



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 11, 2024

12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Videoconference

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair; Hon. C. Todd Bottke, Vice-Chair; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Hon. Michelle Williams Court; Mr. David Fu; Mr. Charles Johnson; Mr. Darrel E. Parker.

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Carol A. Corrigan

**Others Present:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson; Ms. Heather L. Pettit; Ms. Lisa Chavez.

---

#### OPEN MEETING

---

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order and took roll call.

##### Approval of Minutes

The Technology Committee reviewed and approved the minutes of the following Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

- February 5, 2024

There were no public written comments received for this meeting.

---

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-6)

---

##### Item 1

##### Chair Report

**Update:** Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, mentioned that the Tactical Plan for Technology will be updated for calendar year 2025-26, and invited participation in the workstream. The Tactical Plan is a two-year strategic outline of the goals that the committee will set out to achieve during FY 2025-26. Judge Brodie then reviewed the IT Modernization Funding program and confirmed that Judge Hanson will continue as the sponsor of the workstream. Finally, Judge Brodie reviewed the five agenda items for the meeting.

**Item 2**

**Electronic Evidence Workstream Phase 2: Findings and Recommendations (Action Requested)**

**Update:** Hon. Kimberly Menninger, Workstream Executive Sponsor, Mr. Rick Walery, IT Director, San Mateo Superior Court, and Mr. Fred Acosta, Workstream Project Manager, Superior Court of Orange County presented the final report that outlined the goals, court survey findings, and pilot solutions for electronic evidence handling and storage in the courts. The presenters proposed recommendations to move forward to the next phase of the workstream.

**Action:** The committee asked questions, discussed the report findings, and voted unanimously to approve the Electronic Evidence Workstream Phase 2 report and to sunset the workstream.

**Item 3**

**IT Modernization Funding Fiscal Year 2024-25 (Action Requested)**

**Update:** Ms. Lisa Chavez, Information Systems Supervisor, Judicial Council, and Ms. Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Office/Director of IT, Judicial Council Information Technology presented proposed branch technology priorities for the FY 2024-25 IT Modernization Funding program. The proposed priorities are to expand the hybrid courtroom; to address additional components such as digital documents, e-filing, and electronic evidence; and finally, to consider innovative solutions, such as AI-assisted ways to improve services and access to justice.

**Action:** The committee asked questions, discussed the program, and voted unanimously to approve the proposed branchwide IT Modernization Funding program priorities for FY 2024-25.

**Item 4**

**Distribution of Remaining Fiscal Year 2023-24 IT Funding (Action Requested)**

**Update:** This item was deferred to the next committee meeting.

**Item 5**

**California Trial Court Facilities Standards (Action Requested)**

**Update:** Ms. Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer/Director of IT, Judicial Council Information Technology, presented an overview of the proposed revisions to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* related to technology and including the comments from ITAC. Mr. Andrae Randolph, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology, presented the list of proposed audio and visual upgrades that include fixed camera views and display panels throughout the courtroom. He also listed additional considerations such as a raised floor system and touch panels for the judges and clerks. Ms. Heather Pettit emphasized and the committee discussed, per comments from the meeting with ITAC members, the need for flexible requirements due to rapid changes in technology. Transferring the technology requirements from the manual to an annually-updated supplemental technology standards guide would offer the needed agility.

**Action:** The committee asked questions and unanimously voted to approve the proposed updates to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards*, including updates discussed in the presentation. A letter outlining these recommendations will be provided to the Facilities Standards Workgroup.

**Item 6**

**California Courts Connected Framework (Action Requested)**

**Update:** Ms. Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer/Director of IT, Judicial Council Information Technology asked Mr. David Fu to elaborate on his recommendations regarding the framework document. Mr. Fu recommended how to clarify the framework language with regards to Judicial Council partnerships and the public. Ms. Pettit agreed and proposed that her team revise the document to include Mr. Fu's recommendations and her own updates.

**Action:** Judge Brodie deferred this item to the next meeting.

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

# **FY23-24** IT Modernization: Distribution of Remaining Funding

---

April 15, 2024



# Goal for today

**Purpose:** Distribute remaining FY23-24  
IT Modernization Funding

- Local Court Projects: \$ 415,000
  - Branchwide Programs: \$1,300,000
- Estimated Total: **\$1,715,000**

# Recommendation

Redistribute FY23-24 IT Modernization Funding to New Courthouses to meet the Hybrid Courtroom requirements.

- Assembly Bill 716
- Senate Bill 133

# Critical Funding Need: **New Courthouses**

New Courthouses: All current construction projects must retrofit new Hybrid Courtroom Standards after permit for occupancy is received.

<b>Court</b>	<b>#CRs</b>	<b>Funding Need 3/26/2024</b>	<b>Estimated Completion</b>
Menifee (Riverside)	9	\$ 398,013	April 2024
Santa Rosa	15	\$ 361,052	March 2025
Sacramento	53	\$ 3,500,000	March 2025
Indio (Riverside)	5	\$ 200,000	July 2025
Modesto	27	\$ 929,804	August 2025
<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>\$ 5,388,870</b>	

\*#CRs – Number of courtrooms

# Critical Funding Need: New Courthouses

**Funding need:** ~\$5.4 million over FY 2023-24 and 2024-25

- Remainder from IT Mod FY23-24 (if approved today)

**Remaining need:**

*Potential funding sources (not part of today's purpose/discussion)*

- Use part of the IT Mod FY24-25 branchwide funding
- Evaluating other Judicial Council salary savings

*\*To be approved by the JC Executive office*



# Request for Approval

Redistribute FY23-24 leftover IT Modernization Funding to New Courthouses to meet Hybrid Courtroom legislative requirements.

# **FY24-25** IT Modernization: Funding for Local Projects

---

April 15, 2024



# IT Mod Fund: Local Court Projects

\$12.5 million budgeted and potentially allocated to local courts annually

Appellate and trial courts submit project proposals

Aligns to judicial branch:

- Strategic and Tactical Plans for Technology
- California Courts Connected (CCC) framework

# Goal for today

**Purpose:** Identify FY24-25 funding models for local projects

- Consider branch and local priorities
- Take an adaptive and responsive approach
- \$12.5m available
- Model up to 3 scenarios

# Prior Year Funding Models

## FY21-22

1. Case management systems
2. Small court floor\*
3. Remainder distributed pro rata\*\*

## FY22-23

1. Digitization of documents
2. Small court floor\*
3. Remainder distributed pro rata\*\*

## FY23-24

1. Case management systems
2. Small court floor\*
3. Remainder distributed pro rata\*\*

\* **Small court floor:** The smallest applicant courts that did not receive 1., received funding for their highest approved project.

\*\* **Pro rata remainder:** Distributed the remaining amount to applicant courts with approved projects via a pro rata formula.

# IT Mod Priorities for FY 2024-25

1. Implementing and/or **expanding the Hybrid Courtroom** to comply with AB 716 and SB 133
2. Developing **additional components of the Hybrid Courtroom** including:
  - Digitization of Documents
  - E-filing
  - Electronic Evidence
3. **Innovative solutions**, such as AI assisted/generated solutions, to improve the court services

# Possible scenarios to model

*Total available: \$12.5m for local projects*

## Option 1:

- A. Set aside ~\$4m toward **hybrid** projects
- B. Small court **floor**
- C. Remainder distributed **pro rata** (toward approved projects)

# Other scenarios?

*Total available: \$12.5m for local projects*

## Option 2:

- ?



# Other scenarios?

***Total available: \$12.5m for local projects***

## **Option 3:**

- ?