

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

[Please stand by for realtime captions]

>> Good morning. Please take your seats.

>> The meeting will begin shortly.

>> The meeting is now in session. According to the agenda, we will adjourn at approximately 11:15. I believe Marsha Slough is joining us by phone.

>> Yes.

>> Before we begin, I want to acknowledge some special guests in our audience, and offer thanks to our departing council members and celebrate the success of the years-long effort at budget advocacy that is delivered the branch budget that will form the major part of our discussions this morning. I was pleased to have the faculty and the new judges and commissioners joining me in my chambers earlier this week as part of the Judicial Council's new officer orientation program. As part of the program they are attending the opening segment of our business meeting, so welcome to all of you to our Judicial Council meeting. I will ask the programs faculty who are imparting their knowledge in the benefits of their years to stand as their names are called, many of us know and appreciate these officers and I'll ask you to hold your applause until all are standing. I want to introduce to you the Superior Court of Los Angeles, Superior Court of Contra Costa County, Superior Court of San Francisco County, and Superior Court of San Diego County. Thank you for your work and your effort and devoting your time to our new judges program.

>> [Applause]

>> I will also now call on the 14 judges and commissioners participating in our orientation program. Please stand when your names are called. Please hold your applause. From the Superior Court of Alameda County, Nikki Clark, from the Superior Court of El Dorado County, Mark Ralphs, from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Commissioner Kimberly Dotson, from the Superior Court of Orange County, Judge Cynthia Herrera, from the Superior Court of Riverside County, Judge Russell Moore, Superior Court of Plumas County, Douglas Prouty, from the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County, Timothy Schmal, from the Superior Court of Shasta County, Jody Burgess. Thank you. We welcome you and we look forward to serving with you and hearing your input on our proposals and we hope we will join you in the future. Best wishes on your future careers.

>> [Applause]

>> I am to the fact there may be a number of future council members in this new group, I encourage all of us to actively mentor the talent in our branch and to share our knowledge and foster and create opportunities for leadership which we have received in our careers before we came on the council.

>> September 15 is an important date, that is when the newly appointed councilmembers begin their terms. That means today is the last business meeting for five of the current council members, I want to probably acknowledge their service to the council and to the people of California, as Presiding Judge Kevin Brazile, court executive officer Superior Court of Placer County, Court of Appeals San Francisco, Presiding Judge Patricia Lucas, outgoing president of the California Judges Association from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, they would take on unpaid second jobs to improve statewide judicial administration and ultimately be responsive to the equal access to justice needs of all Californians.

>> It is the interaction amongst the judges, justices, commissioners, from diverse backgrounds, that enrich our deliberations and help us reach the best decisions we can under the circumstances.

>> Councilmembers had an opportunity to personally acknowledge our departing members last night, thanks to the creation of the event, and we will provide our departing members with copies of the Federalist Papers which remind us of the importance of constitutional democracy and the points of the oath we swear to support and defend and we like to joke it now that you don't have the binders to read, we know you will now immerse yourself in the Federalist Papers.

>> We are fortunate to have a wealth of talent and dedicated public servants within the California branch, so many are willing to volunteer time and expertise to this cause of access to justice.

>> As we have members leaving the council, we also have members joining the council. Before I announce the names of the joining or reappointed members of Judicial Council, I want to have a hearty public applause for the departing members.

>> [Applause]

>> We are joined by 10 newly appointed members to the Judicial Council taking up a variety of voting and nonvoting positions, we also have new advisory positions. Was an orientation yesterday for the new and returning members, it was members and staff of council who facilitated that so we thank you for your time.

>> We welcome back in some cases to the Judicial Council the following members, incoming president of the California Judges Association, please stand.

>>[Applause]

>> Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Superior Court of Fresno County. Court executive officer Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Superior Court of San Francisco County. Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Minister to Presiding Justice Brad Hill. Attorney and state bar appointee, Patrick Kelly. Presiding Judge Superior Court of Mendocino County. And

presiding judge incoming chair of our Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and from the Superior Court of Sonoma County.

>> Thank you for your service. Thank you for your efforts, your court is equal access to justice. My early budget statements have ranged in the early years from dismay and great concern that were, in my opinion stated publicly, neither fair nor just. In recent years, my attitude has changed to welcoming and appreciating both prudent and strong budgets that will improve equal access to justice in California, and a matter what the budgets brought I've always acknowledged dedication and perseverance of judicial officers or executives and staff, dedicated council staff and attorneys, and the justice system partners who doggedly advocated for adequate funding for our branch and for the last eight years.

>> Again, I am expressing this gratitude to those folks and I thank you all both here in this room also in the audience also in the state of California the courthouse is in offices who have endeavored in this effort for the last eight years, I also want to highlight the efforts of one person who since taking office in October 2014, who came from the executive branch to the foreign branch of the judicial branch, they made the budgetary challenges for this branch issue number one. Who brought his expertise and his contacts and his knowledge of how state government works not only in government itself but in the capitol, to the judicial branch. It is Martin Hoshino. He worked this budget not just this year but every year to get to where we are today. He spoke with old friends, made new friends, he provided facts to support the figures. I thank you all for the surveys and the information that you provided him and to our team in the capital, in the governor's office with the information, he responded to difficult questions he dealt with objections was as you know can be many in the capital and even in our own branch any crafted solutions, all of his public service efforts and I think tremendous skills has led us to this very welcome budget that we have. I want to thank you Martin for your work and for your service to our branch.

>> [Applause]

>> He is always watching. He said I forgot to mention that there was a reappointment. Thank you.

>> The next order of business is the regular opportunity for public comment and display turn things over to Justice Miller.

>> Thank you. We have five individuals, six, I'm sorry, to provide us with public comment. I will call each of your names and ask you to come forward to the podium and I will call the second person who is up next and if you can approach the swinging door to be ready. Each of you will have three minutes. Please remember this is comment about general judicial administration. We are not an adjudicatory body. We cannot make any decisions in individual cases, so please don't refer to specific judges or facts per se of their individual cases but we welcome your comments with regard to general judicial administration.

>> The time frame is three minutes on the podium. There are three lights, green, yellow when you have one minute, and red when their time is up.

>> The first person is Deborah Powers. For ADA reasons, she will talk to us by telephone. And then the next, and I apologize for pronouncing this statement incorrectly, if you could come forward and you will be next after Deborah Powers, and Deborah Powers please begin. Since you cannot see the timer I will remind you when you have one minute left and when your time has expired.

>> I am here. Good morning. Thank you. Good morning. My name is Deborah Powers. I am from Santa Clara County. I am talking on behalf of myself as a victim of domestic violence. I have seen the process is not just for victims of domestic violence in the courts, victims are being retaliated against for bringing forth any accusations, or for abuse or child abuse. We are now being separated from our children, and we are not allowed equal access at this time to the court system. It is disturbing to me being a victim of domestic violence that these things are happening in our judicial system. I am requesting that more accountability, more oversight happens in our courts. And that victims not be retaliated against. When we have enough evidence to support allegations for abuse and child abuse, that is it. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. Thank you for taking the time to present. Thank you.

>> I am glad to be here. My name is difficult to pronounce. I have some comments and the time is short. I respect all of you and I will continue. Comprehending the law in complexity, we want to use knowledge. There is the concept of law and we want justice. Researching the issues, and referring someone to them, in compliance with their duties, I can copy and paste and replace, they are the the right tools. Searching and researching nonprofit organizations, especially those who are receiving grants in compliance with their duties, they are not doing the right job. There is a reference to authority, each is referencing two or three other authorities. Reviewing authorities from decades and centuries, categorizing individualizing, and simplifying concepts and they suggest them to legislators to make easy law. Separating the Bar Association from the judicial branch and letting them act independently, the attorneys of law, and legal advisors are in question. Whether or not they are independent, they interpret the law and they can prepare the judgments. If somebody complains to the Justice Department, the Bar Association says, go get legal advice. They asked for \$500 for one hour. This is not right. Some honorable judges are shortcoming in their duties and their judiciary duties.

>> Thank you.

>> You're welcome.

>> Next up please. Good morning. Welcome.

>> Thank you for having me. I'm here today to speak in reference to Family Court. Along with millions of other parents in the state, across the country I personally had the unfortunate privilege of becoming intimately aware of the comings and goings of the family court judiciary. I can attest there is not a single article of the Constitution that is not routinely violated in Family Court. It is a court where both I and millions of other parents like me are routinely subjected to egregious violations of our civil rights. I had my 11-month-old baby boy kidnapped and abducted from me by unjustifiable state intervention, despite the fact I never committed or been

convicted of any crime or abuse. I was afforded no presumption of innocence, no trial, no chance to face my accusers. The Family Court Commission was my judge, jury, and executioner. I was categorically denied due process. While Family Court throughout the state missed dose -- what is driving all of this? The government has financially incentivized the kidnapping and trafficking of children for profit, otherwise known as child support. Shocked and stupefied are not strong enough terms to describe my state of mind when I found out the entire judiciary in California including this council are under contract with the executive branch agencies to help assist with enforcing title for Dan exchange for federal incentive funds, article 3, section 3 of the California State Constitution states the powers of state government our legislative, executive, and judicial, person starts with the exercise of one power may not exercise either of the others. According to the California Code of Judicial Ethics the judge need to uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary. In what way, shape, or form for any of you sit there with a straight face maintained that the judiciary's independent when you fall into bed with the executive branch for money. This is nothing short of state-sponsored abduction and trafficking of our children for profit. Worst of all this corruption is committed under the guise that it's all done in the best interest of our children. 90% of all homeless and runaway children are from fatherless homes, 32 times the average. 85% of all children who show behavior disorders come from fatherless homes, 20 times the average. 80% of rapist with anger problems come from fatherless homes. 71% of high school dropouts come from fatherless homes. When family courts tell us you're taking the children away from fathers and driving those fathers into poverty, the racketeering and extortion activities a title for this all done in our child's best interest, excuse me when I say I don't know what that means. I want to leave you with a quote, the state must declare the child to the most precious treasure of the people, as long as the government is perceived as working for the benefit of the children the people happily in the were almost any curtailment of liberty unless any deprivation. Thank you.

>> Next we will hear from Catherine Campbell.

>> Good morning. Thank you for having me. I want to bring attention today to the Family Court situation, and Family Court takes away children from protective parents when there is no evidence against them, we have seen from California Protective Parents Association it is mostly the mothers were losing custody, and there are fathers who lose custody in different situations when abuse has been alleged. When abuse is being alleged, it is dismissed. The Leadership Council says that 58,000 children per year are taken away from the protective parent and placed within custody of the abuse appeared. This is staggering, that means today, it is 500,000 children are placed with abusive parents. That needs to stop. Abuse is being dismissed. We're seeing this on every level how abuse is being dismissed. If anyone watched the ESPN Espy award to Saul the courage award this year went to the athletes who from 1997 until 2016 list every year disclosed the sexual abuse by Larry Nassar. None of those girls were ordered to spend the night with Larry Nassar. Yet in California, these children are ordered into custody and they are being chilled, by parents. And as I said, 500,000 children right now in America are living with or in custody with an abusive parent. Abuse has been dismissed, it's a culture we need to end, and I'm going to ask this council to do something about it to create a policy of how we can change what we do when we look at abuse. We need to be more trauma informed, we need to listen to abuse.

Scores are going up, I've been coming here for quite a few years telling you about this, it's continuing. We really need to do something about this. We need to make a change. We need to believe abuse happens. The study done years ago shows one in five children are sexually abused. One in five. This needs to end and I want this council to do something and also support the upcoming settlement with the Commission on Judicial Performance and the auditor so we can have accountability. Thank you.

>> Fox loan?

>> Good morning. I came up with Santa Cruz County, I didn't really become a child advocate until 2012, when I was unwillingly sucked into the black hole vortex of injustice of CPS, and the dependency hearing process. The process led to the death of my daughter, she was allowed to commit suicide, after being informed she was going to be TPR, terminated of her parental rights, two or three children, I never realized how black and dark and evil the system was. I heard rumors. I talk to other people in other states, about when I got into this myself, it became a visceral issue that I needed to confront. In my five years journey through this, I have met others, other parents, families appear to have committed suicide, children that have committed suicide. It all goes back to either CPS dependency, or family divorce, hearing process. Because of the border issue, it's been like a match in our gasoline, all of a sudden everybody is all up in arms about 25 or less and 2500 children being taken forcibly from the families. When this is been going on with United States citizens, American families, for over 40 years. But I can ratchet that back to a tradition of forcibly separating families by the government to the black Americans during slave days, to my indigenous ancestors who had the government come in and even had little custom-made handcuffs to take children forcibly out of their villages away from their families. George it and, in the 1940s, has been identified as a serial killer, over 500 children in her care disappeared. We are not accounting for this, we're talking death. Death is final, my daughter is not coming back. My granddaughter who thanks to Santa Cruz County dependency CPS, lied to us and lied about us, they altered the truth to their ways, they destroyed evidence, they ignored evidence, I was amazed and has a lot of us are on the lower echelon of economic scale it is difficult to hire attorneys and go through the process. We are on notice here. We're moving forward.

>> Thank you. Next is Connie Valentine.

>> Good morning and welcome.

>> Thank you. I am a fixture here. The Family Court seems to be a theme, thank you Madam Chair and council members, my name is Connie Valentine. The Family Court actually the problems are only about 10 or 50% of the custody cases. Most parents settle reasonably. Those 10 or 15% live on of our courts, and causing all these disasters that your hearing about. Most of them are domestic violence and child abuse cases, and they're not always handled well. Children are being placed at risk as you have heard, and we have been coming here for about 15 years. I have met with staff to see if we can arrange some way to make it better. We have tracked the child deaths, about 60 child deaths in California over the last decade, of which zero occurred in 2016. And six occurred in 2017. When the courts new these were dangerous parents, the recent

meeting with staff has been asked for implementation of a form for Family Code sections 3111 and 3118, which would be for mediators and for evaluators to investigate properly and have a form so they can follow all these complicated rules. This simple form would help prevent these dangerous custody placements by gathering in one place for law enforcement CPS, domestic violence, substance abuse, all the other different issues that are needed. We haven't told the judges do not want such a form. I cannot imagine why. Why judges would not want such a form. It doesn't make any sense to me whatsoever. So what we would ask, the ask for today is that you would help support and facilitate the next meeting with the Center for Families and Children and the courts, and that you would support such a form. That would vastly improve the situation. We believe it will improve access to justice, with domestic violence and child abuse victims. Thank you very much.

>> Scott Largent, good morning.

>> Good morning. I am a Santa Clara County resident and I am a clean and sober father, this is my daughter, she's the reason I got clean. I was a business owner in Silicon Valley for about 20 years, I fell on hard times and I ended up living in a motorhome and I became meth addict and I stepped up to the plate and I was a father, I'm going on was three years of sobriety, I have been fighting as hard as I can to be a dad and all I had to the court system was a slap on the wrist, it was a drug diversion chart. I had no bond. Long story short, I was guilty. Slap on the wrist. That's what these programs are designed for. I could not go to the traditional routes of going through the reentry sent her or probation center, I would just left out in the corner. You have to go break the law to be able to be in your kid's life and fathers are felons they get to see their kids, they get programs that help them. I did not get access to any of that. I beg for drug treatment, mental health services, it was a no go someone continue to fight in front of the courts and exercise my First Amendment right, I'm not sure -- some these rules are starting to come out in our courthouses, the presiding judge put together a list of rules that are absolutely unconstitutional. I have every right to be out in front of the courthouse criticizing my government and standing up for my community and I am fighting to be my daughter's life. I'm fighting for visitation orders, mediators to contact my ex I went in there begging and pleading, when I think about methamphetamines I think about my daughter, and it goes away in my mind but why would I be arrested out in front of the court just for speaking up. I was using a kid's toy megaphone, not enable five device, I was not blocking the sidewalk, and Judge Patricia Lucas thought it was appropriate to throw me in jail, so there's a news article about this. And Lori Smith our sheriff stepped up to the plate and had the resisting arrest charges dropped, as from the out of the jail and one is supposed to have court last week I am on the no complete calendar, have not talked over 2000 city council meetings, I go to all the stuff to try to fix the problem. Why am I left behind? And why are you filling my daughter? We need to get families back together and quit dividing them. This is shameful activity.

>> This completes public comment.

>> Thank you. The next order of business is reviewing the minutes there from the May 24 meeting, I knew you had an opportunity to review them if you need to look at them again please do so. I will entertain any motion to move adoption.

>> Thank you. All in favor? Oppose? The minutes are approved. Next on the agenda is my regular report to you summarizing my engagements and ongoing outreach activities on behalf of the branch since the last meeting. For this reporting period I want to highlight the engagements, the first celebrated of the jurist known to many of us who said punches above her weight class, the second addresses how courts can play a positive role in correcting chosen paths or providing new paths for juveniles who happen to come into our system, and the last engagement provided early training for my future or my successor.

>> The first, in Sacramento I was pleased to provide welcoming opening remarks for the screening hosted by the Women in California Leadership Caucus of "RBG," a documentary about United States Supreme Court Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and her early years and her years as a student lawyer jurist to today. It was an inspiring program. Assembly woman, and the women's caucus invited leaders and staff from the three branches of government to look at the movie about a diminutive figure who fought with passion and spirit for equal rights throughout her marvelous public service crib.

>> I attended the Juvenile Law Institute where juvenile officers and trial court attorneys benefit from the three day program put on by [Indiscernible] covering issues as trauma and drug abuse and sharing best practices on evaluations and collaborative justice. I was quizzed about the initiatives including Keeping Kids In School and Out of Court, and the Power of Democracy and the work on education and engagement to improve outcomes for at risk youth and the need for ongoing advocacy and funding for dependency counsel.

>> Back in Sacramento I had the pleasure of swearing in the Governor and the Chief Justice at the 71st Governor's Ball organized by California YMCA government. A high achieving passionate 17-year-olds -- the program seeks to promote leadership skills, character, value, social responsibility, and civic engagement in California's program, it is definitely doing the job.

>> The Chief Justice I believe is going to Harvard this a number of high achievers in these immigrant families and first-generation students were part of this program.

>> Sacramento Mayor, assembly members, they also attended and participated in the Q&A with our future leaders who wanted to know more about money bail, the importance of diversity and ask how California can contribute to a positive development in the state. That concludes my report to council.

>> Thank you. I have a report that has updates on the activities of the direction that you provide. In the guidance you give.

>> A couple of things I would always like to highlight, out of the report, I will let you know the advisory committee and group have met between the last meeting and today, about 19 advisory groups, they convened in this included the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee as well as its subcommittees, and they will be presenting recommendations for your consideration today. That will be on the budget allocation that the Chief mentioned earlier.

>> In addition, I want to know some of the educational programs, branchwide education more than 40 programs and opportunities were offered both in person and online, this included the Judge's Institute for judges, the handling of multiple types of calendars and what a focus on issues affecting small courts, our own councilmember and presiding judge has been serving on the planning group.

>> It's a big group of which 36 counties are represented. I want to highlight the launch in June of the mobile-friendly update for our California Courts website, there are more than 1 million visits to this site each month, so it is important we start to meet the public's expectations for being able to navigate the site and find the information they need.

>> I will read you some statistics in terms of the trends that we are seeing, the usage of the website, since 2012. The bottom line, overall desktop access to this website has been dropping dramatically while mobile uses increasing year-over-year. In 2012, 86% of these visits accessed the site via desktop and was 10% on mobile and 3% on tablet.

>> Only six years later, the numbers are different, with 53% accessing our website on desktop, 42% on mobile, and still a lone number on tablet, 4%.

>> In addition to that the update that we did included in redesign of the homepage, the three principal sections, based on usage.

>> The first is self-help users, the second access to local court websites, and the third being judicial branch policy administration which is the business of the council.

>> I highlight this and asked the question, why is this significant? Why is this a big deal?

>> It is a big deal because it matches our organizing philosophies and principles, about everything that we do. Which is, namely, we put the public and court users at the center of the things we do, and we put the local court and its operations on the ground level, at the next level and then the business of the council and the state level being third.

>> It is not surprising, this particular change, it shows, again, we organize in a fashion that addresses the changing needs of our users and how they actually access the system.

>> The next thing, an awareness item for you, leverage purchased agreements, especially in the area of technology, we have been using this for quite some time, we recently now use this to apply this to a new e-signature product that will be available to all courts.

>> Let me define leverage purchased agreements, it is about bulk purchasing, and availability think about big buy warehouses, Costco, Walmart, and taking a strategy to get better deals when you lose in large numbers.

>> We have done this, the e-signature technology was being used by a couple of courts originally, Los Angeles was in front as well as the Fifth Appellate District, as part of our Information Technology office, they optimize resources and we were working with the courts to establish their interest and needs with results now that we have a negotiated agreement to make

the product available to all courts and by leveraging the branches of buying power and ball, this is not the only one.

>> The council manages a total of about 53 of these leverage purchased agreements, ranging from technology to maintenance services, security. Lastly, you'll know in your materials we chronicle the state of judicial appointments in the form the vacancies are out there, no surprise the pace appears to be picking up. We have had a considerable amount of appointments in January, 25 appointments in February, another 36 instead meeting in May so that will make for a busy orientation for us, and currently we are sitting in California with about 55 vacancies and I think, we expect more in the coming months.

>> My last comment has to do with the budget that closed, I want to thank the Chief for the kind words but I want to commend -- I use the word "team" and it takes a team to be successful, we had a good year, and a lot of people, too many to be named, they are all my own staff, but also everybody in the judicial family has to have on or in the water to be helpful and this is a good year for which all deserve credit.

>> I am passing the credit route because it's not completely altruistic, I have a little bit of a concern about expectations being unrealistically high and so those are not met in the coming years old make sure we share in the other version of the book it happen in the future years, which it takes a team to win and it takes a team to lose. Thank you.

>> You have been warm and generous with your comments. With respect to the business and the next steps, but we have in front of us, as this fiscal year closes, in terms our responsibility, session now begins for us to implement and deliver and we will have a particularly busy year what you start to make your allocation decisions I know trial courts and the courts of appeal, they are planning and preparing and spending and getting ready, and they are doing that responsibly. To that end, what happens next will have later, this morning, presentations to make recommendations about those allegations, you will also have -- a presentation about budget change proposals as we get ready to formulate the fiscal year 19-20.

>> And then we will continue to work on budget language that is associated with the budget that we just completed, a couple of open issues, that folks are having some concerns about and we want clarification on, there is one trailer bill notably AB 1810 that establishes a pilot program and we have concerns about the implementation associated with that so we are working with the administration and the legislature on that new program.

>> There is also a set aside amount of money for bail reform in the event the legislature were to start and will not, it is a bulk amount that is set aside so it is positive.

>> The legislature will return shortly to end its session. The second year of a two-year session, we will watch for the notable bills that might have impact to our work, and it is a general election season and we are paying attention to the voter initiatives that are in play.

>> I look forward to a busy year with everybody, with that, I will close my report.

>> Thank you, Martin.

>> Thank you the outstanding report I would highlight one point that you made, that is, where in the business of trying to make our court system user-friendly, that is an important part of what we do. And we certainly should keep that in mind.

>> The genesis of this idea came many years ago, we had a presentation from the country of Australia. They organized the court system in such a way that they had one telephone number for the country. For anyone to call, for any problem they had, one telephone number and the Chief said we are going to give them your telephone number.

>> I want to say, our tech advances, for the use of laptops, it is a testimonial to the vision, as long as I can remember, you have championed mobile access. And in the early days when you were a champion, you said crazy things like, one day on our watch we should be able to bank, it's coming true and so I am happy you are here to see your vision materialize.

>> Thank you.

>> Next we will hear reports from our internal committee chairs and vice chairs on ongoing activity.

>> Thank you. The executive and planning report will be posted online detailing our activities over the last couple of months after this meeting. What I want to do, is to use this opportunity to announce this year's honorees of the Distinguished Service Award.

>> Is of the highest honors given by the council, the award recognizes individuals or organizations for their extraordinary dedication, outstanding leadership, and significant contributions to advancing the council's strategic goals for the judicial branch.

>> Hard to believe, this is the 25th anniversary of the award program. Over the years, awards have recognized justices, judges, court commissioners, executives, administrators, legislators attorneys, and governors. This year we received two dozen nominations which included candidates from 12 counties across our state.

>> Nominations were vetted by the council's five internal chairs and recommendations were forwarded to the Chief Justice.

>> I am happy now to announce this year's award recipients. The first, Los Angeles Judge Donna Grollman, she has been a trailblazer in decriminalizing school disciplines to keep students in schools and out of the juvenile system.

>> As supervising judge of the delinquency division of the Los Angeles juvenile court, she had oversight responsibility over the largest judicial, juvenile court in the United States which handles about 65,000 cases per year.

>> She spearheaded an effort to and practices such as school police issuing costly tickets for truancy. She created a special Los Angeles court dedicated to children and snared by sex trafficking and I presides over the county's mental health court. She also serves as vice chair of the Chief Justice's Keeping Kids In School and Out of Court initiative. Congratulations to Judge Donna Grollman.

>> Next Richard Feldstein, Richard has led the court through two disasters, we can all remember those got the 2014 earthquake and last year's wildfires. Both times he kept court services open and running for the people and the public of Napa County. In addition, under his leadership, the court has improved efficiency and access to justice, including the launch of a fully automated criminal courtroom that provides instant access to information for court staff and justices. Richard has served the judicial branch for nearly 30 years, including court leadership roles in Riverside County. Congratulations to Richard.

>> Next is Steve Binder, retired San Diego Deputy Director, yes founded the Family Court, the program takes place with a local social service agencies, and allows our homeless residents resolve misdemeanor criminal cases without the fear of fines or incarceration.

>>'s the recently retired and continues his work with San Diego's annual stand-down initiative, that brings coordinated services to those in need and helps cities across the county and country start new homeless court programs. Congratulations.

>> We will learn more about these recipients during the awards program at the next judicial meeting on September 19. And again, congratulations to all three of our recipients, and thank you to each of them for your service to the people of California. This concludes my report. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Next we will hear from Judge Kenneth So.

>> Thank you. The policy committee has met four times since the last report we have taken positions on six pieces of legislation, at May 31 meeting we took a position on AB 2664, and a position AB 2531, both deal with court reporters got the committee adopted and oppose list on Senate Bill 1129 which relates to spousal support awards dealing with convictions for acts of domestic violence.

>> At the June meeting the committee took support positions on both Senate Bill 1187 dealing with [Indiscernible] relating to court fees, seven of the council's continues to move through the legislative process as Martin has indicated, the legislation will return from the summer recess that will be on August 6, the last day for each task is August 31, and the governor will have until September 30 to sign or veto these bills. I anticipate the policy committee will meet several times between now and then to address as we know, the last minute I managed to these bills and I am grateful and thankful for the preparation that the committee takes, have great dedication.

>> Thank you next we would hear from Justice Harry Hull.

>> Thank you. The Rules and Projects Committee has met once since the May 24 meeting, on July 2 we met by telephone to consider two proposals from the Proposition 66 Working Group to circulate permission to circulate those proposals for comment on special cycles, and one other proposal that circulate for comment, as I am sure you are aware, after Proposition 66 the death penalty initiative was largely affirmed by the Supreme Court last fall, that initiative gave the Judicial Council responsibility for putting rules in place to carry the law forward, and at that time, the Chief -- the working group chaired ably by Justice, I have been trying to follow their

work and there came a time when he decided, there were certain issues that could be dealt with early on.

>> [Captioners transitioning]

>> Thank you Justice Hull. Next we will hear from Presiding Judge Gary Nadler.

>> Good morning and thank you and honor to present on behalf of the chair for the Judicial Council. Justice Slough was unable to attend in person. We've been holding meetings in teleconference. The Information Technology Advisory Committee as well as the Strategic Plan Work Stream has each met twice. At our June 11 meeting they received a proposal for funding approved by the Judicial Council for the case management system. The funding was so that these courts, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and San Diego Ventura County, can finish off the V3 legacy system. The proposal was approved by the trial court advisory committee in May and the request is not judicial funding but rather to use the pre-appending amounts from the fiscal year. Voting in favor of the proposal we will review in this meeting. I also received a report on the Judicial Branch Budget Committee prior to rosacea and of the contents across all programs for fiscal year 19-20 funding. Which we will also consider at this meeting. At the July 9 meeting the report about 4 separate proposals related to technology from ITAC. The weather was related to providing remote access to court records. The proposals were circulated for public comment and ITAC approved of them. Recommended for the council. The fourth rule was received as the information item that we discussed for proposal amendments that establish procedures for handling seals and confidential material submitted chronically in the court field. This proposal was circulated for public comment but the JCTC will weight. And status updates on the systems management project will receive and the committee continues to track these 2 products for proposed funding. ITAC met on June 22 and ability-to-pay tool program for the sex offender registry as well as conducting a brainstorm session on a branch IT. We can continue to be proud of the work is courts are engaged in participating and developing solutions to address statewide technology issues consistent with the 3D Access initiative. To this the request was sent to the court for volunteers to participate in expansion of the management strategy work stream. The data analytics and teams to address the Futures Commission related to intelligent chat and remote video characters. On top of that the technical update work stream has launched this period. The strategic plan update work stream for which Justice Marsha Slough continues to make progress for developing updated strategic plan. The following members are also a part of this effort. This team met June 21 by teleconference and the team has accomplished over 90% of the work that on track to deliver a draft by the end of the month. The work stream examine proposed strategic goals to reflect the knowledge and progress achieved over the last 4 years. The goals represent a vision looking forward to incorporating the Futures Commission's and court technology directives. I will close by thanking you, Chief, in your leadership and vision of access and inclusion to recognize the committee for its extraordinary efforts. As the committee has been very busy approaching these in technology matters. And thank you to the IT community, court staff and Judicial Council staff for their commitment of supporting all of these initiatives that we are involved in. I am continually impressed by everybody's commitment to ensure that we were

able to use technology as a tool to increase access to justice. Thank you for your time that concludes my report.

>> Next we will hear from Judge David Rubin, chair of Judicial Branch Budget Committee.

>> Thank you for this opportunity to report on the activities of the Judicial Branch Budget Committee since our May meeting. The charge is to administer the \$10 million branch emergency fund to coordinate a budget change proposal request before going to the Department of Finance. To administer the \$25 million innovations grant program and any other budget tasks. The budget committee takes a branchwide approach to support the fair allocation of limited resources to affect our branches overall statewide interests. It met twice in May and one meeting was conducted via teleconference the other in person. Our work has primarily focused on budget change proposals and the integration grant program. Our meeting has frequently had an educational component to them we bring in people to talk about different matters of people who affect the budget. At our in-person meeting on Wednesday we received an extremely interesting presentation regarding the court appointed special advocates program the presenters were Sharon Lawrence and Judge Isaacson. It's overtired dependency judge out of San Diego County. If you don't know CASA volunteers give a significant court system and these volunteers give significant information to the courts about the children and their care. There's a difference that it can make in the lives of California 61,000 children and child care. June 22 conference call budget committee review for projects asking for additional grant funding. We started a program for this eventuality. It was good foresight. Additional grant funding was awarded to Merced County for videoconference projects and earlier this week the committee interviewed Superior Court for access to information to have a simple project. For the humble interactive video project. Both of these requests were approved and as always committee members seeking changes to grants do not participate in these discussions around these votes. The update from staff for grant activities to discuss a contingency fund balance to maximize its use as we promised in the program that kicked off last year we went come back in September to discuss what some options were there were many contingencies based upon money so we used up the \$25 million completely. It did refer to us for cost and fees the master agreement for court telephone grievances coming back to this body with the recommendations later this year. And as always the community thanks our amazing staff for the dedication and commitment we could not do without them that concludes my report. Met one more report from Judge Brazile from San Luis Obispo County.

>> Good morning. Chief and members of the council, this report is based upon my June 8 visit to the San Luis Obispo Superior Court. The county is located in central California. Halfway between San Francisco and Los Angeles. As the population of 3300 square miles. As you can see from the map it is located adjacent to San Bernardino County to the south and Kern County to the east. Here's a map showing the county itself. It's the third largest wine producer in California behind Sonoma and Napa County. For you wine lovers it's a very nice place to go. Real nice drive from Los Angeles up the Pacific Coast. This photograph is of the historic county courthouse opened in 1940. It's next to the current courthouse even though on the sign it indicates that the courthouse is not being used as the courthouse presently is being used as office

space. Here's the actual existing SLO courthouse that was opened in 1980. This is Presiding Judge Ginger Garrett. I spent the morning with her when I made my visit and she gave me a tour of the SLO courthouse I also had lunch with her and several other judges he spent a lot of time with the operations and some of the concerns that they had. I will talk about that during this report. This is Michael, CEO of San Luis Obispo County gave me a tour of the administrative side of the courthouse we went over the operation of the court. For these operations we have got 13 judges, 2 commissioners, 129 administrative staff and zero vacancies. One of their commissioners just won an open seat so he will be taking over in January. The bench is very excited about his election. The operating budget is \$17 million and the yearly filings across all case types last year was 58,000. This is the entrance to the San Luis Obispo courthouse and its very nice. As you walk into the front coming forward. You come into this area which, as you can see the photo on the left, it's like an atrium that they have there a very nice open space and everybody really enjoys the building. The SLO courthouse has 12 courtrooms as well as family law, criminal, and the courthouse consists of about 3 floors. They operate an adult drug court, a veterans court and the behavioral treatment court in the SLO courthouse. This is a wall of retired judges from SLO opposite the self-help center. There is one judge who's recently retired I understand the vision will be going up soon. This is the courtroom of the Presiding Judge Ginger Garrett. They like it, it makes them feel more engaged in the trials based upon the shape of the courtroom, it's very popular. This is the self-help center. It is opened 4 days a week for walk-ins and they serve 7200 litigants last year is also opened on Fridays but only by appointment. It's a very active self-help center open 5 days a week. This is the jury assembly room that once the former hearing room for the County Board of Supervisors. When they built the new courthouse they converted that into a jury assembly room that really state-of-the-art. I met the staff here they were incredibly kind and gracious. It's really just a great facility. This is the Paso Robles courthouse There are 2 courtrooms located in this facility. One does family and the other does civil law. It opened in 2008. It's about 32 miles away from the SLO courthouse in the northern part of the county. No criminal is done in this building because they don't have a lockup or holding cells. It's one thing that they talked to me about with most of the judges they like to give this holding facility a lockup so they can have a full service courtroom in the northern part of the county. This is a diagram in the back that is hard to see it shows you where they would place holding cells or lockup facilities behind the courthouse. It's a proposal and there's been no funding for it. Making sure you enter that into the council.

>> The courthouse opened in 2008. It's beautiful and I just love these sconces. They really want to use it more by getting that lockup so hopefully something can be done about that. This is traffic and small claims they do it 4 days per week. This is a house. I was a little fascinated it is located directly across the street from the courthouse. It's a converted house and as you walk in there is a living room, dining room, and the use it for court staff. They also use it for their assigned judge and it's the San Luis Obispo courthouse.

>> Technology. They are one of the first courts to adapt for 2014. The SLO court is paperless in traffic and civil law they have mandatory e-filing they are working on having paperless and criminal as well as criminal. One thing they are very proud of is what is called the Judicial Council Tech Refresh Program which is done every 4 years. There currently undergoing that

program. It's updating their network infrastructure in terms of switches, routers, and other hardware. Are very excited about it. They do have some IT positions they want to fill. I wish to thank Ginger Garrett and CEO Michael Powell for the time and warm welcome. They were both incredibly kind and well-informed and extremely helpful. The entire bench operates as a family. And they genuinely care for and help each other. The collegiality was wonderful to witness. This was evident when I went to lunch with a few judges during my visit. They were warm and friendly the budget court and dedication of fairness to equal access by the entire bench was truly amazing to see. The atmosphere in the courthouse among staff and judicial officers was one that everybody enjoys. Got to meet the jury assembly room staff, the IT staff, those in the window for the court office, it was delightful. Regretting that I did not spend the weekend in SLO because the entire community was so warm, friendly, and caring. It's a great place to live and work. One of the amazing things was there was no traffic. Being from Los Angeles I used to traffic everywhere I go, so before I came up. Judge Garrett told me that you're going to be amazed there is no traffic. I thought you know we will see, but she was right. There is no traffic it's a wonderful place to work and the people are great. It doesn't get any better than this. That's my report.

>> Before we take a recess let's handle the consent calendar, take a recess, come back and handle our action item. It consists of approximately 6 items all waiting for the advisory committee they have been vetted and proposed to us. After the review I will entertain any motion to remove consent agenda. All in favor for moving please say aye, or any abstentions please say no. We will stand in recess until 10:10 AM.

[Meeting on break until 10:10 AM PST. Captioner standing by]

>> Let's take a moment to allow one of our court success stories let's talk a little bit about something we don't always see because we don't see the end results. And right Gabriella and Nicole to the podium. Please come forward and share your story.

>> Thank you for letting us take a moment to speak I'm Nicole I work upstairs on the 6th floor. I was exclusively juvenile law and Gabriella was one of my clients. She recently told me she had some exciting news.

>> I am now 24 years old and have just graduated from community college in Oakland finishing my bachelor in legal studies. With support of Nicole throughout foster care I will hopefully be a star supporter of my children as well.

>> We are pleased to hear your rich directory it's very informative to all of us. Let's begin with our 3 items. For modernization funds and trial court funds. Spent the first is the item related to the allocations for Improvement and Modernization Fund. You have a report detailing this entire allocation the trial court advisory committee unanimously recommends the approval of extending the use of the V3 funding sessions through June 30, 2020, approved a total of \$57.1 million in preliminary allocations in Trial Court Trust Fund and General Fund allocations in the amount of \$68.8 million.

>> I will entertain a motion to move these recommendations as you all know notwithstanding of movement is still up for discussion. All in favor of making this recommendations. And any abstentions or oppositions. These recommendations are approved. Thanks for your hard work on these I know they are fully vetted and discussed prior and the fact that we have had the opportunity to review your work without question is testament to the good work that you do.

>> Thank you. Thorough discussion is an understatement I appreciate that. This second item relates to the trial court allocation. This allocation is a majority for the funding of the trial courts. This council has a statutory obligation to make the plug in a very for July. I want to clarify that this allocation does not include the seven types million dollars in discretionary funding provided in the Budget Act that we are so appreciative of today. After the council has opportunity to review this item I will seek the council's guidance regarding TCBAC proposed approach. I would point out that in the report, the snapshots that will be utilized to discuss those, they are particularly effective on a personal note take a look at the bottom of the snapshot there are explanations of acronyms that we use day in and out. Thank you that's very handy. And as you've indicated the recommendations are fourfold on pages 1 and 2 of 18-116. An action item. I know you have reviewed those or participated in those coming to council in some way or fashion. If there are no further questions or any questions or observations by entertain a motion to approve these recommendations and take up the matter to the advisory committee.

>> Echoing what was said. If you talk about all the information contained in this report as well as the displays, it was outstanding work that was easy to look at. It was simple yet focusing on differences. I appreciate it and wanted to let Budget Services know that this was a great report.

>> All in favor, 4 recommendations carry item.

>> Thank you judge for your continuing work seeking advice on that \$75 million. It had not determined it was clear considering language considering the 75 that is what was previously, methodology to see if they could receive any further instruction from the administration or the legislator about the allocation of the \$75 million in the 2018-19 budget. This appropriation mirrors the Governor's proposal by delineating the \$75 point million separately. The funding methodology subcommittee met on July 12 to discuss the application methodology and this discussion was a robust effective discussion and the advisory committee will consider those recommendations at its meeting July 31. At that meeting, the recommendation was provided to allocate the funds rather than according to a pure approach for a number of reasons. The language and the intent was that a different model be used as to that. While it is an impressive amount it's less than 3% of the overall budget. When developing the policy last fall we did not anticipate the 2 best news is we could get the \$48.7 million for the discretionary funding that we received. We have not had the opportunity to thoroughly address and how to handle issues including those allocated to courts that may exceed their stated 100% need. We wanted to make sure that all courts receive a reasonable allocation from this large investment and provide all courts the ability to report service level improvements. At the FMS meeting we did not concur with the recommendation and provided in reinforce that they were strongly allocated and they recommended that the time to take that on July 31 for the adjustment, the first 50% has been allocated and should be suspended. They discussed proposing budget adjustments or reductions

for courts over the 100% need however a large court is receiving just 3000 from the amount. The council may recall that there was legislative language utilizing for increasing court reporters. FMS recommended the entire \$75 million be allocated, echoing those comments I appreciate feedback regarding that approach. The TCBAC will make the final recommendation to this council on July 31.

>> I wanted to note, I've had the honor of being a member of this council for 7-1/2 years I have gone through the years of difficult funding, I don't have any suggestions as to how this money should be allocated. It's apparent to me that whatever we decide with regard to this portion of the budget, the expectation is that not be submitted according to our WAFM. Whatever the point we decide we cannot afford to leave the impression with legislative or executive branches that we have not acted in good faith with regards to the legislative expectations. This complicates our future funding efforts equally if not more importantly could undo much of the progress we have made in recent years and this adds to our creditability when it comes to money matters which so many people have worked so hard to achieve. So I just wanted to get those thoughts before the council at this time.

>> My comments are a bit reflective of what Justice Hull has indicated that if we look back on history and particularly this year. How well we do when we work together with the governor and the legislator. Mindful that they were both pretty clear in their intent that we not utilize WAFM but emphasizing the point that history suggests how well we do when we are mindful of their intent and not in any way crossing that or being dismissive of that is so clearly stated by both the governor and the legislator? My question is, if we have 8 or 9 formulas depending on the money and the allocations we are talking about that work and are utilized based on whatever the need is for the branch. If we have another one that's one off, what's one more as long as it's fair and equitable to everyone. But it's going to be consistent with the intent of the governor and the legislator.

>> I think you're right. If it is just this particular issue and year. It accomplishes the goals of mindful interest of the legislator acting in good faith. I think we all come out ahead we regained the credibility that has been achieved with the governor's office, the Department of Finance and the legislator. It's something you know we are all used to making numbers work it's not such a task that we can't use one more methodology. It's important that I have not heard comment or reference that this should in any way be interpreted as a recognition for the money currently used. It's such a unique circumstance with this money that the other methodologies are needed.

>> I think if I were here where this came back to council, the things I would look to help fight the council about is as you bring these things back. How do we stay true to the intent of the language provided in the Budget Act. Talking about council indicating its priorities and the allocation of the money. While maintaining flexibility to the courts to have this general allocation it's something that might indicate the intent and broad categories about how courts might improve access to justice or operations. It's also important for us to consider what people perceive certain words to mean. In this case and acronym. And people think we are taking money to give to others and in that contact being mindful even if there is a desire not to use what we call WAFM, it doesn't mean it's not proportional on level of needs and workloads. But making sure

we are not taking money from one to give to another. That this proportional benefit leaves all courts that leads new functions. For court reporters that's not something that's considered calculations, for what's needed, because that has not been a mandate. I think we can all agree it's a mandate from the future. Incorporating those things into the future could be helpful.

>> I agree strongly that they can act in a way that will be executive in the legislator. Keep an eye on maintaining credibility with the judges and in that regard. The approach concerning the \$10 million and court reporters, I think it's easy to see that at least that amount of money can be directed for compliance in the post-*Jameson* world that it would be preferable not to devise an allocation that would disadvantage courts who have made advantage for presence of court reporters in a Family Court.

>> Just briefly, I feel remiss this is a fantastic problem to have. To say we've got this chunk of money having a discussion about priorities for what keeps lights on and doors open to be able to move forward into building technologies and really expanding access as opposed to just maintaining it is a fantastic opportunity. We are lucky to have this discussion.

>> Just to elaborate on Kyle's comments. As we are having this discussion among friends let's not tear ourselves apart again. We can have a reasonable discussion. Let's do it.

>> A few observations. I think it's helpful to solicit input. It would be helpful to me if you gave us approaches with competing methodologies if you will, so that we can have a variety of approaches to evaluate.

>> These comments are all helpful. Thank you very much to everybody contributing.

>> Thank you very much we look forward to discussing this again in the near future. That concludes these presentations. Thank you very much. We know that while we are talking about the budget cycle that we just achieved, we are already into the next budget cycle. Our last discussion agenda item is the judicial change proposal for all courts including the facilities program, judicial program, trial court resource center we invite Judge Rubin to present [Captioners] Let's now go to the 19-20. A couple of observations and how it fits into an overall bigger picture. In my time on the council, this is probably the first time -- a great set of thanks to Mr. Hoshino, and his budget staff to help educate us. This is the first time we have worked well with other branches, but also thinking about if this budget is a budget that is taking a longer view, working on a budget to allocate money for 18-19. In thinking about they out years as well. Keeping budget coordinator, as it forms a discussion that we would have today the message we want to give today given the budget that we just got. An extraordinary budget we have a share. Welcome to the 19-20 judicial branch -- 19-20. For those that are new, a little bit of background. It is a job of the council to develop the budget of the judicial branch, based on the priorities established by each of the courts, and it is driven by the needs of the public, and that use our court, as well as the people that work there. Again a little bit of background, we use the BCP, budget change proposal, it is named document, and a form of literature when you look at it. The essence of the way it works, a BCP targets a particular line item within your budget, project, or operation issue, whatever it is. It seeks an increase over the previous year. We give it to the Department of Finance, they analyze it, and as you know from discussions we have had in the

past, it is the government's obligation to have a balanced budget by the 10th of each year. These budget change proposals become a part of it and are worked into the budget. Hopefully. We are very fortunate to have with us Mr. Feeder [Indiscernible] and have an insight to help craft these things and move along. That is how it works. It is the workhorse if you will, and one of the big tools that will budget entities, and any entity in the state that receives money from the governor is a budget entity. Welcome to the 21st century, the judicial branch entity. And then will get its budget increased. We want to show you our timeline for those new to the process. If January 10 is when the governor has to present his balanced budget to both houses, BCP are due September 1 we have reversed engineered our timeline to mediate. Innovation brought to us by Mr. Hoshino and his team. For those that come from a -- another budget entity that might do this process in one course of an afternoon, as they do, it is our desire in terms of the Chief's charge to us, to be opened and transparent and involve as many people as possible, and to include as many people in the branch as possible. Between October and March we gather initial funding request. Basic concepts, and starting in March and April, and through the spring, the judicial branch budget committee looks at the funding request, and it calls them down to a manageable number, we send them to be further developed into what we call BCPs. And we get together in May, and we have -- Judge Conklin referred to it as a robust meeting. And we start to form up these BCP within the branch, and we try to come up with what we think reflects the values of the branch. And a narrative of the branch moving forward, we present them to you at the July meeting, that is where we are today. It is the council's responsibility, not the budget committee, to make the final determination of those priorities in terms of the BCP. And those will be worked up through the balance of the summer, and ready to go for the September 1 for those of you that are looking at it, we talked about the out years, we are talking about 19-20 -- and then 20-21. And to start soliciting ideas for budget change proposals for 20-21. It is an ongoing process. While you see these demarcation points along our timeline, the fact of the matter, cheap mooring Budget Services are in constant contact with the Department of Finance, 24/7 process. And these are milestones within that. They are working overtime. Once the proposal is presented, we expect that the Department of Finance will have some give-and-take, but it is having us an idea of where we are going. That is the timeline. It will reflect our branch values, we are trying to talk about greater access to justice for everyone. And to alleviate budget challenges, especially affecting the more vulnerable populations that we serve. Our recommendation is to adopt the priority list as we have it, given our history, I do not expect it to be exactly what we have done, but it is a good priority list. We seek that you would delegate to the Administrative Director, and as necessary, to budget change proposals, as discussions with the Department of Finance evolve. Let's take a look at the list, page 2 of our report. And we want to make one change to it. It is this. In a post-*Jameson* world, where the Supreme Court clarified our obligations for us, for those folks from whom we granted fee waivers, we do not know the scope of it at this stage, we know that it will become one. Therefore, at our most recent meeting we want to make an amendment to the list, and after number 4, it is a budget change proposal to seek funding for court reporters, in cases in which we have granted fee waivers. Everything -- we remain as you see them, 5 would be the new budget change proposal, and everything else would be through 16. This has become a very successful program, and if you include that this year, we have had 30 requests, we basically cut it down half. I think that narrative that we are telling, in light of the extraordinary budget year we

had, again, think again -- we are coming to 19-20 having the 18-19 budget. And thinking about the budget request and what it will look like. We maintain our credibility. I think what we are saying, the story seems to come up from the branches, coming off of life support. We are now able to focus on specific areas that we need to look at. For instance, for the access to justice, it seems like technology, the biggest area of interest and will yield the most result in terms of creating a branch that is nimble, responding to the public, and in bad and good times it will be accessible to the public. It will allow for remote access, on phones and on tablets, and computers -- in other words bringing us into the 21st century or the late 20th century, in terms of technology. As well we need to still increase the number of judicial officers. We have currently 2,000 judicial offices in the state of California, serving 12% of the population in the U.S. It seems like we may be thinly staffed. And we will be having it as well. And that is a story we are telling. We are moving into focusing on specific areas. I want to address one issue out of the gate, and you'll probably notice that is not as in budget change proposal for trial court operations. Given our extraordinary results that we had this year, \$150 million in new money, we will break out trial court operations in these constituent pieces. And we will still hate and achieve -- we are looking for more trial court operations. Maintaining credibility moving forward. We think this list is a responsible and it reflects it. With that, I would like to ask is there anything I need to add?

>> No, you have done a great job. I want to thank the staff. This is the culmination of the first two items, the end of this last budget process and the first step of the new budget process. We would not be able to provide the type of support if it weren't for the hard work of Ms. Lucy Fogarty, [Indiscernible] they are critical to what I take as far too much credit, it is their work and I want to acknowledge and they have left to do more work. I want to acknowledge them and all the work of the staff. It has been a great team. And I felt necessary to make that comment.

>> And to add to that, one of the initial funding requests coming we make an initial pass to see what other advisory committees, if need to be involved, we send these requests out to the advisory committees and subject matter experts. They do extraordinary work. I want to single out one group, the technology folks who are intelligent and gracious with us in terms of -- and Robert [Indiscernible] getting back to us. We emphasized technology and they were wonderful to work with.

>> Any questions?

>> And Judge right.

>> A clarification. In terms of cost increases for benefits and other cost, those are not going to be separate -- will that be a separate process?

>> Baseline budget development.

>> Thank you the other related to the newest -- the wording for court reporters and [Indiscernible].

>> I said in those cases in which we have granted fee waivers. A high percentage of fee waivers will be captured.

>> My suggestion where someone will have a fee waiver, and in some circumstances, there are other methods that are able to take a verbatim record. We suggest the verbatim record. And my perception of that at this point, the number 1 priority, not the fifth priority the others are obviously important. This issue is very emergent, and it will have a fairly significant impact on us, even within the current year.

>> Thank you. I want to make a comment and then I would like to raise an issue. First of all I want to add my voice to the work of Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic and his team. It is not only unbelievable the work that has been done, and that product that you produce, but that myself, I can understand it. It is comprehensible to when dealing with numbers and the magnitude, and all different formulas, etc. when you say and you put your legs up on your desk at work to start to be hyperlinked, and you go through and it is comprehensible. We come to the meeting fully informed and it is a great asset to all of us. I want to follow up on what Jake alluded to, we talk about technology, and ways we are moving forward, we have the Futures Commission report, etc. We also have this issue of having to provide court reporters, that week ran a fee waiver, and I think the reality out in the world is that, nobody is going to court reporter school anymore. It seems that we are going to find ourselves with a shortage of court reporters, even if we do allocate money for that, which is why I think Jake's point is well taken. In limited, civil traffic, etc., we can use recordings, and there are other types of proceedings we cannot. Not necessarily advocating that we switch to electronic recording fall proceedings, but is it something that maybe we should be looking at, as we begin to proposed budgets years from now?

>> I think technology is the way forward in terms of making the court user-friendly. There are many technologies out there that will convert voice to text. We have court reporters, which we are used to, recordings later transcribed, technologies that allow it in hospitals. We use it on our cell phones. There are a lot of things worth exploring.

>> To make sure we are not shooting ourselves in the foot in terms of court reporters, I do not know if this take the time with \$10 million, whether we get clear instruction, in terms of how it is envisioned that it would be for court reporters.

>> This is sort of a different approach in terms of the budget.

>> I would like to take the liberty of asking if that is a motion to move within a friendly amendment, yes or no? And whether that is his second of the friendly amendment. For the verbatim record as new item five in the list of priorities?

>> Yes.

>> I second that.

>> Once again, it does not and the discussion, any further discussion -- end?

>> If I may make a friendly amendment. You want the language to be “verbatim record” and exclude the word “court reporter”? Or include “verbatim” with “court reporter”?

>> Or do you want “verbatim record including court reporters”?

>> Otherwise you may have a firestorm and to eliminate us. And we do not live in an either/or world, we put ourselves in a good or bad world rather than an inclusive world. This is an inclusive world that includes court reporters and any means of getting a verbatim record. I do not know whether or not you accept that friendly record. [Laughter]

>> Before you commit yourself to the friendliest of amendments, this might be the most friendly of all amendments, Chief. Including but not limited to court reporters.

>> Okay, I am in the habit of phrasing, feel free to all of these amendments. The new five

>> BCP, indicating that funding for verbatim records, including court reporters for fee waiver litigants.

>> -- Including -- would you like to include but not limited to?

>> We are agnostic on wording.

>> [Indiscernible - multiple speakers] including but not limited to.

>> If I may -- advising you all on this -- the words will be important, however we are talking about a placeholder BCP. There are so many things that we do not know, we have the scope and we need to regret the dimension of it. That might inform later -- you might see this item later, or get updates as it develops. I think it is important that you establish your wording here. Judge Anderson’s advice. I think it is sound. And to understand again it is a very much work in progress, this is the concept phase. We really are, it is so fresh, we are looking to figure out how we will fill in this placeholder BCP.

>> I would like to leverage off that and suggest, given the nature of this interaction that expect to happen up in the capital, that we get flexibility to Martin and the team, to alter the titling of this. These titles go on. And people see these titles to be as advantageous as humanly possible. We cannot come up with a salary -- precise language. They may need to change it to make it more palatable.

>> We want to make clear that we are not sick yes and that this would not include court reporters. Acknowledging this is a brief statement, if we went with verbatim records/court reporters, in cases with a fee waiver, and leave it at that level. It encompasses that without -- it makes it clear that we want one over the other, that we just want to be clear that it will be one, both, many, -- I would make that amendment -- I agree to it. It would be my honor for that to be my second. My last statement, I agree with Marla completely. And the friendliest of amendments. This is certainly not meant to say, we are against court reporters. We just want to be able to make sure that as we move forward, we have the ability to provide access, a verbatim record, by whatever means the future holds for us. I second with the family and them as Mr. [Indiscernible].

>> Thank you. The recommendation for this is not only the priority list, which has been amended, but also includes the authority for the administrative director to make technical adjustments. As Judge Rubin alluded to, what we all know in substance, a sickly we have made out it in this Judicial Council meeting, our judicial intent term of this BCP. As mine moves forward with maybe explaining this to folks that might find it unclear, he certainly is in front as indicated, there is no ill will to court reporters. [Indiscernible] with this in mind, as amended and the kitty, recommendations one and two, without hearing further discussion or observation, all in favor say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any opposed, any abstentions, that carries as amended thank you Judge Rubin, to your committee, and thank you staff and team for this.

>> I would like to add, we could not do this work without the staff. The community members are joining me thinking John Wordlaw, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Lucy Fogarty, everyone who helps us that we cannot do it without them. I have asked the committee to thank the CEOs, and the lawyers who join us, and give us our observations on how the courts are using their experience, and it gives us a great insight and I want to thank them for that. With that, thank you.

>> Thank you. Two matters before we officially conclude. I asked the departing members of the Judicial Council to stay behind a few moments, so we are able to give you our Federalist Papers and to take a picture. Also as you know, sadly as we almost always do, in my experience, we end our meeting with a remembrance of our judicial colleagues, recently deceased. All of this list of retiring from the bench.

>> Hon. Jay R. Ballantyne (Ret.), Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District We honor them off of the service to the courts, and to the people of California. This concludes our July the business meeting. Next set for September 20, safe travels, lunch is served. Thank you.

>> [Event Concluded]