

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 videocast 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.

>> The current shortfall has required difficult choices by our Governor and legislative leaders. I appreciate the Governor's efforts to advance a budget proposal that would minimize the impact to the courts while still setting the state on a path for long-term fiscal stability. In light of the final budget agreement that was ultimately reached the judicial branch is facing some significant challenges. Our sister branches of government have emphasized the importance of a sound budget that, in their words, protects vital programs assisting millions of Californians and that protects public services that matter most to Californians. While that includes our courts. We know the courts are vital to the public and the fair administration of justice. It is vital to all Californians. So we will continue to provide the data and information that is needed in an open and transparent fashion to demonstrate these points. We will continue to raise our concerns about the real-life impact of these cuts on Californians throughout the state who rely on our courts. As you well know, our judicial branch is resilient and despite these challenges we will continue to work diligently to mitigate and manage impacts to the courts and to the public we serve. And this is a team effort, again, as you well know. I very much appreciate the contributions of Presiding Judge Hernandez, Judge Conklin, Judge Moorman, and David Yamasaki for guiding our budget process over the past year and for advocating for our legislative priorities in the capital. And all the planning and information sharing by appellate and trial court leadership and court professionals through our advisory committees. And, of course, the great work and advocacy that you have all seen by Shelley, Rob, and Salena and their teams including Cory and Zlatko. Shelley will have more information and insights to share on the details of the budget during her Administrative Director's Report. I wanted to comment on Judicial Council membership. Our July business meeting has historically been one of transition for council members. As you know, September 15 is, for us, a milestone marking the beginning of the terms of service for our new council members. We have been providing an orientation for these new numbers which some of you may remember going through yourselves. Introducing them to their new roles and responsibilities. I would like to thank our Judicial Council staff who facilitated that training. We are also acknowledging and saying goodbye to some of our colleagues for whom this is our final meeting. I want to start with the departing members first. I want to acknowledge the service and contributions of the following four departing council members. Judge Conklin for his two three-year terms. Judge Feng from San Francisco Superior Court for his three three-year terms. You can do the math. That is a lot of commitment. Attorney David Fu for his three-year term. And president of the California Judges Association, Judge Yew, completing her one-year term. On behalf of all of your colleagues I would like to thank you for your public service. For your dedication to the rule of law and for your numerous contributions and improving the administration of justice in

California for what amounts to, as you all know, a second full-time job. As someone commented yesterday, the work that other job of yours entails does not go away when you go home and it is an incredible tribute to your dedication to public service that you are here. You have made indelible contributions and we will miss you. Indulge, if you could, in a round of applause.

>> [Applause]

>> We will also continue to see five council members who are reappointed to new terms. They are, as follows. Judge Brodie from San Bernardino. Judge Dulcich. Justice Fujisaki. Presiding Judge Hernandez. And Administrating Presiding Justice Hill. Thank you all for agreeing to stay. We appreciate your commitment and continued service. We will continue to rely on your talent and expertise to the benefit of the public we serve in these statewide roles. We are, as you know, fortunate to have knowledgeable and talented judges, court administrators, and legal practitioners to draw upon to serve in the governing body of our branch and to help advance key goals and objectives in the Judicial Council Strategic Plan. It is this mix of experience and institutional knowledge combined with new ideas and fresh perspective that enables the council to continue to enhance judicial administration statewide, support the rule of law, and deliver equal access to justice for all Californians. I am pleased to announce we are adding to our knowledge and experience database if you will with eight new incoming members. They will assume their duties in September so you do have a little bit of time. You can't change your minds. I would like to welcome them all here today. Some of them are with us in person, others remotely. Others couldn't attend. Judge Kimberly Apaloo, president-elect of CJA from San Bernardino Superior Court. Presiding Judge Bunmi Awoniyi from Sacramento Superior Court.

>> [Applause]

>> Justice Stacy Boulware Eurie from the Third District Court of Appeal. A familiar face.

>> [Applause]

>> We have Commissioner Ryan Davis from the Sacramento Superior Court, who is present. We have Justice Joan Irion from the Fourt District Court of Appeal, District One.

>> [Applause]

>> And attorney Craig Peters from San Francisco.

>> [Applause]

>> Presiding Judge Lisa Rogan from San Bernardino Superior Court. And we have Assistant Presiding Judge Tamara Wood from Shasta Superior Court who is not here, but we will give her a round of applause.

>> [Applause]

>> I thank you all for volunteering for these positions and thank you to everyone who submitted nominations for these positions as well. Just as I have enjoyed working with departing council members I look forward to and am excited to work with each of you in years to come. Thank you. Now for public comment.

>> Thank you very much. We will now begin the public comment section of the meeting during which members of the public are provided with the opportunity to speak on general matters of traditional administration or specific agenda items. Today's meeting including public comment is live streamed and a recording will be available to the public online. Although our meeting today is being held in person, members of the public were given the opportunity to speak either remotely or in person at the Judicial Council office here in San Francisco. Please be reminded for those of you speaking in a moment that the Judicial Council is not an adjudicatory body. The council's not authorized to intervene on behalf of a party in a case. Rather concerns as to substantive rulings of the case may be addressed through the appropriate procedural mechanisms. We request anyone testifying refrain from speaking about specific cases and the individuals involved, including court personnel and the parties. I will begin in a moment by calling those speakers. I believe we have two. I will remind those speakers who will be with us remotely that when your name is called I would ask you turn on your camera, unmute your microphone, and begin by stating your name and, if applicable, your affiliation. A timer is displayed on the screen to help you keep track of the time. When there is one minute remaining I would ask you begin to wrap up your remarks. Note that we will be adhering to the three-minute time limitation. I will call the first member of the public who will be with us today. It will be nice to have Natalie R. If you wouldn't mind putting your camera on and unmuting the mic and we look forward to your remarks.

>> Good morning. Can you hear me?

>> We can hear you. We can't see you. If you do not wish to have your camera on that is perfectly fine, but if you did wish to we cannot see you.

>> I just prefer to move forward.

>> Perfect. Go right ahead.

>> Thank you. In 1926, when the voters voted yes on Prop 27, the authors ensured the public that whenever anything goes wrong any litigant or other citizen will know who to make a complaint. And it will be the duty of the Judicial Council to propose a remedy. And if this cannot be done without an amendment to the laws the council will recommend to the legislature any change in the law which it deems necessary. Since 2022 I have sent you mountains of evidence with proof beyond a reasonable doubt of government attorney Daniel Shinoff's

perjury, subordination of perjury, obstruction of justice, violation of the Brown Act, violations of the California education code, conspiracy with Richard S Whitney to deprive constitutional rights, conspiracy to discriminate, and his repeated course of conduct harming the public for decades. With carte blanche immunity. I informed you that when I went to the San Diego County district attorney I was stonewalled. I was told it was a civil matter. I informed you that because of the California State Bar's conduct and practice of taking bribes from attorneys who defraud taxpayers thereby participating aiding and abetting criminals and they are giving them a license to repeatedly harm the public. And mine and my child's lives are now in danger. I ask for your help. In response, on July 1, 2024, I received an email from you directing me to stop sending emails to the Judicial Council. Shortly after that I learned you promoted Judge Joan Irion of Del Mar to a voting member of the Judicial Council. As you know, Joan Irion and her friend attorney Daniel Shinoff and Richard S Whitney are in violation of 18 USC section 241 conspiracy to deprive constitutional rights, obstruction of justice, acting without jurisdiction, fraud on the court, and intentionally harming the public. This is not okay. The integrity of the judicial process is most severely damaged when government actors defraud the court. Fraud on the court occurs with the judicial machinery itself has been tainted, such as when an attorney who is an officer of the court is involved in the perpetration of a fraud on the court or makes material misrepresentations to the court.

>> Your time is expired. I will certainly allow you an opportunity to wrap up your remarks, but I ask you do that at this time.

>> Okay. We were promised that whenever anything goes wrong any litigant or citizen can be assured that they can make a complaint to the Judicial Council and it would be the duty of the Judicial Council to propose a remedy. And if this cannot be done without an amendment to the laws the Judicial Council will recommend to the legislature any change in the law which it deems necessary. Now I am asking you to honor your oath and duty to the people. Every minute that you failed to act is another minute that another child is being irreparably harmed. This matter is urgent, time is of the essence. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. We appreciate you joining us today. We will turn to the second speaker we have with us. Niles River. If you wouldn't mind turning on your camera again and unmuting. We look forward to your remarks.

>> Some sophisticated stuff here.

>> I have the same difficulties sometimes. You are not required to turn on the camera, but if you would like to.

>> Whatever I can get going, that is fine. I sympathize with the young lady that just spoke. And I think that the Judicial Council and the commission judges performances are derelict in their responsibilities for this. Myself, I am subjected at this point in time to two prefiling order approval requests. In other words I do not have access to the courts until I file a request for such

and get leave from the court and permission from the court to do so. Prior to the time I was declared a vexatious litigant there was an issue that alleged, but there had been no due process hearing. No due process notice. And the judge that issued that particular notice denied the existence of that particular order when I raised the issue. And at the same time I also believe that you have a criminal enterprise with regards to the child support services department. During this time that I was not allowed before the court they were continuously garnishing my wages, bank accounts, et cetera, and refusing to allow me to adjudicate those matters. I understand what you are seeing. I do not want to get in the specifics about the case, but there seems to be no standards by which a judge can issue prefiling approval. For example, the Ninth Circuit has indicated, oh by the way, I was in the family law court, but the order was pervasive and precludes me from having the opportunity to go to court without leave. All of the California superior courts. And the second prefiling order was issued about three years later. And it was issued that I have to file prefiling approval on all other issues except violations of visitations and that issue was moot. I asked the judges there—and I notice you do not have any Black men judges sitting on the council—but I want to ask the judges there, have they ever issued an order and then subsequently been denied the existence of that order? It seems strange to me. This happened in a particular situation where the judge had indicated that I was a vexatious litigant. Took my OSC off the calendar because I was a vexatious litigant. And at the time we had the hearing to declare me a vexatious litigant he denied the fact there was a prior adjudication of such and that it is because it wasn't done by due process.

>> Mr. River, I would just note your time has expired, but if you wouldn't mind wrapping up your comments.

>> I think there should be, I think you should void the ability of the Child Support Services to issue summary suspensions and garnishments because I think they are stealing. There should be a specific standard of prefiling order judgments. There is quite a bit of I would say corruption. And judges who operate for improper purposes. That is all I have to say.

>> Thank you very much. That concludes our public comment portion for today's meeting.

>> Thank you, Justice Hill and to our speakers, as well. We appreciate the time you took to join us today and express your concerns. Next on the agenda is my regular report as Chief Justice summarizing some of my engagements and ongoing outreach activities on behalf of the judicial branch since our May 2024 meeting. I've had the pleasure of addressing the graduating classes of two law schools. First at the University of San Diego School of Law and the following weekend at McGeorge School of Law, which was celebrating its 100th commencement ceremony. As I said, no pressure. My thanks and appreciation go out to USD School of Law Dean Robert Schapiro and McGeorge School of Law Dean Michael Hunter Schwartz as well as their respective faculties and staff for the opportunity to address these graduates and their families during these very special events as the students now embark on their entry into our legal profession. Back in San Francisco I welcomed two groups of judges and commissioners participating in the New Judge Orientation program. There was a total of 17 judges and 11

commissioners representing 14 different trial courts. I had two additional opportunities to address future members of the legal profession and our judicial fellows who demonstrate an early interest and commitment to public service in our judicial branch. I attended the American Bar Association's judicial intern opportunity program where I spoke to law student selected for six-week summer internships to do legal research and writing for state and federal judges. These internships were offered to members of traditionally underrepresented groups to further our mission, developing a judiciary that continues to better reflect the diversity of our state. And I helped send off graduates of our judicial fellowship program during their end of year ceremony. These 10 fellows spend 10 months working in either our Judicial Council offices or with seven superior courts throughout the state under the mentorship of our court executive officers and professional staff. We thank our fellows for their contributions to our branch and hope it has inspired them to continue public service, hopefully with our state judiciary as many of our fellows have done over the years. Also last month I participated in a meet and greet and Q&A session at the Third District Court of Appeal moderated by Administrative Providing Justice Earl and spearheaded by Justice Shama Mesiwala. There were about 25 externs and research attorneys who asked very thoughtful, probing, and engaging questions and the event was also attended by several judges of the Third District who devote so much of their time to this important role of mentoring the students. I also had the opportunity to meet with members of our state-federal judicial council which is designed to provide a means of communication between state and federal judges on matters of mutual interest and concern. During this meeting we were joined by former California Supreme Court Justice Tino Cuéllar and Professor David Engstrom of Stanford Law School who both gave excellent presentations on the timely topic, one you are familiar with by now, artificial intelligence—things have already changed since the meeting we had—and its impact on our society and courts in particular. We also express our gratitude for Judge Connie Callahan who is rotating off as co-chair. I also met with Administrative Director Curran and Assistant Presiding Justice Hill and members of our Leadership Support Services division to discuss appointments to our council's many advisory bodies and education curriculum committees. We considered a total of about 300—precisely 392, a startling number of applications for 246 positions. It was so delightful to see how qualified the applicant pool is. We express our gratitude and selections will be announced in mid-August. Finally I had various meetings with partners, stakeholders, and members of our sister branches of government including during Governor Newsom's reception attended by several state legislators including our own. I look forward to continuing these and other outreach activities in the months to come. That concludes my report to the council. Now we will hear from Administrative Director Shelley Curran.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning. Before addressing my submitted report, I will provide some comments on the budget, a recap of the budget as the Chief mentioned I would. We shared a budget memo with the courts on June 28. The Governor signed AB 107 on June 26. Several days afterwards he signed additional budget related legislation. As you noted, Chief, this is a clearly challenging budget for the branch given the reductions included. What is included in the budget itself for the branch is backfilled to trial courts and facilities funds. Additional funding for self-help centers, employee benefit costs, court reporter

funding at a \$30 million level. Ongoing CARE Act implementation funding. It extends the sunset for both criminal and advanced proceedings to January 1, 2027. It does not include an increase in the fund balance. We ask for a fund balance cap increase which was not in the budget. From a statewide perspective there is branchwide reduction of 7.95 percent. This equates to a \$97 million cut to trial core operations and a commencement reduction at the state level operations including the Judicial Council, Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Habeas Corpus Resource Center. A tough proposition as we are moving on from the uncertainties of a pandemic to the uncertainties of these budget reductions. The Judicial Council staff organization is already preparing for our cuts and looking at all of our spending in the context of these reductions. Over the course of the next year immediately we are restricting all unnecessary travel. We are changing many of our in-person meetings to remote meetings. A soft hiring freeze for our staff and all offices have asked to identify savings they might, that we might score in the coming fiscal year so we've begun to make the changes we need to make in order to absorb those cuts. We had very productive conversations with trial court leadership and appellate court leadership in order to think about how we can best manage some of these cuts and also to document these cuts in the coming months. As always, we are really appreciative of the partnership we have with both the appellate courts and the trial courts as we are trying to navigate these new changes. We are going to continue to work through the presiding budget is about the appellate and trial courts as we continue to gather this information and to share it with the sister branches of government. One very effective way to deliver this message on the impacts is by having legislators see for themselves what is happening in the courts. I know this is a subject very near and dear to Senator Umberg. We are stepping up our outreach efforts for court visits from legislators in case staff. This is an especially opportune time right now as legislators are on their summer recess and many of them are back in their home districts. It is a good time to visit the courts. We appreciate the efforts and initiatives by the courts in order to bring the legislatures to their home courts to see it in action and also really appreciate the support and encouragement from Senator Umberg with his colleagues in the legislature to encourage them to take us up on our offer to come and see you. As a brief recap, since January we have had 27 meetings with legislators. This is capital in their districts as part of the benchmark coalition on top of all of the work we are doing pretty much on a daily basis with office of governmental affairs and the regular conversations they are having with legislators. On-site court visits are also happening. So far this year we have had five courts I am aware of have hosted legislators. Santa Cruz, Sacramento, Monterey, Orange, and San Francisco. We are hopeful more of those will continue. I know at least eight other legislators visiting courts in the coming months, three more records, so that is very good news. We appreciate the efforts of the courts to host those legislators because there really is nothing like seeing court in action as opposed to this theoretical thing that may happen. To actually see what is happening in the courts is wonderful and important. On July 3, Mike McGuire was serving as acting governor of California, he was represented by members of his lead staff who attended the groundbreaking ceremony for the courthouse in Lake County. I want to say congratulations to Presiding Judge David Markham and the entire court as the construction of this long-awaited project begins. The new four room courtroom will replace two existing facilities, increase security, expand capacity for proceedings. Also parking for jurors and the public and solar power capability. The

project is estimated to be completed in May of 2026. Solar power generation is a timely topic. Our facilities director reported to me the groundbreaking ceremony was short because that day it was triple digit temperatures. Unfortunately the climbing temperatures raised the risk of seasonal wildfires. This last Friday, due to wildfire conditions in Mariposa County, they ordered evacuations there. The court was forced to close. We were in touch with Presiding Judge Fagalde and Court Executive Officer Desire Laird, who reported that all court staff and judges and the courthouse were safe. I saw a beautiful photo of the historic courthouse. It came close, but thankfully all were okay there. We hope always that wildfires can be controlled quickly, council staff are ready to assist the courts to address some of the needs that may come up related to both facilities issues and operation issues. This includes cleaning up smoke damage and also emergency orders to address court closures. I will briefly return to my regular administrative report. As you know, this is a report you will have in your packets. A report on some of the work we've been doing since our last business meeting in May. The report itself recaps 19 advisory bodies' actions in intervening weeks. And I do want to make special note of one of the items in my report. That is the completion of the claimant to all 58 courts of the MyCitations ability to pay tool. Allows individual struggling with court debt with eligible infraction violations to address their matters online through a tool that can be used on the phone. They can look up their citation, answer simple questions, submit a request for a possible reduction in the amount owed, time to pay, or community service. As of July 1 over 177,000 requests have been made. 86% of the individuals received some relief. The average amount owed at the beginning of the matter was \$542 and the average amount imposed post-analysis to MyCitations –was \$265. Statewide 250 judges registered to review matters on MyCitations. And 1250 court staff have access to the tool, as well. Statewide expansion provides an important alternative for people appearing in person. Tulare was our first court to come on board in April of 2019 and Orange and Sacramento came on at the end of last month. Getting this project off the ground and implemented took many years. It began with U.S. Department of Justice grant application in 2016. In 2018 the legislature provided additional funding first to bring on three more courts. And in 2021 the legislature made the decision to expand this to all 50 trial courts and included backfill for the loss of production. All courts needed to be online by June 30, 2024, and beat the deadline by six days. I want to call out and thank Martha Wright, who is the manager in Criminal Justice Services who first identified the opportunities to U.S. Department of Justice. She wrote the application and spearheaded the effort in the first several years of the project in very close collaboration with Suzanne Schleder in the Information Technology office. Those two in collaboration with trial court leadership, the pilot courts, the staff in their office, and of course the budget services offices laid the foundation for a program that has helped many, many Californians. I want to thank you and the team who have continued this work and all of the court staff who worked on this for many years.

>> Thank you very much. I will open it up to comments on any portions of the report including the budget if any. Thank you. Next on the agenda is the consent items. The council's Executive and Planning Committee says items on the consent agenda is to optimize the best use of meeting time. The council's Rules Committee provides guidance to the Executive and Planning Committee on agenda setting related to rules proposals. The fact an item is on the consent

agenda is not a reflection of its significance and, as you know, any council member can request an item from the consent agenda to the discussion agenda if they believe it would benefit from further discussion and deliberation. As always, we appreciate the many hours of work put in by advisory committees and staff that brought these performers for consideration. I'll ask if members have any comments since you have had the opportunity to review all the items or any questions before I entertain a motion for approval.

>> I am not looking to have an item moved, but at the appropriate time I would like to make comments about some of the Ike items on the consent agenda.

>> Go ahead.

>> Thank you very much. Good morning and good morning to the council members. With the start of the new fiscal year the attention is heavily focused on the budget. I want to highlight several items on the consent agenda. Seven reports and recommendations developed by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee admitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee. These items include allocations to trial courts for pretrial release programs, CARE Act implementation, court-appointed dependency council, self-help services, programs funded from the State Trial Court Modernization and Improvement fund and the annual allocation to increase the number of court orders in family law. In civil cases. Today's action is to allocate 20 million for this purpose which was the amount included in the governor's revision. As a final budget for the fiscal year 24-25 included a total of 30 million to increase the number of court orders. The Judicial Council will see another report to allocate additional 10 million at a subsequent meeting. Lastly, there is an item to revise allocation methodology for the model self-help pilot program for technology projects that will support the expansion of critical self-help services. These allocations ensure funding for critical programs and services provided by trial courts and support one of our core missions which is to ensure access to justice for Californians across the state. I want to take a moment to especially thank members of TCBAC, members for ensuring these items are considered and recommended to Judicial Council in a thoughtful and timely manner. That concludes my comments. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. Any additional comments?

>> Thank you. Just a comment concerning trial courts and court reporters. That remains a very active issue in the legislature as to whether there is or is not a court reporter shortage. I believe there is and I know there's a survey underway. I would ask that survey be widely distributed. Following to your comment, Ms. Curran, is that when members of the bench invite legislators, that is one of the points they show in addition to remote access. The challenge with respect to court reporters, for example family law courts do not have court reporters right now. And that concludes my comments. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you. We are looking forward to providing any additional information and sharing, as I said earlier, being open and transparent. I think it is important. Thank you. Anyone else? Thank you. I will now entertain a motion for the approval of the consent agenda.

>> I move.

>> Thank you. Thank you. All those in favor please say aye. Any noes? Any additional abstentions? We do have one abstention that we'll note in the record. Thank you. The consent agenda passed. Six discussion items for today. Our first item is the announcement of an invitation to participate in the California court interpreter workforce pilot program. Item number 24-128. Although there is no report in the materials, but we do welcome the presenters today, Mr. David Yamasaki, court executive officer for the Superior Court of Orange County. We also welcome Mr. Denton from the Center for Families, Children and the Courts.

>> Thank you very much for allowing us the opportunity to present today. The launch of the California interpreter workforce pilot program. More than 200 languages and dialects are spoken in California. Without proper language assistance from court interpreters, limited English proficient users may be excluded from meaningful participation in the court process. The workforce pilot is an important and timely vehicle to help increase our numbers for court interpreters and will assist the courts with meeting the needs of California's 6.8 million LEP residents and potential court users. As you can see, the 2023 Budget Act dedicated \$6.8 million for a five-year pilot program that is to run between 2024 and 2029. The underlying goal is to increase the number of court employee interpreters by reimbursing aspiring interpreter candidates for training costs and up to three examination fees. As of July of 2023 there were 1,823 certified/registered interpreters. 760 are court employees, 42%, and 1,060 are contractors representing 58%. California has the largest court interpreter workforce in the nation however the number of employees has been decreasing over recent years. In addition to court employees California courts have tremendous need for more court interpreters including Spanish and most other major languages. There are some serious challenges the branch needs to address and guard regarding interpreter workforce. The workforce is aging and retiring. There are geographic constraints and limitations. Sometimes reluctant to apply for court jobs. Often times do to the opportunity for flexibility and competing rates. The Judicial Council language access services program is also working to expand test capacities since COVID-19 restrictions were lifted. This chart shows the most interpreted languages for FY 22-23. You will note Spanish is by far the most interpreted language and courts have indicated to council staff their greatest need right now is for more Spanish interpreters. There are also some languages such as Punjabi and Arabic that have 10 interpreters to serve the entire state. Under the pilot participating courts agreed to hire successful pilot candidates after they pass all required exams. Subject to available positions and funding. Candidates must agree up front to work for the court for at least 10 years. Each court may have up to 10 candidates that can participate per year. JC staff are coordinating efforts with Los Angeles which also has a separate training program for their court to become court interpreters were court reporters. Courts will be extensively involved in candidate selection and monitoring. Candidates will have to submit six months progress reports

to the Judicial Council. If candidates do not pass in two years they can apply for the next cohort. At this time I will turn it over to Mr. Denton.

>> Thank you. I think David said the interpreters have to work for the courts for 10 years. It is actually three years. This slide shows our participating courts for cohort one. We opened up applications in June and I'm happy to report with David that we have 20 courts participating which shows the great need for more interpreters. They represent all four regions of the state. I think it shows the commitment of courts and the goals of the pilot to fill those roles. Our strategy will be to work with courts to select the most promising candidates. That includes near passers for certified languages. These are people who have taken the exam for certified status one or more times and have come close to passing but may need more training to be able to pass the exam. Bilingual court staff, provisionally qualified interpreters, ASL interpreters interested in becoming a court reporter and interpreters for registered languages if the court has a need. The pilot alliance with our recruitment efforts. As David mentioned, we are making up for work for supply gap since the pandemic. We have had to stop testing for a year because of the prohibition on gatherings. So we are making up by expanding, testing, and recruitment of new interpreters as our number one priority. Our program has several recruitment strategies underway which are reflected here. We are definitely using web resources, also direct marketing. We have expanded our educational opportunities for aspiring interpreters. And I am happy to report that we have been able to add more ASL court interpreters since the council approved reciprocity for the court interpreting last November. The pilot will leverage near passer trainings to increase the exam passage rate for certified languages. This is 16 hours of free training that gives the participants more skills to be able to pass the exam for certified languages which is challenging. Prior to 2020 we had under 10% overall passage rate but since we've implemented the near passer trainings the passage rate averaged 23% for the past three years for persons who participate in the training before taking the exam again. The slide shows some of our deadlines and how to submit questions. June 21 was a deadline for courts to apply. August 1 is the deadline for aspiring interpreters to apply for cohort one. And I will share with you, we've already had over 500 applications which I think shows the great interest in this program. Also a link here for our candidate webpage where clients best candidates can go for more information and a contact to submit questions.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Denton. This concludes our presentation. Thank you very much again, Chief, for allowing us to showcase the benefits of this pilot program which is very much needed. We are happy to take any questions if there are any.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you, David. The question I have is out of the 500 applications what is the breakdown in terms of languages?

>> Most of the courts participating wanted Spanish interpreters. Like mentioned, that is the greatest need, but also courts that wanted an ASL court interpreter, Punjabi, other languages. Hebrew. So it varies based on court need, but it is predominantly Spanish.

>> You have statistics for how many for each group?

>> I have them, but not with me.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you. Anyone else?

>> I think getting 500 applications at this point in time is fantastic. It is a testament to your recruitment efforts that were designed and implemented. That speaks volumes about the effectiveness of the recruitment effort. We congratulate you. That is fantastic. It's great.

>> Thank you both for your presentation. I would echo her sentiments. As we all know language access is so critical to the public we serve. It is wonderful to see the efforts underway. We also thank the legislative branch for their support, ongoing support in this area. We appreciate your presentation.

>> Thank you very much.

>> For our second item we have recommendations for the trial court trust fund and childcare allocations for fiscal year 2024-2025. Agenda item number 24-032. We welcome Presiding Judge Conklin, the chair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee. Welcome.

>> Thank you so much for allowing us a few minutes to present this important item. It does address the allocations for the 2024 to 2025 fiscal year. I'll remind council members it is their responsibility to make these allocations in July to allow trial courts the time necessary to prepare for and expend those funds. These recommendations come to you through a triple play so to speak. They mainly come up through the funding methodology subcommittee through TCBAC and then through the Judicial Branch Budget Committee. We ask you today to approve \$3 billion in total allocations from the trial court trust fund for the fiscal year. Of that \$3 billion, 2.5 billion represents workload formula allocations which at its most simple definition pays for the work we do every day. They're based on council approved workload based allocation methodologies. You've considered those for years and approved them each year. I would like to mention briefly, due to the state's fiscal deficits that FMS and TCBAC took on the challenging role of deciding how to allocate the \$97 million reduction to the trial courts. So when I say allocate, that was a mandated reduction. Typically we talk about allocating funds in a positive sense. Unfortunately this is allocating that reduction of funds so in essence what we are doing is making a decision of how to spread that reduction out to all of the trial courts in the most fair manner possible. We considered that very carefully. The goals were equity and transparency

and stability. This council has for years recognized the importance of equity in trial court funding. That equity applies equally when you talk about reduction in funding. Every step is taken to try to make sure that any reductions while spread throughout the courts preserve the goal of equity which means by definition some courts are going to take, by perception, higher or greater reductions than other courts to maintain that goal. As this was discussed through the funding methodology subcommittee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the goal remained and the committee members equally dedicated to preserving that goal. It was an interesting discussion through FMS and discussion through TCBAC. But at the end of the day the policy, the policy, not the numbers, but the policy was considered and decided by FMS, TCBAC and then it went to Judge Moorman and the Judicial Branch Budget Committee to consider the policy recommendation for the allocation of that reduction. It was approved. After that and through the good work of Budget Services, as they always do, they continue to look back at the formulas to make sure that as those formulas were calculated they were mathematically accurate. And it was discovered somewhere in that formula—it is much too complicated for me to understand or explain—there was an error. That was recognized and the appropriate time was taken to account for the error. This budget, as you all know, is an ever moving target and the numbers behind it are the same. So once that error was discovered it was also recognized that necessary time needed to be taken to ensure we were able to correct that error. Rather than send out numbers immediately steps were taken. It took a matter of weeks. We needed to make sure we had appropriate staff expertise available to us to explain and to correct that error. Those numbers were then checked and rechecked and rechecked to make sure they were all accurate and they were finally distributed July 3. I recognize as chair of TCBAC in working with our court executive officers both on the committee and throughout the state and, candidly, we have acknowledged the importance of our court executive officers to the success of our business there. The brains behind the business—no disrespect to presiding judges intended—but the CEOs are the ones who make these numbers work. I recognize this was a difficult change for those CEOs, but the reduction allocation was then presented to them. It resulted in approximately one half of 1% of a change to courts. I'm getting way down in the weeds with this, but we have a banding. We recognize courts that are further away above or below the funding average and those allocations and reduction allocations changed. It did impact their numbers, but at the end of the day it did not impact the policy. We make every effort to decide policy before we develop numbers. The development of the numbers here caused some concern. And I recognize that. But we continued on and I believe we were consistent in our application that we did not let those numbers change the policy. That being said, and while we are asking this council to approve the recommendations of both the allocations and the reductions, it will then come back to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee—as a matter of fact, it has been added to our work plan as was just approved by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee—to step back and look at that funding methodology for reductions for upcoming fiscal years. But it is just simply not practical nor would I ask this council to change the allocation recommendation for this fiscal year because if you think about it practically it is a defined \$97 million. With that \$97 million if we change it around again then we will impact other courts and cause them to make the change. So while we are hoping to get restoration to that funding and we hope with that restoration we will not have to cross this

bridge again we are also being practical that if those restorations do not develop and we have further reductions we have to continue to refine the methodology for those reductions. Moving on from the \$97 million reduction, the other details of your allocation recommendations are included in your report. They include recommendations concerning the consumer price index and how that is to be considered in our methodology. These numbers sometimes make my head spin, but to try to explain it as I understand it simply, we truly appreciate the consumer price index allocation, CPI allocations we've received. This year we did not receive one, but the decision was made that when those CPI allocations come into the branch that they not be considered in the definition of new money because the purpose of the CPI allocation is to address each court and the fixed costs those courts have in running their business rather than including it in a new money definition which would then draw in equity and other discussions about the allocations. So that is also part of your recommendation today is the revision of the definition of new money excludes CPI funding. With that, I have Zlatko next to me for questions or corrections or more details.

>> Thank you very much. Any questions or comments?

>> Briefly, Chief, I would like to make a comment. And thank you, Judge Conklin and everyone on TCBAC and the FMS subcommittee. The work done within FMS and the larger advisory group is always heavy lifting. Always complicated. If I don't attend the meetings I listen to them on the audio recording so I am aware of the spirited debate and the congenial nature in which this conversation was had. I think it is just important to emphasize in this meeting that the \$97 million of reductions, FMS, and the broader TCBAC committee, discussed the methodology. Sometimes we refer to it as a policy. It is really methodology to adopt to allocate the \$97 million in reductions. And that is the focus of the presentation today. That is the focus of the presentation before JBBC which adopted or accepted TCBAC's recommendation about the methodology. The information contained in the spreadsheets originally, both at TCBAC and later at JBBC did contain an arithmetical error. There was a known contained in the spreadsheets that turned out to be incorrect which did result when those corrections are made in a change in how the methodology was being implemented. I want to emphasize it was an arithmetical error and the recommendation today is to adopt the methodology. In explaining how the methodology is implemented of course we include the information about how the cuts will be distributed. The goal is always to have our trial courts reach an equitable level of funding, a stable level of funding, and that our process in doing so is transparent. I want to ensure everyone the error was discovered after the report was sent to Judicial Council leadership staff on June 17. I believe it was June 17. The error was discovered before then, but how it was going to be remedied and running down the numbers and having everyone in the room at the same time took us about two weeks and the final numbers were arrived at on July 3. The materials the council members have today do reflect the corrections to the arithmetical errors. The policy discussion remains the focus, I think, of the recommendation. I am happy to answer any questions anybody may have on the process. I think it is important again to underscore that this methodology for this round of cuts, FMS is going to look at it all over again to see if that is the methodology we want to use in the future. Should we have to be confronted

with additional productions, but also it's a good conversation to have when we have funding restored which I am very confident that will occur. We can document and have documented and will continue to document our conversations so that when we do have funding restored it will be taken into account to achieve those same goals of equitable funding across the state, a stable funding, and a transparent process that takes us there. So Chief, I am happy to answer any questions, as well.

>> Any questions or comments?

>> No questions for me. I have had the opportunity to participate in both the discussions at TCBAC as well as the Judicial Branch Budget Committee. As was reported by Judge Conklin the discussion was very thorough. This is one of those rare instances having worked on the budget advisory committee for many, many years I cannot recall another occasion where there was a calculation and so this is a rarity. As was stated the methodology was followed. There was a calculation error. I think the budget team operates with flawless efficiency and accuracy. Sometimes these things happen. But it is not a reflection of any of the work they do and the great work they put into making sure everything is accurate. I just want to take a moment to thank Zlatko and his team and all of the members for being very diligent and trying to do the best job they can.

>> Thank you.

>> As you might imagine there was a fair amount of consternation among the CEOs. It's already high anxiety when you have some reductions. And the surprise was startling to a number of us as well. But several of us had communication with Ms. Curran and I appreciate the openness to talk about how to improve communication whenever something like this is discovered again. As mentioned, we are in the planning stages and have been in the planning stages to deal with the reductions. Depending on which side of the equation you fall it either negatively or positively affects that planning. So I appreciate the open communication and willingness to work with us to avoid this sort of thing in the future. But also to communicate as effectively as possible.

>> Thank you for the comment as well.

>> The same things Mr. Parker echoed. Being able to have the open communication. I'll also comment on returning to TCBAC for further discussion on the methodology next year. I know there were concerns about how we would address this. Also sharing for my own county, it is a pain point for us. We took a large hit on this. But it is important we are true to the methodology and the policy while also being open and communicative to address any other changes as we move forward. We're appreciative of all of the hard work that has been put in and the opportunity for discussions.

>> Thank you. At this point I will entertain a motion if there is a motion to move approval of this item and its recommendations.

>> Judge Moorman moves.

>> I'll second. Judge Brodie.

>> Thank you. Any additional discussion? All those in favor say aye. Any noes? Any additional abstentions? The item is approved. Thank you. For our third item we have recommendations on the judicial branch five year infrastructure plan and a capital outlay budget change proposals for fiscal year 2025-2026. This is item number 24-119 in your materials. We welcome as our presenters Administrative Presiding Justice Brad Hill, chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee as well as other titles. He wears several hats. And Ms. Pella McCormick, Facilities Services.

>> Thank you very much. This five-year plan we are bringing to you today would not be possible without the outstanding staff we have and Pella and her team manage over 433 court facilities with approximately 22 million square feet to manage. I should note that the great majority of those facilities are old facilities well past their useful life which brings us to our plan for the future in the next five years. When we were building these courthouses we were trying to the greatest extent possible be frugal and getting every last ounce of bang for the buck in terms of courthouses that certainly will last a long time, but are not testaments to marble and Brazilian hardwood. We put in very nice laminate. We have a process where we look at every single cost available and do our best to make sure—and Sam will remember, at our first meeting 12 years ago we created a subcommittee called the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee. We thought it was important that we not just build courthouses, but that we take a very keen eye to every expenditure. I tell the story when we would have maybe four projects in a day and one PJ from the Valley told me that after watching what had happened to a court that was before him in his court they all went out to the lobby and shaved off about 1,000,000 1/2 additional dollars and came back and their project moved forward and the preceding project did not. We've saved probably over \$100 million through that process. We know the viability of this courthouse construction program allies and is reliant upon knowing that we are saving cost to every extent possible. Courthouses are expensive. We know that. Obviously one of the drivers is the security cost built into all of them. So we need to do our part to make sure that we come in at reasonable cost and under budget if possible. We have serious issues over the coming years to address. Not the least of which is related to seismic issues. There are critical issues involving so many courthouses around our state. We are simply in a race to build seismically secure and safe courthouses in high-risk areas before an earthquake hits. It is not if, it is when. That is why we are moving so quickly that we need to get on this. How the session probably two years ago that talked about a number of seismically deficient courthouses in our state. Courthouses where we have hundreds and thousands of people on any given day in courthouses that are seismically not safe so we are working hard to bring those courthouses to fruition. With that, I will turn it over to Pella.

>> Thank you very much. I am the director of Facilities Services. The Judicial Council facilities program mission is to provide uniformly safe, secure, and well-maintained court facilities. The program strives to optimize spending, reduce the deferred maintenance backlog, replace substandard antiquated facilities because California's courthouses are aging. The –oldest court facility in California is 170-year-old Mariposa County courthouse. More than 30 facilities are over 100 years old. An additional 150 courthouses are 50 years old with infrastructure systems at or beyond use of life. An additional 142 court facilities are over 35 years old and need renovations. Progress is being made to replace the antiquated and deficient courthouses. Since the inception of the Trial Court Facilities Program in 2002, a total of 32 new and renovated courthouses have been constructed. Fourteen courthouses completed construction using funding through Senate Bill 1732 and another 12 through Senate Bill 1407 and six through a combination of Senate Bill 1407 and General Fund. The 1732 and 1407 projects utilized funding generated by court user fines and fees. Notably, projects appropriated after fiscal year 2018-2019 funded by California's public building construction fund which is the majority of state agency capital construction projects. The fund authorizes the sale of lease revenue bonds to finance project construction and backed by the state general fund. In 2018 and response to legislation Judicial Council conducted assessment of all outlay projects that have not been appropriated. The process produced a statewide list which is the basis for the judicial branch five year infrastructure plan. 12 of the 80 trial court projects from the state list have been appropriated and are proceeding or awaiting funding for subsequent stages. An additional 10 trial court projects that were appropriated in 2018-19 not in the 2019 statewide list are completed or nearing completion. In the past year new courthouses for the courts in Glenn, Imperial, Shasta, and Riverside New Menifee completed construction and are open to the public. Projects for the superior courts in Sacramento, Sonoma, Stanislaus, and Riverside Indio are in the construction phase and anticipated to be complete in calendar year 2025. A new courthouse for the Lake Superior Court started construction and is expected to be complete in calendar year 2026. A new courthouse for the Sixth District Court of Appeal is in design and the construction planning has been appropriated. A new courthouse project for the Superior Court of Mendocino is in the design-build phase, a project for the Superior Court of Monterey is in the acquisition phase and six additional projects for superior courts in Solano, San Luis Obispo, and Fresno and Nevada, Plumas, and Los Angeles Santa Clarita are in the site selection phase. Today's requested action is to approve the judicial branch five year infrastructure plan and eight capital outlay budget change proposals for fiscal year 25-26. Submission of the five year plan is required for projects to be considered for inclusion in the governor's infrastructure plan. The annually published infrastructure plan itemizes all California state agency capital outlay funding needs. The submission of the branch's five year plan is a requirement for the state budget process and is the basis for the administration's forecast for long-term state-wide infrastructure. An agency's individual project proposal not considered without an accompanying five-year plan. The edges so that judicial branch five-year funding plan shows the basis for the funding request for the upcoming and outlying fiscal years. The judicial branch five-year infrastructure plan is based on the 2019 statewide list and is updated annually to reflect progress. Capital outlay budget change proposals, or COBCPs, are also required in the state

budget process. The COBCP requests funding for individual capital projects. Capital projects are funded in phases with each subsequent phase requiring a submission of a refreshed COBCP. The 2025-26 Judicial Branch five-year infrastructure plan proposes 23 projects over the next five years. The estimated total cost of all 23 projects is \$8.552 billion. The projects will activate a total of 304 courtrooms. Fiscal year 25-26 funding requests include four ongoing capital projects for superior courts in Butte, Fresno, San Luis Obispo, and Solano and four new start projects in San Joaquin, Kern, Lake, and Placer. The total request for 25-26 is \$50.686 million. These projects will provide benefits to eight superior courts and activate a total of 68 courtrooms. These eight projects will replace 14 antiquated facilities and renovate three others. Antiquated facilities are a challenge to maintain and operate. In fiscal year 23-24, a Judicial Council facilities program expended approximately \$31 million of our \$80 million facility modification budget on emergency repair projects which are not only costly but hugely disruptive to core operations and impedes access to justice by closing courtrooms and sometimes entire courthouses while repairs are made. Approval of the 25-26 judicial branch five-year infrastructure plan and eight capital outlay proposals ensures Californians have access to courthouses utter secure, maintainable and functional. The facilities programs appreciate your continued support and happy to answer any questions.

>> Thank very much for your presentation. Any questions or comments.

>> First of all I want to thank you, Chief, and former Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye in recognizing the importance of continuity with court facilities and also the trial court modification advisory committee. For me, it was a difficult time when we stood on the court cost reduction subcommittee and Justice Hill is absolutely right. That is a cut to the bone that we do not build opulent courthouses. We build warehouses that are respectful. I remember the times when we talked about center bench. Talked about foliage outside might as well get rocks and. As far as decoration, forget about that. Get the local elementary schools to paint pictures. We will frame it. I want to thank you. Most importantly, bringing up the seismic issues with courthouses in California. That is so important to take into consideration thank you for the opportunity to serve on court facilities before coming to Judicial Council. I've made wonderful friends and the service that was provided and will continue to be provided is amazing and it is needed. So thank you for all of your work and thank you for being my friend and thank you for inviting me to your dinners. Thank you, Chief, if there were no other comments or questions I would move to adopt the request.

>> Thank you. Before I ask for a second I wanted to echo those sentiments. Having visited the new courthouses in Imperial, Glenn, and Shasta County as I can attest to how important it is to the community is. I think the courthouses are very nice and I enjoyed the artwork from the elementary school students too.

>> And I had one thing? The work that Brad's committees and Pella and her staff, it is amazing. We had a new courthouse built in 2016 and we were a demonstration project which is a euphemism for getting a 20% cut to your budget. A lot of materials were subbed out and

whatnot. But Pella and her predecessor and all of the staff have been routinely in contact with us. In fact Pella and some others were recently in our courthouse and we did a walk-through from top to bottom. Every single thing that had been substituted out, what had worked, what hadn't worked. It is and just here is a new courthouse you're done. Obviously an ongoing effort. But I think the facilities team does such a great job with not only the planning, but the follow-up on what has worked and what hasn't. That has certainly been the case at every courthouse that has been built since I've been around and certainly our own courthouse, and every day I am in it, I know that Kevin, our CEO, has contact with Pella's team. If we have an issue with [inaudible] who's on site, it has been remarkable. I think that ongoing review of what works and what doesn't is just as important as the planning and I think facilities certainly gets that done. I just wanted to comment on that. Thank you.

>> Thank you. That is a second?

>> Yes.

>> Thank you. All those in favor say aye. Any noes? Any additional abstentions? Thank you. The item is approved. We appreciate your presentation.

>> Thank you. We appreciate your comments.

>> For our fourth item recommendation on budget change proposals for the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal, superior courts, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, Judicial Branch Facilities Program, and Judicial Council. We welcome our presenters, Judge Moorman, chair of the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and he already took a seat but is going to be seated again, welcome again, Zlatko from the Judicial Council Budget Services.

>> First of all, I am never comfortable having my back to a court appeal justice. Thank you and good morning members of the council. As the Chief mentioned, the fourth item on our agenda today is item number 24-031 which is the judicial branch budget 2025-26 budget change proposals commonly known as BCPs, an acronym I will try not to use today. As you may remember, the role of court requires the Judicial Branch Budget Committee to review budget change concepts annually and we do that with the goal of making recommendations to the full council on budget change priorities. We have done so today in the materials you have. I will not repeat what is in the materials, but I will explain some of our thinking in coming forward today with the eight proposals we do have. Budget change proposals are brought to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in the form of concepts. All of the concepts in our opinion represent the branch's values. This year we did zero in on what we think is our core mission, the budget change concepts that really were necessary for us to advance to the Department of Finance so we can fulfill our core mission of providing access to justice while having in mind and being well aware of the current budget deficit which we think will continue into some years. We have made our commitment to our sister branches of government to participate in providing solutions to the deficit. So when we reviewed our concepts this year we had in mind the existence of the

deficit while also having in mind there are some concepts that need to be advanced to ensure all Californians have access to justice and cultural courts and appellate courts and we accurately and respectfully accept input on various bodies. As I may have mentioned, we had 23 very worthy proposals that were reviewed. We devoted one meeting to a presentation of each of the proposals. Somewhat in-depth presentations. We also had written materials. The Judicial Branch Budget Committee then discussed various concepts with the values I mentioned. Including the projected future deficits while trying to ensure we have equitable and stable funding and that we can fill our core missions. The eight proposals you have before you today we think meet that definition. The other proposals we discussed will be deferred for future consideration. The 2025-2026 recommended proposals focus on funding the branch's key priorities in the following areas. One, the inflationary and equity funding adjustment to support trial court operations. Judge Conklin mentioned the CPI component that is not considered new money. We think that is essential to pursue in future budgets. We have a budget change – proposal directed at facilities support and security assessments at trial courts. We have a budget change proposal dedicated to obtaining funding to improve our court appointed council programs for the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal. The fees and payment to court-appointed counsel has been an ongoing issue for many years. We think it has reached a severe critical need. And these court appointed council programs to fulfill our Constitution does constitutional obligation to fulfill the. Budget change proposal reflected on her litigation management program and the capital outlay funding. Chief, the list represents a budget package I think does conform with the highest priority is with the goal of increasing equal access to justice by all Californians while acknowledging the deficit the state is experiencing. When we do make these proposals today we did not prioritize them, they are not listed in any order of priority. We did not think that was appropriate. We presented these proposals as we think they represent the highest priorities for the council to consider. We also think for the prioritizing takes away from the flexibility I believe the Chief and Ms. Curran, our Administrative Director, and Budget Services staff need to have in their advocacy efforts with the Department of Finance and sister branches of government. Finally, a recommendation of the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, the submission of the eight in your report to the Department of Finance for consideration of the 2025-2026 governor's budget. Zlatko, would you like to add anything?

>> Only a couple points. Just to give you a number about what the Department of Finance has presented now that the budget has been finalized. As far as the out year deficits. They are looking at the budget year these will be submitted in the range of the \$2 billion problem growing to about \$14 billion in 26-27. What is important about that is the Chief mentioned earlier, you mentioned that this budget does improve the fiscal health of the state. That required the reductions discussed earlier today. But in comparison to the January budget the projected deficits were in the \$30 billion range. These are critical items for us to advocate for. They are core to our mission. We will definitely work our best to have a great product going to the Department of Finance and supporting them if you choose to support the recommendations from the committee.

>> I want to thank the committee. I would like to again thank our Budget Services staff. Very thorough in providing us with the necessary information to have important and cogent discussions as well as arrive at conclusions in the form of recommendations. I finally want to say to all of our advisory groups and stakeholders that presented concepts, thank you for your presentations. Thank you for explaining to us why the concept is important to our core mission. Your presentations will not just be put in a file somewhere. I have them teed up for a future agenda. Thank you. We are happy to answer any questions.

>> Thank you so much for your detailed presentation and your thoughtful deliberation that would into what we see here before us. I know that there is a lot of difficult decision-making points along the way and we appreciate your dedication to this mission, continuing, as you indicated, to protect our core mission. Any questions or comments?

>> I just have one. I agree it is a thoughtful list at a challenging time in which to make budget change proposals. Just for historical perspective, the litigation management program, I believe the current funding level has been static for a pretty long time. Do you know when was the last time that fund had any significant increase?

>> Something about three years. We've had some small increases. The biggest change in the program was on it moved from being funded out of the improvement fund and the general fund expense. There was an increase to that line item. I think it was a smaller one after the pandemic we had an increase of about 600,000. As we know, these costs are escalating.

>> I feel like that number, the current funding level, although there have been small changes, has been pretty static for a long time.

>> We look to internal branch resources for any gaps in the funding, but we cannot sustain that on an ongoing basis.

>> Thank you. At the same time we are looking to make some changes with the litigation management that we think will not only preserve resources, but actually maximize any additional funding we hope to receive.

>> Thank you for that question. Any other comments or questions? Okay. I will entertain a motion to move approval of the site Amanda recommendations. Thank you. Thank you. All those in favor please say aye. Any noes? Any additional abstention? The item is approved. Thank you very much. Now our fifth item, recommendations on court appointed special Advocate funding methodology for fiscal year 2024-2025. Item number 24-088 in your materials. We welcome the following presenters, the Judge Thomsen, member of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. Ms. Sharon Lawrence, member of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. And Ms. Kelly Meehleib, Center for Families, Children and the Courts. Welcome.

>> Good morning, Chief Justice. Good morning members of the Judicial Council. Thank you for having us here this morning. We know you have already read the report and its recommendations. We thank you for the opportunity to highlight the invaluable and important work performed by CASA with the allocated funds and supporting our families and children in both juvenile dependency and juvenile justice court. I will turn it over to Ms. Sharon Lawrence who is the court executive officer of the California CASA Association. As you already heard she is also a member of Fam Juv and she will go into more in-depth information on CASA's role in the specific work they perform in the courts that is so valuable to us.

>> Thank you. Good morning to all. Court appointed special advocates, or CASAs, are those who do actually know a work in the juvenile system. Trojan our meat from their homes for their own safety by social workers or law enforcement. They lose everything all at once. Their family, friends, teachers and schools, pets and belongings. Children often move from home to home not understanding why or what will happen next. CASA volunteers with their one-on-one advocacy provide invaluable support doing these tumultuous times. They offer stability, consistency, and the hope they so desperately need. Unlike other mentoring programs CASA serves as an officer of the court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 103. Highly trained volunteers on topics such as the impact of trauma on children, cultural competency, and dependency laws. They get to know their assigned to children and families and they interviewed teachers, attorneys, social workers, service care providers, doctors, therapists, anyone who knows the child. They review confidential records regarding their children and make recommendations to the court both by appearing at court hearings as well as submitting written court reports. Recommendations could be about placement, medical or therapeutic issues, or educational support. Whatever is in the best interest of their assigned children. Beyond their service as court officers advocating to judges CASA are persistent presences. They show up for the children, taking them to the park, visiting them when they moved to a new home, attending school performances, celebrating birthdays by bringing cupcakes to the children in their class, and connecting the children with their siblings. CASAs advocate for crucial services for parents and caregivers as well recognizing that often the best solution and the one that must be considered first is the return of the child to their family if it can be done so safely. Research shows that children with CASA have higher self-efficacy scores, do better in school, and avoid many risky behaviors that can lead to devastating outcomes later in life. Approximately 11,000 children have a CASA. We have 7400 CASA volunteers throughout our state working in 52 counties where 99% of the children lived. In the past year these CASA volunteers donated more than 400,000 hours in their roles to help children, judges, and other professionals in juvenile court. CASA said the children up to age 21 in the child welfare system as well as youth in the juvenile justice system. Founded in 1987 the California CASA exist solely to support the work being done by our local programs and we hope to provide more resources necessary so that every child who needs a CASA volunteer will have one by the year 2032. That is approximately 50,000 years. Some of the ways we help and support our local programs as with fundraising, technical assistance, CASA University which is a free service volunteer computer training of 30 hours or more. Legal consultation, mentoring, a learning center for CASA volunteers and program staff that is open 24 seven. Language translation

services, monthly trainings, leadership and staff zoom calls, in person meetings, and, in September, we will host a conference for all CASA staff in the state. We also advocate for systemic change in the foster care system and juvenile justice system through our legislative advocacy work. In 2022 the governor and the legislature invested \$60 million in our network to be paid over three years for the stabilization of our local programs and capacity building so that we can expand and serve more children in the next few years. The majority of these funds are given directly to the local programs by California CASA, but some of these funds are designated for shared services such as HR consultants, a statewide volunteer recruitment campaign which in its first months have garnered 39 million impressions on social media, wrote in strategic planning consultants and volunteer recruitment specialist. In addition we are working on better understanding the impact of the make on children and families by consulting with a nationally recognized expert on data outcomes, learning for action. We hope that work should be wrapped up in the next year.

>> California CASAs are guided by Welfare and Institutions section 100 et seq. Code sections that come thereafter. Legislature deemed them very important with regard to their functioning capacity and their work in the juvenile courts. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee oversees a CASA program local assistance funding. In the report you receive as well as the governor's 60 million funding over the course of three years, this year being the last year. The allocation of these funds is really at the heart of the report. Recommendations to you for your consideration. We often hear about clichés. The eyes and ears of the judge. This is no cliché when it comes to CASAs. CASAs are on the ground, interacting on a far more frequent basis with the children and youth that they serve than the caseworker can, than minors counsel can, thereby allowing them to get important and urgent necessary information to the caseworkers, the minor's counsel, so the action can be taken in a timely manner, not waiting for an interim review three months later, not waiting for a mandated review which can be up to six months later, so these children's needs are taken care of immediately. I have seen CASAs remain in children's lives as an important person both post reunification—they develop relationships, they appreciate that person being in their lives. I've seen it when a child ages out of foster care when the child is agreeing to participating in AB 12 wants the CASA to stay on voluntarily. It is not court-appointed at that point. It is a voluntary basis at that point. I have seen it as well when a child ages completely out of the foster care system and beyond judicial oversight having that person remain in their life through contacts and get-togethers. The voluntary service, I think as you have seen with all the work they do, is invaluable. To the courts, the judicial oversight of these youth, and the families we serve. On behalf of the family and juvenile law committee may request approval of item 24-088 as recommended. Thank you for giving us this opportunity to highlight the importance of champion and work in our courts to the benefit of youth and children.

>> Thank you. I want to thank you for your presentation and advocacy for this important program. I know we have the opportunity to meet I think it was May of last year. Along with Judge Isacson who is also a very strong advocate for the CASA program. And I think many of us around the room have seen firsthand how important they are. They provide somebody who

the children can really trust and confide in. I'm so happy to hear from you again today. I will open it up to additional questions or comments.

>> I am an advisory member then so I cannot vote, but I just wanted to lend my voice. First to say hello to Scott. I haven't seen you in years. You've gone gray like me. But also to lend my voice to the extraordinary work CASAs do. I was a CASA for three girls when I was an attorney. Two became attorneys and one became the first Black female judge in Monroe County, New York. In our county we have a treatment quit for truancy and it was really clear with COVID and kids not going to school and the Department of family and children services not filing on certain cases that kids in truancy could really benefit from CASAs so we talked to the Judicial Council, talked to our legal staff and we've moved truancy cases to the juvenile division and have a pilot program where CASAs are now appointed to children in our truancy court. It has made an extraordinary difference. Some of those families are on the cusp of entering the dependency or child welfare system so many of those families and parents are no longer working. The children are depressed, they have lost family members to COVID. It is really extraordinary to see the CASA program be able to expand itself and extend into that arena, as well. So thank you.

>> Judge Hernandez?

>> Thank you. I would echo Judge Yew's comments. We've had so much discussion this morning about budget. This is a prudent allocation because it will prevent further penetration into the system. Some of the comments Judge Yew made about truancy into whether it is child welfare or the juvenile justice side, this is a preventative piece. In light of the volunteer nature of all of these wonderful CASAs, the allocation of this amount of money would be prudent on our behalf for preventative penetration further into the systems. I would move approval.

>> Is there a second? Thank you. All in favor say aye. Any noes? Any additional abstention? The item is approved. Thank you very much. Our final discussion agenda item is a report and recommendation with respect to AB 1058, child support commissioner and family law facilitator program funding for fiscal year 2024-2025. Item number 24-114 in your materials. We welcome our presenters, Judge Conklin, welcome back, and we have Ms. Melissa Poulos, family facilitator and self-help program manager with the Superior Court of Sutter County, and Ms. Anna Maves, Judicial Council Center for Family, Children and the Courts.

>> Chief, members, thank you. I'm going to quickly turn this over to the pros from Dover. This is a recommendation for allocation of AB 1058, Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding for fiscal year 2024-25.

>> Thank you so much, Judge Conklin, members of the Judicial Council. My name is Anna Maves. I will provide you some history of the program. The federal government requires each state to have a child support program to establish parentage and child support for families receiving welfare benefits and for all families request assistance. In the early 1990s California

had a failing child support program. Then-Governor Wilson established a task force to review the current system and make recommendations for an efficient, humane, and conflict reducing process to expedite the establishment of child support and parentage. The recommendations from that task force resulted in Assembly Bill 1058 which established our Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program. It created a statutory scheme to expedite child support matters. Made unique forms for families mostly unrepresented to access to justice and allowed for federal funds to be leveraged to pay for this case type. The family code requires each court to have a child support Commissioner who is a highly trained specialist judicial officer to hear child support matters where the local child support agency is involved in the case and the family code also requires each court family law facilitator who is a licensed attorney who provides free legal services to families navigating the child support system or local child support systems involved in the case. The funding for the program comes via contract between the Judicial Council and child support services. The Judicial Council approved a funding methodology based on workload for the child support commissioners and in 2021 approved a population-based funding methodology for family law facilitators. For fiscal year 24-25 about \$48 million is available to local courts from the child support commissioners and \$15 million available for the facilitators. For fiscal year 23-24, approximately 2.8 million people were served by the commissioners resulting in \$1.6 billion of current child support being collected. There are 91 courtrooms in 69 locations statewide providing services. For the family law facilitator program the facilitators reported that they had about 42 instances of services. These services are delivered both in person and remotely and also by workshops where a group of people who have a similar issue can come and work together to have their issues resolved. I will turn it over to Melissa Poulos, family law facilitator for Sutter County Superior Court.

>> Good morning. I have been the Sutter County family law facilitator for almost nine years and I am a member of the family and juvenile law committee also. It is an honor to be here today. I want to speak about the family law facilitator program and give you some real life examples of people we felt in our office. He was served in the family law facilitator's office? We help anybody who does not have an attorney. There is no confidentiality or attorney client privilege so we can help anyone in the case that our services are free. Each county has a program and their own service model. These are some of the different ways services are offered. Walk in and schedule appointments. In Sutter County our facilitator's office is the last two windows in our court lobby pictured here. Our workshops, we offer workshop to establish or modify a child's court order and this is a photo of a classroom. Forms review can be done as a walk in or and scheduled appointment or as a workshop. Services can be offered in person or remote. And this is about meeting people where they are. We have had several people attend our workshops via Zoom from other states. Just recently Kathleen in Washington state attended the workshop via Zoom. She had already been working on the forms and had some questions. She was able to share her screen so we could go through the forms together. I was also able to give her information about how to e-file her documents. What types of service do we provide? Basically we help people with their forms. Megan attended our workshop recently. She had the same child support order in place for more than four years. She knew the father's income had increased so she can take it help with forms to modify the order. We went over her forms,

answered her procedural questions, and ran a calculation. When she got to her court date, the child support order ended up more than doubling. At a different workshop Patrick came to help to modify his child support amount as his income had decreased substantially over the last several months and he was unable to pay his former child support. We help them complete forms, explain the procedure, and run a calculation. When he got to his court date he was able to sign a stipulation order before the case was called to decrease his support amount even lower than initially requested. Joe was a walk in customer who had just been served with a governmental complaint and was confused with all of the paperwork. We were able to separate it and show him which pages he needed to complete and file. At a scheduled appointment we helped Stephanie file a motion to enforce the court order that father pay for one half of the uninsured medical costs of that child. One of the most hopeful aspects of the program as we not only help people fill out the forms, but we also educate parents about court process and procedures. During workshops I don't just tell people what to put on the form, I explain why it is asking for information and what different responses mean. I explained the different factors that go into a child-support calculation. A lot of people are surprised to learn there can be a child support order even if there is a 50-50 custody arrangement because of different incomes. One of the big court processes we talk about is service. Anytime someone files something we educate them on the proper ways to get papers served and filing proof of service. In some situations we serve the papers for them. We want to avoid delays in continuances because someone did not have their papers properly served. We also help parents with complex legal issues. In one case both parents questioned whether Carlos was really the father though both signed voluntary declaration of parentage. We helped with the motion to set aside. Court ordered genetic testing and it turned out he was not the father. The volunteer declaration of parentage was set aside and the child support case was dismissed. In another case a complaint was filed and a default judgment was entered establishing Michael as father and paying child support. Months later he asked for help in setting aside the judgment and asking for DNA testing. We helped with the motion, default judgment was set aside, DNA testing was ordered, and it came back that Michael was not the father. The child support case was dismissed. Recently we helped Sam file a request for order to determine arrears and lower the monthly payment amount toward arrears. The previous order included he paid \$200 per month in addition to his ongoing monthly support. He couldn't afford to pay that much so he asked to lower the arrears payment to \$100 a month. A lot of child-support issues go hand-in-hand with other issues. At the facilitators office we provide referrals for many other services. We can refer people to the local child support agency for genetic testing, an arrears audit or enforcement. If someone comes to us needing help with evictions or needing domestic violence shelter we can refer them to the appropriate local agencies. If someone comes to us needing help with child support there is a good chance they need help with custody or divorce issues also. And we refer that other self-help workshops and services. Everybody benefits from our services. The documents are completed correctly, guideline calculations are done and attached, the parents are educated on how and where to serve the documents. Parents understand the court process and are prepared for court allowing to hear matters and make orders efficiently. The majority of the time parents can get orders at the first hearing and not have to come back to court multiple times. In some cases after seeking our services the parent may decide not to file. Emily came to

a workshop to establish a child-support order. We completed the forms and ran the calculations. Before filing she took copies of her completed forms to the other parent as well as a stipulation and order form so that she could show him that child support calculation. They ended up reaching an agreement and filing a stipulation in an order instead of filing for a hearing date. Juan attended child support modification workshop to lower his child support. He was unsure what the mother's income was so we ran different calculations based on a number of different scenarios. We discussed how it was possible his child support obligation could remain the same or even increase. Juan decided not to file at that time. That is all I have. I think we are out of time. But thank you so much for your time.

>> Thank you for that presentation. The funding recommendations are outlined in your materials. Include and request approval of \$46.9 million in federal drawdown allocation of \$17.5 million. This concludes this committee presentation and we are open to questions.

>> Thank you for your presentation. I want to quickly say, as someone who studies family law, I saw firsthand the beneficial services that were provided. We as judges could not do her job without the facilitators office. And the same is true for the AB 1058 program.

>> I do want to make a comment, as well. I served in family law for nine years. I was on the Fam Juv advisory committee. Having the facilitators office is truly an access to justice issue. The people who come into family court are at their worst times in their lives, they do not know where to turn, and the facilitators have always been measured, kind, informative, and give people the information they need to proceed. Thank you for what you do and that is my motion to approve.

>> Thank you.

>> I would second that, but have a comment. Being in a small court like criminal law and family law I get to serve in each one of them every day. 15 years I have seen the impact of our 1058 commissioner who we share with Colusa, Glenn, and Plumas and our family law facilitator because we only have four judges so we see the direct impact every day of the family law settlement conference calendar, you name it. We are in an underserved area with respect to attorneys and legal services and without having that commissioner and a family law facilitator people simply would not have options other than going online so it is fantastic. The other point I wanted to make was, and I think this gets lost sometimes, Judge Conklin for so many years has turned it over to the pros from Dover. I think some people remember what he is referring to, but it is important contextually because in the original M*A*S*H movie, Elliott Gould and Donald Sutherland were the pros from Dover when the South Korean infant could not get services locally on a life-threatening issue and they came in and basically went around the Colonel who said, no, and said we are the pros from Dover, we are here to make it happen. You and Ms. Poulos are the pros of Dover and everyone else who preceded you. I will miss that would Judge Conklin. It is a testament to him knowing the expertise of the people who work with him when he presents. I commend all three of you. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> If I could conclude my comments with one more. Go Dodgers. [Laughter.] Thank you, Chief.

>> I second his go Dodgers. [Laughter.]

>> We will leave that for further discussion later. [Laughter.] I have a first and a second. All those in favor please say aye. Any noes? Any additional abstention? Thank you, the item is approved. As a final item we have the internal committees, the chairs of the committees prepared reports. They are part of the written materials and posted to our California courts public website. We thank them for that. That concludes our meeting for July. Our next regularly scheduled business meeting is on September 19 and 20. I do have a quick announcement. At that meeting CJA will be conferring awards to Judicial Council staff Cory Jaspersen and Bonnie Hough. We look forward to that, as well. Thank you and the meeting is now adjourned.