growth that was seen for the next fiscal year. There is this difference. Again, the \$4 million is based on based on what we think might happen in terms of salary negotiations. They were not ready to recognize that, so Judge Conklin's reference to we're not sure what that cap could recognize that, so Judge Conklin's reference to we're not sure what that cap could be, 's, again, what might be the final outcome of negotiations. I think the recommendation I think the recommendation is an up to a mount would still a good recommendation as it is written and we

would say as budget service staff recommendation as it is written and we would say as budget service staff and TCBAC come back to you during the Fiscal Year to identify what actually was identify what actually was the needed allocation to cover the shortfall in 1920.

>> I apologize. I do not have the insert. I have the summary but not the insert.

>> The actual report?

>> Correct.

>> The report top and perhaps, and perhaps, and thinking about it -- I will read the actual recommendation which says the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial says the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council effective July 1, 2019, authorizes up one-time allocation of unrestricted fund balance from the Trial Court Trust Fund in an amount not to exceed \$13.5 million to address the projected 2019-2020 shortfall. The current TCTF fund condition statement prior to the use of fund balance to cover statement prior to the use of fund balance to cover projected court interpreter program expenditures is provided in attachment a that there are so many moving pieces here that I think that will be the recommendation will be the recommendation moving forward, because between now and the ultimate budget, again, I don't want to curse anything but if that \$9.6 million changes in any way that would impact the \$13.5 million. I to curse anything but if that \$9.6 million changes in any way that would impact the \$13.5 million. I think TCBAC recommendation stand it not exceed \$13.5 million and we will circle back to this body once the budget is finalized and give you the actual number that comes out of the TCBAC.

>> I understand and that makes perfect sense in terms of authorizing now waiting to see how the May revise moves to the legislature that we well know this in a few months, actually, of course, when the budget is signed at the end of June. And so at this point then budget is signed at the end of June. And so at this point regarding their recommendation, any questions? Judge to move the Commission. I'm sorry, Commissioner Whiteman seconds.

>> Any further discussion? All in favor of moving the recommendation please say Aye?

>> Aye.

>> Oppositions?

>> Extensions?

>> Thank you, we adopt

>> Thank you, we adopt that.

>> Thank you, Chief, Thank you so much.

>> The next two items to be considered in tandem relating to the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System that we know as JBSIS. This is item 19-069, and also the second, 19-063, the JBSIS version manual. And of course for this I know Jake Chatters as I understand will be joining on the phone, and we welcome Leah Rose-Goodwin and Ms. Emily Chirk.

>> Thank you, Chief, and members of the council. The next two items for your consideration underscore the importance of the branch's use of data to make data to make policy decisions and our efforts too continuously improve that process. It is not just the compilation of the data itself, but the implementation of data governance in standardization of just the compilation of the data itself, but the implementation of data governance in standardization of definitions that help ensure competence the data that we use. I'm now going to turn it over to Jake Chatters, the Chair of the JBSIS Subcommittee, to get brief overview of the items. Emily Chirk is also here to give specific technical details if needed, and to answer questions.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you, Leah. And thank you Chief Justice and members of the council. Part of the advisory committee charge that periodically review and recommend revisions to the JBSIS manual, our two items here today in that regard. And as part of that the JBSIS Subcommittee is tasked with handling most of that activity on behalf of general. Back a year ago in 2018, the Judicial Council Advisory Committee on Audits and Accountability requested CSC review and determine whether recommendations additions to the manual in area of responsibilities and data quality received yours and reporting. That was the result of recent additions to internal audits performed on data integrity around the filings, in particular. And the recognition there was not anything in the JBSIS manual specifically required court to take particular action on data quality, nor specific requirement [Indiscernible - low audio]. The JBSIS Subcommittee over the course of the past year met a number of times to review this item. The specific recommendation new requirements to the JBSIS manual, those are here today and the materials for you to consider. The specific recommendation from CEAC to Judicial Council is located in your report on the fifth page on this item, which is label page of Attachment A. That is to add Appendix to the JBSIS the .02 adopt -- and data management, and includes two new mandates for member to those when errors are identified by a court. Those amendments would be required whenever there is an error of 2% or more on items that are included in the annual court report. What that means any error results different to more than 2% for filings times disposition, disposition counsel, or trials, it has to be amended and submitted by the court back to the Office of Court Research. Other JBSIS data, of which there are many tend to be measuring detailed work accounts but they are a little bit more internal to the operations of the court. While those do need to be fixed prospectively, there is not a requirement to amend past data submission on those when you identify an error. The first to be fixed prospectively, there is not a requirement to amend past data submission on those when you identify an error. The first item, the second on top of that is that every JBSIS court would be required to resubmit their data annually for three years. And that is to ensure that the data that is most recent in the court statistics report along with any data used by judicial branch on any various workload studies are court statistics report along with any data used by judicial branch on any various workload studies are up-to-date. Saying that a slightly different way, each year the office year the Office of Court Research requires courts to review their data and confirm that it is correct by a particular day, usually in the their data and confirm that it is correct by a particular day, usually in the fall. Sometimes a little bit later. In the courts historically have verified the current year and they submit that to the council. This would require that when that occurs the courts provide their data and confirm for

the prior fiscal to the council. This would require that when that occurs the courts provide their data and confirm for the prior fiscal year, and the two years prior to that. It's three years' worth of data resubmit every year, and that way we capture, even way we capture, even though small change of 1% or less or one and one-half percent on items that are within those workload studies. For JBSIS court that is not a significant burden. It is an automated process. Yes, there is some effort into it but it's not substantial for not substantial for them so that requirement exist for JBSIS courts. For-- courts not yet JBSIS capable that processes a little more complicated and it's our recommendation that not be applied to them, but instead the 2% over it would apply it still be required to amend if they find something in error more than complicated and it's our recommendation that not be applied to them, but instead the 2% over it would apply it still be required to amend if they find something in error more than 2%.

>> So those are the recommendations on this item. Those are located specifically on page number two of Attachment one on the item. Those are located specifically on page number two of Attachment one on the report, the fifth page. I am happy to answer any questions.

>> They can, Jake.

>> I do not see any hands raised for this recommendation regarding data quality control. Did you want us to vote on this separately or are you prepared to talk about the manual 3.0?

>> We can talk about the manual and doing the combined is okay, Chief.

>> Please do.

>> The second item relates to the adoption of the to talk about the manual 3.0?

>> We can talk about the manual and doing the combined is okay, Chief.

>> Please do.

>> The second item relates to the adoption of the JBSIS the 3.0 manual itself. In January 2018, Judicial Council approve changes to Judicial Council approve changes to the JBSIS definition effective July 1, 2018. Over the past year Emily Chirk and Leah Rose-Goodwin and -- research have been working with CAC individual courts for other divisions that Judicial Council and vendors to implement these new definitions and develop a revised JBSIS manual to support its use. On for your approval today is that detailed JBSIS manual. It is very lengthy. We're happy to answer any technical questions you may have about you may have about it and otherwise request your adoption of the new JBSIS 3.0 manual.

>> A contract. 'S council knows these budget recommendations are found in 19-069 regarding the data, in 19-063 is the manual 3.0. Before entertain a motion to accept these recommendations, the course you know even when motions have a 1st and a second week there is still opportunity for observation or questions. Justice Chin moves to adopt both. Second by Judge Conklin.

>> All in favor of accepting the recommendations found in these two action items please say aye?

>> Aye.

>> Any opposition or abstention?

>> Matter carries. Appreciate your very hard work on these detailed information.

>> Thank you, Chief.

>> At this time we will take a break until 11:10.

>> [Judicial Council of California is in recess to reconvene at 11:10 a.m.]

>> This is item number 19-062. It's an action item. Judicial Branch Administration, Trial Courts: Resource Assessment Study Model Work-Year Value. We welcome Assistant Presiding Judge Lorna Alksne, Chair of WAC, and also Ms. Kristin Greenaway, judicial Office of Court Research.

>> Good morning Chief and to the council. As she said I'm sure Workload Advisory Committee, and we are charged with overseeing the workload models that are used models that are used to make the resource allocations. What we are here today to ask for your approval is a small revision or a revision to the resource assessment model that we presented to you in July of 2017. By way of background, the RAS model, as we call it, has three parts. The three parts or the weights that we use to measure the amount of time that various case types that we presented to you in July of 2017. By way of background, the RAS model, as we call it, has three parts. The three parts or the weights that we use to measure the amount of time that various case types take. That we look at the average annual filings that measure the volume of our workload, and Arthur component is the work year value that measures the amount of time that are staff has to actually do their work. And the recommendation that we are asking you to approve is that the staff year value, recommendation that we are asking you to approve is that the staff year value, the 98,550 minutes, or 1643 hours, which is based on the empirical data that was gathered during the time study that we performed in the 16, and this would be used in the 2019 and 2020 trial court funding allocations. I'm here to answer any questions. I also have Kristin Greenaway here to answer any real technical answer any questions. I also have Kristin Greenaway here to answer any real technical questions.

>> If anyone has any, thank you.

>> The recommendation is found in your materials.

>> Move approval.

>> I'm sorry.

>> Who moved approval?

>> Judge show the approval and seconded by Judge Stacey.

>> This took a lot of work. I think about the time study and I remember courts that participated in that prevent them also for helping provide the foundation. All in favor of supporting -- I'm sorry?

>> Could you explain why you thought the 1776 hours did not make sense, because I take it you just used what you got from the various trial courts that you studied in detail. Is that right?

>> The 1776 from two years ago?

>> No, it looked like we were using a higher number than that.

>> Yes, in 2016 we did recommend a higher number, and based on the empirical research and data we did, that number was incorrect.

>> Right, and I guess, I am wondering why the difference from, say the Department of Human Resources and DOJ numbers?

>> We ended up using the data that we found from the study, so instead of using another number from DOF we went with the numbers that we found from our study. we found from our study.

>> Do you anticipate this may cause us some difficulties with DOF?

>> We use the information from the Judicial Council leave data, the leave data from the tenth courts and -- courts regarding leave data. I cannot interest paid with a we would, but it is empirically sound, and it something the council can work with the Department of Finance.

>> Thank in.

>> I can add to that a little bit for that a little bit for the members. In the report it talks about some of the policy implications as a result of this, and it does it does feed out to the Workload Formula, but it's something we work on annually as a regular course of business something we work on annually as a regular course of business with the above and a finance, so this changes and enters that dialogue. It's a very long equation that we have when it comes to our appropriation and workload pieces. This is just one variable that very long equation that we have when it comes to our appropriation and workload pieces. This is in there. I think the totality of the length of length of the equation, the things we use, this item itself when standout, perhaps create a problem, but we will work through the summer of the course of multiple years with the multiple years with the Department of finance on this issue.

>> Thank you, Martin.

>> The motion is it now before us. It has been seconded. All in favor of adopting the recommendation please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any opposition, extensions?

>> It is adopted. Thank you for your hard work.

>> Next is item 19-115, Judicial Branch Administration, the use of the 2018-19 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund known as IMF for the 2019-20 Sustain Justice Edition, California Court Technology Center hosting. This is an action item. Welcome, Mr. Koon.

>> Thank you. Good morning, everyone. Basically hitting the highlights of the Judicial Council report that was submitted that was submitted for this, in June of 2016, the Judicial Council endorsed a provision that provided funding for six of the nine is CCTC-hosted courts hosted at that time. 'S is it easy to move hosting. Contained within the proposal was a provision which eliminated the use of Improvement and Modernization Fund for CCTC hosting after June of

2019. There were made two courts which use of Improvement and Modernization Fund for CCTC hosting after June of 2019. There were made two courts which are in the process of -- CCTC hosting. The last court is expected to leave in October of 2019. Continued funding is needed while these last two courts transition to a new case management system and leave CCTC hosting. We have savings from fiscal year 2018-19, which can be used covered the CCTC hosting, so the ask today is not for any additional funding, for any additional funding, but to receive approval to use the savings from 2018-19 through December of 2019 for the last two courts leave and transition away from CCTC hosting. Any questions?

>> Thank you, Mr. Koon. This recommendation is on page 2 of item 19-115 as Mr. Koon I described. I would entertain a motion if council is prepared to vote on this.

>> So moved.

>> Moved by Judge Nadler. Seconded by Judge Feng. All in favor of adopting the recommendation in 19-115, please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any objections or abstentions?

>> So moved. Thank you may adopt them out.

>> Next is Judicial Branch Administration, Tactical Plan for Technology 2019-2020, item 19-062. We welcome Judge Sheila Hanson Kutcher, Judicial Council Information Technology Advisory Committee. And Ms. Heather Pettit, Judicial Council Information Technology. Welcome.

>> Thank you, Chief, thank you members of this council. As you know I am joined by Ms. Heather Pettit, here today. As we move to the next slide, I wanted to start by first reviewing the branch business goals and remind everyone how these back to our guiding documents pick you have seen this illustration before. It begins with setting the overarching goals for the branch, which are set by this council through the branch strategic plan. remind everyone how these back to our guiding documents pick you have seen this illustration before. It begins with setting the overarching goals for the branch, which are set by this council through the branch strategic From their Judicial Council Technology Committee led by Justice Slough collaborates with representatives across the courts, and our partners to establish broad goals for technology, and outlines those in our technology strategic plan. You will recall the update to that plan was adopted by this council late last year. Next, and again, through the use of a branchwide workstream, ITAC been defined wide workstream, ITAC been defined and aligns specific branch IT initiatives necessary to meet those branch goals. We do so through updating are tactical plan for technology, which is what I am pleased to present today. This plan is updated every two years, and so this will be our this will be our second update since its inception in 2014. The Tactical Plan Update Workstream included a very diverse membership, including representation from both the trial and appellate courts, as well as including judicial officers, as well as including judicial officers, executives, and take all adjust. The work involved many, many others, however, beyond the immediate this council, for which I am grateful. I would also like to offer my special thanks to the countless judicial officers, executives, court staff and other stakeholders who took

time to provide their invaluable expertise and feedback for this update of the tactical plan. At the onset of this work we did establish some objectives that we wanted to achieve as we achieve as we considered updating the plan, which included, of course, aligning the initiative with the new strategic plan goals. We wanted to continue driving the spirit of innovation and spirit of innovation and the concept of leveraging local innovations on a branch level. We wanted to not only look at the existing work but think ahead to incorporate emerging technology themes and have a future focused tone. Also to improve usability or consume ability of the plan, we wanted to be more sustained and improve its presentation. To make sure that it served the purpose of speaking to its target audience, which includes internally to our courts so that we may provide guidance, also to our sister branches of government as we discussed funding and proposed legislation, and of course, of course, to our justice partners, and to the people of California so they understand where we are trying to go as a understand where we are trying to go as a branch. Next are workstream establishes some general rules for guidelines that provided the parameters around what to include or not to include in the plan. We wanted to make sure that sure that the initiatives included would be at the right level. That means we wanted to make sure the efforts that had a significant investment in money or time. We also wanted to be clear and mindful that the initiatives had branchwide impact, and not focus on activities of a single court or be clear and mindful that the initiatives had branchwide impact, and not focus on activities of a single court or opportunities that are not shareable or scalable. We also wanted to be inclusive of initiatives that may need support financially or strategically to help convey how that work fits into the overall branch roadmap, which is been extremely helpful in recent years as we have advocated for important modernization of our extremely helpful in recent years as we have advocated for important modernization of our branch. We also made a conscious decision not to include maintenance or operational efforts, unless either of those criteria is had been applied. The thinking was that maintenance and work is really the baseline of our services, and it our services, and it was a necessary to restate that information year after year. Also to that point of being focused, impactful and sustained, we did not feel we needed to create an all-inclusive plan, but we also didn't feel it was necessary to limit was necessary to limit or restrict ourselves to a certain number of initiatives. So, what we established these guidelines as a as a mean for determining what to include or not, we were careful to acknowledge that if initiative was not included within the plan, it did not me that it me that it was not important. Instead, it may be smaller in scale, or it may be an activity that was that was in maintenance mode or not suitable as others too actually include within the plan. At this time I would like to turn the floor over the floor over to Ms. Pettit. She will talk about the specific initiatives included within the plan.

>> Thank you. So, as Judge Hanson mentioned got it mentioned got it was absolutely critical that when we looked at putting together the tactical plan that it aligned with the new strategic goals that we had been put forth and approved by the council. So, with that we ended up with 17 initiatives, which our new initiatives. Let's take a little closer look at those initiatives. This first set of initiatives start with a very first strategic goal which is Promote The Digital Court. This five, this was the actual largest group of all of all of our initiatives, and it's not surprising it is because, ultimately, much of the work is in promotion of the digital court. The first set of five you see our initiatives that had been on the previous tactical plan, and we believe that, ultimately,

needed to continuum the tactical plan moving forward. Explicitly because of the language access piece, which we currently have a workstream right now dedicated to the voice-to-text interpretation, as well as the video remote appearance, which is currently, hopefully, going to be funded in next year's Governor's budget for remote hearing technology. Moving on to the next five initiatives that are associated with the first goal to Promote The Digital Court, you see this is where we start looking at some of our new digital court, you see this is where we start looking at some of our new initiatives. With this, out of all of the five new initiatives, four are located in this particular area, but there is two a particular I would like to call out there is two a particular I would like to call out the first is the branch wide identity management. This is a complicated, but yet incredibly important initiative that needs to be addressed. It focuses on court users, how they access our systems, how they access our access our data, and what rights they had to access our data. This will actually go to the process using technology to validate who and what has access to our systems, justice partners, ports, public. The second initiative I think is absolutely critical to call out is the data analytics is the data analytics and business intelligence initiative. As we all know, and we've seen from the presentations earlier today that presentations earlier today that we have moved from a paper-based environment, too now a digital database environment. And it's with this information and this change in how we do business, it's absolutely critical that we look at the top of data we collect, who has access to it, how it is being used, and so, this is one of the work critical that we look at the top of data we collect, who has access to it, how it is being used, and so, this is one of the workstream's core goals to figure out how we address these type of initiatives. We already have one workstream kicked off and several others are moving forward with this as well. These are our current 10 initiatives that are located under the strategic goal to promote digital court. Let's turn to the rest of the strategic goals and initiatives with them. The next strategic goal is Innovate Through IT Community. We have an initiative that expands of the collaboration amongst the IT community, and that we have Advance IT Security And Infrastructure. The three initiatives up top were the ones we looked at over the last several years. As a matter of fact the council has approved several of the frameworks and recommendations from them but the key new one which I think is critical to all of us is a branchwide Information Security road map. The reason is that technology is ever changing, so we need to make sure that we as a branch of prepared to address those changes on the risks coming toward us with a new technologies out there. We thought this was absolutely critical to stay on top of this, and to do it as a branch with workstream methodology, as well as keeping us whole in general. And of course the last one, but not we need to make sure that we as a branch of prepared to address those changes on the risks coming toward us with a new technologies out there. We thought this was absolutely critical to stay on top of this, and to do it as a branch with workstream methodology, as well as keeping us whole in general. And of course the last one, but not least is recognizing to Promote Rule And Legislative Changes. New policy, new rules, new legislative changes have been occurring very rapidly, and a lot of them impact the technology we use today. A lot of them State we need does the new technology, so you need to be on top of that. So, knowing that. We need to be sure we are aware of that. That's part of our goals initiatives to this tactical plan. So, knowing that, have a little bit of a sneak preview for you preview for you guys of what our one page flyer or our information about the tactical plan looks like. It's really small. I'm sorry. I wish it was a little bigger, but as you can see we laid out all of the initiatives in the

tactical plan, highlighted what will they apply to, and keep in mind, most of these apply to multiple goals, but these are the primary goals they apply to. With that we are presenting to you for your approval the 2019-2020 Tactical Plan for Technology. If you have questions we are happy to answer them.

>> Judge had to, thank you with a, Heather.

>> I have to say I'm overwhelmed but impressed. And especially by the fact how much you are thinking ahead, and understanding the world that is changing around is changing around us, access of the data analytics and the people who ask for our data. We have to manage at first but we have to know who they are first, so this is impressive. Thank to manage at first but we have to know who they are first, so this is impressive. Thank you.

>> Chief, just one comment real quick. I wanted to have a shout out to Sheila. I will get to her in in a second but, certainly everybody that has been a part of this and certainly the people here in the room with Judge Brodie and the room with Judge Brodie and Ms. Flener, Nancy Eberhardt, of course, Heather Pettit, but Sheila has worked on this for so long. I have worked with Sheila for several years with Sheila for several years on different things, and we used to travel in the same circles in Orange County, and I know she and I know she has taken so much time to get this right along with all of the other all of the other people that have been involved. I certainly don't want to make sure there was a special note of thanks for her. So, thank make sure there was a special note of thanks for her. So, thank you, Sheila, Anthony.

>> Thank you, Judge Bottke. I had fortunate to work with tremendous good but not does he I did step at a tremendous number of people tremendous number of people throughout the branch so, thank you.

>> I'm glad you said that. Thank you. We'll said. I appreciate that.

>> I would move for approval of adopting the Tactical Plan for Technology. I would also say an impressive part of the whole document in having in having the privilege enough to work on it is to see all the projects coordinate with each other, how they'll tie in with a bigger strategic plan for moving the branch forward. They are not just individual itemized projects that are each other, how they'll tie in with a bigger strategic plan for moving the branch forward. They are not just individual itemized projects that are somewhat idea of something we should do, there will structure, will supported and well executed. So, thank you for keeping us moving forward.

>> Thank you, Judge Brodie. Seconded by Judge Stacey Boulware Eurie. I have to say to see the goals in this way and of data, the tactical plan, the strategic the strategic plan, it's tremendous because this is homegrown from the branch. It is probably are greatest populist movement where we use the talent, and the communication of the branch to create this. I will greatest populist movement where we use the talent, and the communication of the branch to create this. I will not delve into history but this is far different from how far different from how we talked about technology 10 years ago, and this has come on with strength and, I would say, fire, and it's getting supported. It's getting financed because of the branches of government recognize the good work that is being done here, and when it's put into a format that we all know it keeps us

on track for our goals. It's very important to us. So, again, thank you for your work. I call for a vote to adopt the uptake of the tactical plan update.

>> All in favor please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any post? Any abstentions?

>> We adopt the plan. Taking.

>> See you in another two years.

>> The next item is not an action item. You will not find materials in your binder. This is Court Innovations Grant Program: County Grant Programs, County Superior Court of San Francisco. They're Veterans Justice Court project. Welcome all to have a seat. I am sure Judge Rubin will introduce his panel.

>> While they are taking their seats, good morning, ladies and gentlemen, again. Chief Justice, ladies and gentlemen of the council, anyone listening. As we were talking earlier about the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, we have several charges, and one of them is the innovations grants. You recall for those of you who were not there are those who were in the 16-17 budget year, with the leadership, the Chief, Martin, we work with our sister branches, were given \$25 million innovations grant. Innovations grant was cut into three segments. One of the segments was courts segment of the largest segment. And what we have been trying to do in each meeting now that the projects are about halfway through their lifecycle in terms of development was to start presenting each meeting, a grant, so you can see what the money has been doing. What has been going on in the branch? You recall there was a tremendous response renovations grant can see what the money has been doing. What has been going on in the branch? You recall there was a tremendous response renovations grant program. The branch responded with many, many, many ideas, many projects. There's a lot of vitality out there. We're trying to showcase for you some of what you some of what is out there. This is just a sampling of what is sampling of what is out there. So, today, we are pleased to hear from representatives from the San Francisco Superior Court veterans court. The court will discuss with us this enhanced Veterans Justice Court project. What they have done is expand they're evidence-based practices, their trauma-informed treatment to participants, in conjunction with support a with support a Pinnacle Case Manager and does participants not eligible for full be a help benefit package. The main project, or the main goal of this project was to increase this project was to increase the graduation rate of Veterans Justice Court clients, and to reduce recidivism among participants. Let me introduce today's folks to talk about the program with you. We have Judge Michael Beckert from the Veterans Justice Court, seven Cisco corporate the Ms. Allyson West, Veterans Justice Court Coordinator. We have also, I'm pleased to introduce Mr. Darian Evans, Veterans Justice Court participant, and with a his service to his country, and also for what we will be sharing with us today. With that let me introduce the veterans court folks. Thank you.

>> Chief Justice and council, good morning, everyone. I am very happy to be here and honored to be able to present to you the San Francisco Veterans Justice Court. Your support is incredibly valuable to the work that we're doing, so, thank you, very much. I have presided over six

different collaborative courts at this point, and in the collaborative courts we encourage people to encourage people to be open about their challenges, so I'm going to tell you I am feeling a feeling a little bit challenged right now. I am a little intimidated by the esteemed group that I am addressing, addressing, and the importance of your support to the work that we do. I am also conscious of the fact that in the not-too-distant future one of your members will be deciding whether I will remain on the Veterans Justice Court, so, good morning, Judge Feng.

>> I was wondering where you were.

>> And I am also a little intimidated by the fact that I am going to be sharing the stage today with Daria Nevins, one of the clients of the Veterans Justice Court, and I know that everyone in this room, myself included, is more interested in what Mr. Evans has to say, so I will try to be brief. I think it's wonderful that you get to hear from Mr. Evans. I wish, and invite each of you to actually observe what happens at the Veterans Justice Court, as Judge Nadler has, and to see real people working, striving, and struggling with fundamental questions that you probably take for granted, questions about, how do I become a responsible adult? How do I regain control of my life? How do I envision a future for myself? And how do I believe that I am worth something when everyone in my life is telling me that I am worth nothing? So, that's the work that we try to do. That's the work that you enable us to do, and I thank you for that. I am going to take a brief philosophical digression here. I hope you will indulge me. We are part of the criminal justice system, and I think it would all agree these are interesting times where people doing that work. This is a treatment court, and so, we are always balancing and considering interest which I will characterize as what people deserve and what people need. On the one hand, what they deserve being a backwards looking interest, and what they need being a forward looking interest. So, on the one hand under what people deserve, questions like accountability, responsibility and punishment. And on the other hand, what people need being healing and recovery, and reconciliation. So, in philosophical terms we would call this the distinction between the ontology and unit tell a -- military 10 is him, which we will not go into right now. In legal terms we call retribution versus rehabilitation, and we can have a discussion about how best to serve the various interests that we all share, and whether that is a retributive or rehabilitative model, I would contend that issues, including procedural costs, social costs, public safety and fairness would counsel in favor of a rehabilitative model. But these are not things that are mutually exclusive. Sometimes people need to get what they deserve, and sometimes people, I would say, always, people deserve to have their needs met. The advantage of working in the context of veterans court is that I think we have broad societal consensus that veterans do deserve to have their needs met as a result of serving their country, and, particularly, under circumstances where their service has resulted in physical or emotional challenges that have contributed to their contact with the criminal justice system. There is widespread support for having justice courts for, specifically for veterans top and I am proud and honored to be involved in San Francisco's. I will go through, basically, who it is that we serve, how it is we attempt to help them, and with what results. So, eligibility, the main requirement here is that they have a case in San Francisco. They can be a resident of any county, as long as their case is in San Francisco. They can have any length of service in the military. And they can have any type of discharge, honorable, dishonorable, or other than honorable discharge. Their criminal exposure can be both a

misdemeanor or a felony. And the procedural posture of their case can be pre-plea, deferred entry of judgment, or a probation case. People who are not eligible would be where the District Attorney's Office is not offering anything less than a state prison sentence, so they would not be able to participate in any of the treatment programs. So, those people would not be eligible for the Veterans Justice Court, and Justice Court, and we do not require that there be an established connection between their military service and the conditions that brought them into contact with the criminal justice system. The way that we provide the services is through a licensed social worker who is provided by the VA. That is for people who are eligible for VA benefits. The huge benefit that the Innovation grant provides us, and the work that you enable us to do is that we can serve people who are either on what is called a grant per diem or have no benefits. These clients are serviced through social worker who is provided through San Francisco pretrial diversion, and paid for by paid for by the innovation grant. But for that innovation grant we would not be able to serve those clients. This gives us the ability to assess people for their needs, both in custody and out of custody. Very significantly, if we can assess people while they while they are in custody, we can also issue an order that allows them to be picked up by up by the veterans court social worker and taken directly to a residential treatment program so that they are not out on the streets where they can encounter danger or get into trouble, that is a critical piece that is not available to all of the treatment courts that we have. It's very important that we be able to take people from a safe place and directly place them in a program that is going to help them. We have status reports that the court receives, and the justice partners receive that are prepared by Case Managers and maintained in a database. And we track that data on a court hosted database. We can serve needs through providing housing, DV that data on a court hosted database. We can serve needs through providing housing, DV therapy or counseling through an at ease program; substance abuse treatment through outpatient programs; detox, and residential treatment. And we can serve people's mental health needs, serve people's mental health needs, in particular PTSD and traumatic brain injury through various kinds of evidence-based programs. Many of these programs training is provided by the Innovation grant. The innovations that we have are that we have a full-time licensed clinician for participants without VA health care. We would not have that without your support. And we have training for clinicians on evidence-based practices, interactive journaling, Seeking Safety, and moral Rick the nation therapy. All of these designed to help people adjust their thinking, which evidence shows will contribute to success and better outcomes. Some of the Some of the challenges that we face are the availability of substance use treatment beds. That is a challenge, more so, actually, if you are not afforded VA benefits, but it is a problem for everyone. That includes detox beds, residential treatment, and dual diagnosis, in particular. Those are challenges and the wait times can be long, we don't have beds available. We also need, and are working on expanding our mentor program. It's important for these veterans to have someone that they can talk to that understands what they are going through, and we're trying to expand that. We need funding for recruiting and for materials to train and support those mentors, and to pay for outings so they can build a bond with the clients. We have had 400 referrals since 2013. We are about six years old now. 50 active clients; 185 graduates; 29 were terminated; 21 we don't count because they have been on bench warrant status for greater than 60 days; 66 elected to opt out; 59 who were referred who were not eligible. A recidivism rate for graduate is 14%. This is a number I particularly like, recent graduates, many people that

graduated people that graduated October 1, 2017 forward, and current participants have a recidivism rate of 2.2%. So, people who are in the program are doing well. The breakdown of how the benefits are divided our 57% VA benefits; 29% have grant per diem; port the present have none. That is significant because if you look at that, that means up and down at any given moment you could have as many as 40% of the participants serviced by that social worker who is funded by the innovation grant, and they would they would not get service if we did not had that innovation grant. 63% of the participants come to us with felony charges, and 37% with misdemeanors. Here are the demographics breakdown of the participants, and the average age is 49 years old. And it is getting younger all the time. At this point, I am going to turn the floor over to Mr. Evans, and I am sure you are all anxious to hear from him, and I will say he is a wonderful participant in the program. He served in the Army for three years, and he has been a participant in the Veterans Justice Court since January of 2018. So, Mr. Evans?

>> Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning, council. My name is Derian Evans. I am a U.S. Army veteran. Wow, I remember prior to catching the case that I caught that landed me in jail, prior to me becoming a participant in the VJC -- tonight. I was completely lost, for lack of a better word. I was hopeless. My PTSD was through the roof. I was in the worst alcoholic relapse that I had ever been in. And I truly felt like I was beyond human aid at that. I was completely out of control. Rick I would look in the mirror and not recognize myself. I was full of anger, hopelessness, shame, guilt, violence, rage, and I just remember just feeling, like I said, I was beyond human aid and I cannot stop myself. I was completely separated from the spirit that I feel that I needed, the spirit of God. Rick I was completely removed from it. When I caught my case January 9, 2018, I remember after I woke up, probably on the next day in jail, I remember feeling like I was exactly where I was supposed to be. I had a sense of gratitude of being in jail because I was like, finally, something stopped me from this fast-track to 1011 I was on. My behavior was that of someone who wanted to die, someone who did not care if they got killed. I felt I was not being the father that I knew I could be to my children. I wasn't the son that my parents raised me to be. I was not the soldier that the Army raised me to be. So, I definitely felt hopeless. And at that moment I felt like I got what I deserved when I ended up in jail. So, yeah, I remember being around the other inmates and everybody's story was how they were going to get out, I did not do it. It wasn't my fault. I should not be here. If only I had made a left instead of right, I would not have gotten caught. And I was the only one sitting there saying, I am right where I am supposed to be, and to an extent I was. Because, that is where the VJC found me. After catching that case, I had it made up in my mind that I was going to be gone about four to seven years. And I was ready to take that on. I thought that is what I deserved. I remember someone knocking on my cell saying you have a visitor. A visitor in jail. How does that work? Not on visiting day. And it was representative from the VJC, Jennifer Perera. She told me that the VA was going to pull me out of jail and get me into the services that are really needed. I was like, no, you must not know what I did or what I am accused of.

>> [laughter]

>> She said, no, we can help you. And I was like wow, this is amazing. I remember calling my children and telling them, hey, y'all, I might be home real soon. And from that day, that day, I had hope again. I had not had hope in a long time. Hard liquor, depression and anxiety can erase

all hope. All hope, morals, just anything that you used to be. Alcoholism can take that from you, and it took it from me. Self-respect, even my size. You hear about people that eat and drink a get a beer belly. No, I drank for breakfast, lunch, and dinner with no food. I was skin and bones. But, yeah, so, I had hope again, and I have had that hope ever since. And when they pulled me out about one week later, as y'all can imagine, I was completely full of gratitude, and they pointed me in the right direction. They got me the treatment that I needed, you know. I did not think I deserved to go to rehab again. I did not think that I deserved to, you know, just had the luxuries that we take for granted every day. But when I said that to my friend, Allison here, that I deserve to be in doubt, she said, no call that is not what you deserve.

>> After going to detox and rehab and all of the things that I needed to do, I had what AA calls a spiritual awakening as a result of doing what I am told. And the by-product, I feel, of my spiritual awakening is an inner peace, something I have not had. I had not had probably ever in my life, and I can attribute that to what we call the gift of desperation. I was desperate to get well, feel better without liquor, pills, or anything like that, and I got it. I owe that to this program, the veterans justice program. As of today, I am still sober. My relationship with my 13-year-old daughter, almost 18-year-old son is better than it ever has been. I am a productive member of society, and I have been blessed. From what I have been told, blessed with a voice that people listen to, and I tried to give back, and that is what we do in AA. The best way to keep what you have is by giving it away, and that is what I do today. I help others who have been down the road that I have been, and help others who have been down the road that I have been, and worse. Older gentleman, older women, younger folks, white, Asian, black, Mexican, all of those when it comes to the spirit we are all brothers and sisters, and I am glad that I was blessed with the circumstances that I went through and survived so that I could help others. My name is Darian Evans, and, thank you.

>> [Applause]

>> Do you want to say something?

>> I do. AQ, Chief. Want to make a couple of remarks. First of all, all of us are great supporters of collaborative courts, but as a person who spent his childhood growing up in the military, and as in the military, and as a person who spent four years on active duty in the Air Force, I am particularly impressed with the veterans courts. Every time I hear a program like this and a success story like Mr. Evans, I am even more impressed, and Judge Begert a few minutes ago mentioned what people deserve and what they need. People like Mr. Evans, and all of his colleagues who are veterans, they veterans, they deserve this type of attention, because after all at one point in their lives they raise the right hand and took hand and took an oath, which was an oath that basically said they were willing if necessary to give up their life in defense of the country, and I cannot think of anything that is more compelling than that. Mr. Evans, congratulations. Best of luck. Keep it up.

>> Thank you, Your Honor.

>> Judge Bacigalupo.

>> Mr. Evans, I would like to thank you for your testimonial and sharing with us your experiences and what you what you have been through. And I would like to comment, if you don't mind that with respect to the journey you have been on, and you are attributing much of it to the opportunities that this veterans court provided you. You would not be here, I believe, if it wasn't for your determination, for your willingness to do all of the hard work, which is necessary for you to achieve the accomplishments that you have. You should not underestimate what you had done. And, Judge, I want to commend you for running this program. I would like to ask if there are services available for family members who are part of the circle of participants in the program, so that they too can be part of the support system to help integrate their family members back into the community?

>> I'm going to let Ms. West answer that, but it will say this, and I think Mr. Evans will back me up back me up on this. The best thing that can happen to that family unit is for this veteran to get better.

>> Thank you.

>> Good morning.

>> The BAF offers extensive services for family members. They had had for family support, family therapy. It's a little more difficult for veterans without VA healthcare services because the city and County, even though we are a very rich city and County still do and County still do not have enough services for justice-involved citizens. One thing about the position funded by this grant is the person in it now has been working in the city for a very long time and found a lot of really great resources to support the veterans for individual, in it now has been working in the city for a very long time and found a lot of really great resources to support the veterans for individual, group therapy, and family reintegration services. There are some, but not enough.

>> Thank you.

>> Judge Bottke.

>> I want to echo what you said, Paul. Mr. Evans, I oversee two collaborative courts my courtroom, and when the participants thank the court thank the members of the Team for everything they have done, I'm quick to jump in and say, have to think yourself, because even though the Team in the core provides the opportunity, it is of the individual that has to provide for themselves with those resources, s and say, have to think yourself, because even though the Team in the core provides the opportunity, it is of the individual that has to provide for themselves with those resources, so, again, I think, is policy, a lot of thanks goes to you, Mr. Evans, because you are the one that got it done besides Judge Begert of the team for providing the work.

>> Thank you, Your Honor.

>> I also want to thank you come is Wescott and you -- for leadership and taking on a court and making it yours, making it available, the fact you bring many skills to corporate this is not particularly a traditional judging as it has been in the last several decades. I thank you for what you bring to the community to the community of San Francisco. I know, Mr. Evans, will speak

for the fact that we wish you the very best Rick I think you said it best when you say, in spirit, we're all brothers and sisters. That's really important for the you say, in spirit, we're all brothers and sisters. That's really important for the courts and for us to think about going forwards. Congratulations on the work you had done and the work you continue to do, especially as you continue to Mentor and reach out to folks who are on the beginning of the journey that you have accomplished this far. Thank you again for being here and sharing such intimate information work you continue to do, especially as you continue to mentor and reach out to folks who are on the beginning of the journey that you have accomplished this far. Thank you again for being here and sharing such intimate information for us. We appreciate it. Thank in.

>> [Applause]

>> Members of council, that concludes our May business meeting. Our next regularly scheduled Judicial Council business meeting is business meeting is on July 18 and 19, now, as you are aware.

>> [Laughter]

>> Or July 25th. On the 18th and 19th we will have much to have much to discuss. In the meantime, much to accomplish. Safe travels, thank you.

>> [Event Concluded]