



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA
94102-3688

Meeting Minutes

Meeting materials
are available through
the hyperlinks in
this document.

Judicial Council

*Open to the Public Unless Indicated as Closed
(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.6(a))*

*Requests for ADA accommodation should be directed to
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov*

Friday, January 12, 2018

9:00 AM

San Francisco

CLOSED SESSION (RULE 10.6(B))—PLANNING, PERSONNEL, AND DISCUSSION PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, chair of the Judicial Council, called the closed session to order at 9:00 a.m.

OPEN SESSION (RULE 10.6(A)) — MEETING AGENDA

Call to Order

Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, chair of the Judicial Council, called the open session to order at 9:35 a.m. in the Judicial Council Board Room.

Attendance

Council Members

Present: 28 - Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Justice Ming W. Chin, Justice Harry E. Hull Jr., Justice James M. Humes, Justice Douglas P. Miller, Justice Marsha G. Slough, Presiding Judge Patricia M. Lucas, Presiding Judge C. Todd Bottke, Assistant Presiding Judge Kevin C. Brazile, Presiding Judge Gary Nadler, Judge Marla O. Anderson, Judge Stacy Boulware Eurie, Judge Kyle S. Brodie, Judge Samuel K. Feng, Judge Scott M. Gordon, Judge Harold W. Hopp, Judge Dalila Corral Lyons, Judge Stuart M. Rice, Judge David M. Rubin, Judge Kenneth K. So, Mr. Jake Chatters, Ms. Kimberly Flener, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann, Ms. Rachel W. Hill, Ms. Audra Ibarra, Mr. Patrick M. Kelly, and Ms. Gretchen Nelson

Absent: 2 - Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson, and Assembly Member Richard Bloom

Others Present

Ms. Maria Alarcon, Ms. Maria Dinzeo, Ms. Cynthia Dizikes, Ms. Roberta Fitzpatrick, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Mr. John Jacobs, Ms. Lyra Jebb, Ms. Amber Reed, and Ms. Alejandra Ruiz

Public Comment

Speaker #1 (speaker requested anonymity), Ms. Barbara Bartoshuk, Ms. Catherine Campbell, Ms. Ana Estevez, Mr. Paul Guevara, Ms. Donna Levey, Ms. Kimberly Sweidy, and Ms. Connie Valentine presented comments on general judicial administration.

Approval of Minutes

[18-005](#)

Minutes of the November 16-17, 2017, Judicial Council meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Ibarra, seconded by Judge Feng, that the minutes be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Chief Justice's Report

Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye summarized her engagements and outreach on behalf of the branch since the council's last meeting in November. The Chief reported that she returned to McClatchy High School in Sacramento. She and fellow McClatchy alum and civics education enthusiast U.S. District Court Judge Morrison England, Jr., addressed the AP Government class of 130 students. Topics covered included history, federalism, the death penalty, collegiality on the bench, and decision-making at the state and federal levels, she reported. The Chief also participated in the Don Edwards Lecture Series at San Jose State University. Retired Judge Leonard Edwards, the son of Congressman Don Edwards, moderated the wide-ranging conversation with Presiding Judge Pat Lucas. Judge Edwards asked the Chief about career paths, bail reform, immigration, life on the Supreme Court, and the importance of trial by jury.

In December, the Chief Justice hosted her annual "Meet the Media" event in her San Francisco chambers. Members of the print and broadcast media who regularly cover the judicial branch, politics, and the courts joined the Chief and Administrative Director Martin Hoshino to discuss topics of interest to them. She noted that sexual harassment and the "Me Too" movement generated questions, along with Proposition 66 implementation, bail reform, and immigration.

With oral argument sessions in San Francisco and Los Angeles, the Chief remarked that the justices of the Supreme Court took the opportunity to connect with local bar associations at various events. These engagements provide opportunities to connect with local stakeholders and foster bench-bar collegiality, she noted, as well as communicate the needs of the judicial branch.

As Chief Justice of California, one of the responsibilities that comes with the role, the Chief noted, is chairing the Commission on Judicial Appointments. The commission reviews justices nominated or appointed by the Governor to the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeal in a public hearing. The Chief explained that the commission considers the candidate's qualifications; the nomination or appointment is effective only if confirmed by the commission. The commission is made up of three-member

panels that include the Chief Justice, the Attorney General, and the senior presiding justice of the Court of Appeal of the affected district. In December, the commission met to consider three appointments by the Governor to the Second Appellate District of the Court of Appeal in Los Angeles and the Fourth Appellate District of the Court of Appeal, Division One in San Diego. She added that the commission will meet again at the end of January to consider two further appointments to the Courts of Appeal.

Lastly, the Chief Justice reported that just the previous day she delivered the welcoming remarks at the Supervising Judges Institute. Over 40 new judges are in this supervisory role, she noted, and the institute addresses topics including leadership, ethics, management, and the unique challenges faced by supervising judges.

Administrative Director's Report

[18-006](#)

Administrative Director's Report

Administrative Director Martin Hoshino reported on the Judicial Council's accomplishments for 2017, as well as the Governor's state budget proposal. Shared branchwide and on the California Courts website, *Creating Access: California Judicial Branch Year in Review* highlights administration of justice improvements by the Judicial Council and provides annual metrics for performance, he noted. Mr. Hoshino highlighted several examples, including the Judicial Council's Legal Services office, which issued 224 opinions last year. The office manages external lawsuits and claims in the trial courts, the Courts of Appeal, and throughout the system, and processed 496 claims last year, he reported. The Judicial Council's fiscal operations process between 240,000 and 260,000 jury checks a year, he noted, and the council's Facilities Services manages and maintains over 500 facilities and completed about 1,400 modification requests last year. Mr. Hoshino also highlighted the council's education program, which delivered 230 live programs and put out 45 judicial publications.

Mr. Hoshino reported that the Governor's 2018-19 budget proposal, which came out January 10, reflects the high priority that the council and its members and all of the courts place on restoring, maintaining, and expanding services for court users. He noted that it reflects the hard work of the branch over the last several years with respect to developing efficiencies and innovations and different ways to deliver services in response to budget cuts. He added that it is gratifying to see that hard work recognized by the Governor in the budget proposal, which makes an investment in the courts. Mr. Hoshino highlighted the \$150 million in trial court base operations funding and \$90 million in backfill money. Lastly, Mr. Hoshino noted that he was particularly pleased to see this funding restored, which could potentially restart the courts' construction program. He recalled that the council made a difficult decision not all that long ago to cease the construction program because of the failing revenue stream associated with those projects. It was the fiscally responsible decision at the

time, he added, and noted there was recognition from the Governor's office that it was the right decision; now the judicial branch will have some assistance to get the program rebooted and restarted. The Legislature will review the budget proposal and the council will work with the Legislature, the Governor's office, and stakeholders, he stated, and he expressed his hope to end the budget cycle with the same good news with which it began.

Judicial Council Committee Presentations

[18-008](#)

Judicial Council Committee Reports

Summary: Executive and Planning Committee
Hon. Douglas P. Miller, Chair
Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee
Hon. Kenneth K. So, Chair
Rules and Projects Committee
Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr., Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair
Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Hon. David M. Rubin, Chair

Executive and Planning Committee

Justice Douglas P. Miller, chair of the Executive and Planning Committee, noted that his written report was included in the meeting materials and posted online, and that he had nothing further to add. However, he thanked the Chief Justice and Mr. Hoshino for their tireless efforts on behalf of the branch and specifically with regard to the budget.

Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee

Judge Kenneth K. So, chair of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, reported that the committee met once to review a piece of federal legislation, the Continuation of Useful Resources to States Act. The committee voted to take a support position because the act discusses child and family service programs as part of their court improvement program grants.

Rules and Projects Committee

Justice Harry E. Hull, Jr., chair of the Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO), reported that the committee met twice by phone and once by e-mail since the last council meeting. On December 7, the committee recommended circulation of a proposal on a special cycle and a proposal to recommend to the council, which is item 18-013 on the consent agenda regarding ability-to-pay considerations in traffic and other infraction cases. RUPRO met by telephone on December 14 to approve nine proposals to circulate for comment during the winter cycle, which will be presented to the council at the May business meeting. RUPRO also acted by e-mail

on January 5 to approve a proposal regarding advisory committee membership and terms, which is item 18-201 on the consent agenda.

Judicial Council Technology Committee

Justice Marsha Slough, chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), reported that since the last council meeting, JCTC held one open meeting conference on December 11 and then again on January 8. At the December meeting, the committee received updates on the work of the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). JCTC also discussed technology budget change proposals and received an update on the strategic and tactical plans for technology, she added.

Justice Slough reported that at the January meeting, JCTC approved ITAC's robust annual agenda and final deliverables for both the ITAC Disaster Recovery Workstream and the Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream. The deliverables include framework documents and planning tools to provide guidance to the trial courts for their disaster recovery and next-generation hosting efforts, she noted.

Justice Slough also highlighted accomplishments related to judicial branch technology over the past year. In 2017 the council approved the first update to the *Tactical Plan for Technology* and is updating the *Strategic Plan for Technology*, which will cover 2019-22. She noted that technology plays a critical role in the success of the Chief Justice's 3D Access initiative, which includes physical, remote, and equal access to justice. Justice Slough reported that last year JCTC collaborated on budget change proposals such as the expansion of the California Courts Protective Order Registry. She added that JCTC was very pleased to see the funding for the expansion included in Governor Brown's proposed budget. Completing the expansion of the registry to the remaining seven large courts, she noted, will provide judicial officers, authorized court staff, and law enforcement agencies across all 58 counties access to protective order data and assure that all jurisdictions have access to these very important public safety data systems.

In May, Justice Slough reported, JCTC co-hosted a small court technology summit with the California Trial Court Consortium that attracted over 80 attendees from more than 30 of the small and medium-sized courts. In August, the statewide Judicial Branch Technology Summit, with over 150 members of the branch in attendance, provided a framework for discussions related to the use of technology in providing better service to the public. In 2017, ITAC became fully engaged in three directives from the Futures Commission report: remote appearances for proceedings, voice-to-text and language interpretation services, and court filing service counters and self-help centers with intelligent chat technology. She added that the trial courts' information technology officers, the CIOs within the 58 county courts, continue to be fully engaged and working together.

Jake Chatters, chief executive officer of the Superior Court of Placer County, gave a brief update on the Placer Court Hosting Consortium, an initiative that brought together six courts to host technology services rather than being hosted at a centralized, statewide level. Mr. Chatters reported that Plumas, Sierra, Trinity, Lake, Modoc, and San Benito courts joined the Placer court. He noted that the project was made possible through the council's approval of one-time funding of \$736,500 to support the courts' move to the network. The effort could save roughly \$670,000 per year for the state from the Improvement and Modernization Fund, he added.

Judicial Branch Budget Committee

Judge David M. Rubin, chair of the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, reported on the activities of the committee since the last council meeting. The committee met on January 11 to hear a presentation about the Governor's 2018-19 state budget proposal from Mr. Hoshino and Budget Services Director Zlatko Theodorovic. Judge Rubin added that the fiscal year 2019-20 budget change proposal process is underway and will close in March.

Judicial Council Members' Liaison Reports

[18-009](#)

Judicial Council Members' Liaison Reports

Summary: Judicial Council members report on their visits to the superior courts.

Judge Stacy Boulware Eurie reported on her visit to the Superior Court of Plumas County.

CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of the Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Justice Chin, seconded by Judge Lyons, to approve all of the following items on the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

[18-002](#)

Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2017 (Action Required)

Summary: The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee recommend that the Judicial Council receive and accept the report entitled *Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2017* and the report cover letter, which includes suggested modifications to the report's observations, and direct staff to forward them to the Legislature. The review of California's statewide uniform child support guideline is legislatively mandated. Family Code section 4054 states that any recommendations for revision to the guideline must be made to ensure that the guideline results in appropriate child support orders, limits deviations from the guideline, or otherwise helps to ensure

that the guideline is in compliance with federal law. The review provides a basis for the Legislature to periodically reassess California's child support guideline and evaluate its impact on children and families.

Recommendation: The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee recommend that the Judicial Council receive and accept the following and direct staff to forward them to the Legislature:

1. The report entitled *Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2017*; and
2. The report cover letter, which includes suggested modifications to the report's observations.

[18-012](#)

Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation: Interpreters in Small Claims Actions (Action Required)

Summary: In order to complete the expansion of language access services, including the provision of court interpreters in small claims actions when court resources allow, the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force, and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council sponsor legislation to (1) delete an exception stating that interpreters are not required in small claims proceedings, and (2) authorize courts to appoint certified and registered interpreters in small claims proceedings. The latter amendment also provides judicial officers with discretion to appoint a temporary interpreter if an attempt to secure a certified/registered or provisionally qualified interpreter was not successful. The amendments support recommendations 71 and 72 in the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*.

Recommendation: The Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force, and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council sponsor legislation to:

1. Amend Government Code section 68560.5(a) to delete an exception stating that interpreters are not required in small claims proceedings; and
2. Amend Code of Civil Procedure section 116.550 to authorize courts to appoint certified and registered interpreters in small claims proceedings; and
 - a. Provide that courts should follow the provisional qualification process if a certified or registered interpreter is not available; and
 - b. Provide judicial officers with discretion to appoint a temporary interpreter to assist a court user during a small claims hearing if an attempt to secure a certified/registered or provisionally qualified interpreter was not successful either after the matter was continued to allow for a further search or at the first hearing if the judicial officer determines that appointment of a temporary interpreter is appropriate without a further postponement, depending on the complexity of the case.

[18-013](#)

Traffic and Criminal Procedure: Ability to Pay in Traffic and Other Infraction Cases (Action Required)

Summary: The Traffic Advisory Committee, the Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness propose two optional, plain-language Judicial Council forms—an application form and a judicial order form—to assist in implementing existing rule 4.335 of the California Rules of Court on ability-to-pay determinations in traffic and other infraction cases. They also recommend a new rule stating the forms’ intended use, their optional nature, and the confidential status of the application form.

Recommendation: The Traffic Advisory Committee, Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness recommend that the Judicial Council, effective April 1, 2018:

1. Adopt new rule 4.336; and
2. Approve new optional forms TR-320/CR-320 (*Can’t Afford to Pay Fine: Traffic and Other Infractions*) and TR-321/CR-321 (*Can’t Afford to Pay Fine: Traffic and Other Infractions (Court Order)*).

[18-015](#)

Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts (Action Required)

Summary: The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve one new request and one amended request for Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts. Under the Judicial Council-adopted process, a court may request that funding reduced as a result of a court exceeding its 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the TCTF for the benefit of that court. The total amount requested by the trial courts that would be reduced from their 2017-18 allocations for exceeding the cap is \$619,413.

Recommendation: The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective January 12, 2018:

1. Allocate and designate \$10,895 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to be held on behalf of the Superior Court of Shasta County. These funds will be reduced from the court’s allocation as a result of this court exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap. The funds would be distributed back to the court in 2017-18, as delineated in Attachment A.
2. Approve the amended request of the Superior Court of San Bernardino County, which adds an additional \$15,086 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to be held on behalf to its revised request of \$697,432. The funds would be distributed back to the court in 2017-18, as delineated in Attachment B.

[18-016](#)

Trial Court Allocations: Final Reduction Related to Statutory 1 Percent Cap on 2016-17 Fund Balance Carryover (Action Required)

Summary: Under Government Code section 77203(b), a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court’s operating

budget from the prior fiscal year. Judicial Council staff recommend approving a final reduction allocation of \$7,392,571 related to the fund balance in 2016-17 and prior-year excluded funds, as required by Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A).

Recommendation: Judicial Council staff recommend that the Judicial Council adjust the preliminary 1 percent fund balance cap reduction allocation of \$7,773,282 approved by the council in July 2017 by a net \$380,710, for a final reduction allocation of \$7,392,571, to match the trial courts' final calculations of the amount above the 1 percent fund balance cap.

[18-021](#)

Judicial Council: Advisory Committee Membership and Terms (Action Required)

Summary: The Judicial Council's Rules and Projects Committee recommends the amendment of several rules in the California Rules of Court relating to membership on advisory committees. The amendments modify rule 10.31, the general rule on membership, to clarify the terms of the chairs, members, and advisory members. In addition, the rules relating to four specific advisory committees are amended to add new or to modify existing categories of membership.

Recommendation: The Judicial Council's Rules and Projects Committee recommends that the council, effective February 1, 2018:

1. Amend rule 10.31, on advisory committee membership and terms, to clarify the terms of the chairs, members, and advisory members;
2. Amend rule 10.42, on the Criminal Law Advisory Committee, to add, as an additional category of membership, a mental health professional with experience in criminal law issues;
3. Amend rule 10.43, on the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, to add, as an additional category of membership, a mental health professional with experience in family and children's issues;
4. Amend rule 10.44, on the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee, to add, as an additional category of membership, a lawyer working for a public interest organization or court self-help center whose practice focuses on guardianships or conservatorships; and
5. Amend rule 10.60, on the Tribal Court-State Court Forum, to provide that, as a category of membership, the forum must have at least one, but no more than three, California executive branch officials responsible for tribal-related work.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

[18-003](#)

Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (Action Required)

Summary: With a sustained lack of adequate and stable funding of the trial courts, the Trial Court

Budget Advisory Committee recommends adopting new policy parameters for the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) to go into effect in fiscal year 2018-19 to continue making progress towards equity of funding based on workload. WAFM became effective July 1, 2013, with a council-approved five-year implementation schedule incrementally shifting funds using a recalculation of historical base each year, concluding in 2017-18. WAFM needs new policy parameters, effective 2018-19 and beyond, to further the objectives of the judicial branch in reaching workload-based equitable funding.

Recommendation: Based on actions taken at its December 4, 2017, meeting, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council take the following actions related to the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), effective July 1, 2018:

1. Approve new policy parameters for WAFM for use in allocating trial court operations funds starting in 2018-19;
2. Direct TCBAC to propose to the Judicial Council changes or modifications to the model as needed; and
3. Delegate authority to Judicial Council staff to make technical adjustments to the methodology as needed.

A motion was made by Justice Slough, seconded by Justice Miller, that this proposal be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

[18-004](#)

Judicial Branch Education: 2018-2020 Education Plan (Action Required)

Summary: The Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) recommends approving the 2018-2020 Education Plan, effective July 1, 2018. Through the work of its standing curriculum committees, the CJER Governing Committee developed this plan for CJER education programs and products that will enable its judicial branch constituencies to fulfill the education requirements and expectations outlined in rules 10.451-10.491 of the California Rules of Court.

Recommendation: Recommendation
The CJER Governing Committee reviewed and unanimously approved the education plan for fiscal years 2018-2020 and now recommends that the Judicial Council approve the plan, effective July 1, 2018. With Judicial Council approval, the CJER Governing Committee and CJER staff will initiate the education and training they are required and expected to deliver to the multiple judicial branch audiences they serve.

A motion was made by Judge Anderson, seconded by Judge Rubin, that this proposal be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

[18-014](#)

Judicial Branch: Revisions to the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) (Action Required)

Summary: The Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) recommends that the Judicial Council approve the revised statistical reporting definitions for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS), effective July 1, 2018. JBSIS is the statistical reporting system that defines and electronically collects summary information from superior court case management systems for each major case processing area of the court. JBSIS is authorized through California Rules of Court, rule 10.400 and is the source of court operational data for the judicial branch, the Legislature, and other state agencies consistent with article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 68505.

Recommendation: The Court Executives Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the revised statistical reporting definitions for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System contained in Attachment A, effective July 1, 2018;
2. Direct Judicial Council staff to update the JBSIS manual, statewide JBSIS data warehouse, and any associated databases and electronic reporting interfaces consistent with recommendation 1; and
3. Delegate the authority to make technical, nonsubstantive changes to the revised definitions arising from court input to Judicial Council staff, subject to review by the Court Executives Advisory Committee.

A motion was made by Judge Brodie, seconded by Presiding Judge Lucas, that this proposal be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

[18-001](#)

Government Code Section 68604: Standards of Timely Disposition Published in the 2017 Court Statistics Report

Summary: The Judicial Council shall direct staff to transmit the already-published 2017 *Court Statistics Report* to the Legislature. Doing so fulfills the requirements of Government Code section 68604, which requires the Judicial Council to report biennially regarding the standards of timely disposition adopted pursuant to section 68603. The 2017 *Court Statistics Report* contains case-processing and time-to-disposition statistics that meet the requirements of Government Code section 68604.

This Report to Legislature was approved.

[18-010](#)

Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Report on California Rules of Court, rule 10.75 (Meetings of Advisory Bodies)

Summary: The *Supplemental Report of the 2013-2014 Budget Package* requires that the Judicial Council report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on implementation of the open meetings rule, rule 10.75 of the California Rules of Court. Under subdivision (p) of the rule, the Judicial Council must review the rule's impact periodically to determine whether amendments are needed. No amendments are needed at this time.

[18-011](#)

Government Code Section 68106: Public Notice by Courts of

Closures or Reduced Clerks' Office Hours (Gov. Code, § 68106-Report No. 45)

Summary: Government Code section 68106 directs (1) trial courts to notify the public and the Judicial Council before closing courtrooms or clerks' offices or reducing clerks' regular office hours, and (2) the council to post all such notices on its website and also relay them to the Legislature. This is the 45th report to date listing the latest court notices received by the council under this statutory requirement; since the previous report, **four** superior courts-Modoc, Alameda, Stanislaus, and Sierra Counties-have issued new notices.

[18-017](#)**Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Allocation of New Judgeships Funding in Fiscal Year 2016-17**

Summary: Judicial Council staff present this report on the allocation of funding in fiscal year 2016-17 for support of new judgeships authorized in FY 2007-08. The Budget Act of 2007 (Stats. 2007, ch. 171) requires that this report be submitted each year until all judgeships are appointed and new staff hired.

[18-018](#)**Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Standards and Measures That Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice**

Summary: This report satisfies the requirements of Government Code section 77001.5, which requires the Judicial Council to adopt and annually report on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice, including, but not limited to, the following subjects: (1) providing equal access to courts and respectful treatment for all court participants; (2) case processing, including the efficient use of judicial resources; and (3) general court administration.

[18-019](#)**Report to the Legislature: Trial Court Trust Fund Revenue, Expenditure, and Fund Balance Constraints for Fiscal Year 2016-17**

Summary: Government Code sections 68502.5(b) and 77202.5(b) require the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature the following financial data from all fund sources, by individual trial court, with totals for all trial courts and each trial court: revenues; expenditures at the program, component, and object levels; and fund balances. The report must be submitted on or before December 31 after the end of each fiscal year.

[18-020](#)**Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Receipts and Expenditures from Local Courthouse Construction Funds: Report to the Budget and Fiscal Committees of the Legislature**

Summary: Government Code section 70403(d) directs the Judicial Council to submit a report of all receipts and expenditures from the local courthouse construction funds to the budget and fiscal committees of the Legislature based on the information received from counties pursuant to this section on or before January 1 of each year. The

Receipts and Expenditures from Local Courthouse Construction Funds: Report to the Budget and Fiscal Committees of the Legislature provides information for the reporting period of July 1, 2016, to June 30, 2017.

There were no Circulating Orders since the last business meeting.

Appointment Orders

[18-022](#)

Appointment orders since last business meeting.

In Memoriam

The Chief Justice concluded the meeting with a remembrance of the following judicial colleagues recently deceased, honoring their service to their courts and to the cause of justice:

- Hon. David R. Baty (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Marin
- Hon. John P. Carroll (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Riverside
- Hon. Daniel E. Creed (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara
- Hon. Porter de Dubovay (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
- Hon. Charles W. Froehlich, Jr. (Ret.), Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One
- Hon. Peter E. Giannini (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
- Hon. Nancy Hoffman (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara
- Hon. Leroy G. MacFarland (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Glenn
- Hon. William L. Peck (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Ventura
- Hon. Harry Pregerson (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
- Hon. John T. Racanelli (Ret.), Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One
- Hon. Philip E. Schaefer (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino
- Hon. Charles S. Wilson (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Kern

Adjournment

With the meeting's business completed, the Chief Justice adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Administrative Director Martin Hoshino, Secretary to the Judicial Council, on March 2, 2018.