JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEETING
Minutes of the February 24, 2006, Meeting
San Francisco, California

Chief Justice Ronald M. George, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:42 a.m. on Friday, February 24, 2006, at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) in San Francisco, California.

Judicial Council members present: Chief Justice Ronald M. George; Justices Marvin R. Baxter, Candace D. Cooper, Richard D. Huffman, and Eileen C. Moore; Judges J. Stephen Czuleger, Michael T. Garcia, Suzanne N. Kingsbury, Barbara J. Miller, Douglas P. Miller, Dennis E. Murray, William J. Murray, Jr., Michael Nash, and Richard E. L. Strauss; Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi, Mr. Thomas V. Girardi, Ms. Barbara J. Parker, and Mr. William C. Vickrey; **advisory members:** Judges Terry B. Friedman and Sharon J. Waters; Commissioner Ronald E. Albers; Ms. Tamara Lynn Beard, Ms. Deena Fawcett, Mr. Alan Slater, and Ms. Sharol Strickland.

Absent: Senator Joseph Dunn; Assembly Member Dave Jones; Judge Charles W. McCoy, Jr.; and Mr. Rex S. Heinke.

Others present included: Presiding Judge George C. Hernandez, Jr., Judge William C. Pate; Mr. Michael W. Boggs, Ms. Leslie Hatamiya, Ms. Beth Jay, Ms. Kristen Jones, Mr. Michael D. Planet, Ms. Erika Rickard, and Mr. Michael M. Roddy; **staff:** Mr. Dennis Blanchard, Ms. Dianne Bolotte, Ms. Deborah Brown, Ms. Sheila Calabro, Mr. Philip Carrizosa, Mr. James Carroll, Ms. Tina Carroll, Ms. Casie Casados, Mr. Roderic Cathcart, Ms. Jeanne Caughell, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Ms. June Clark, Ms. Donna Clay-Conti, Mr. Blaine Corren, Mr. Dexter Craig, Ms. Kim K. Davis, Mr. Douglas Denton, Mr. Robert Emerson, Mr. Michael Fischer, Mr. Bob Fleshman, Mr. Malcolm Franklin, Mr. Ernesto Fuentes, Mr. Mark Garcia, Ms. Susan Goins, Mr. Ruben Gomez, Ms. Christine M. Hansen, Ms. Hilary Hehman, Ms. Lynn Holton, Ms. Kathleen T. Howard, Mr. David Hurley, Mr. Kenneth L. Kann, Mr. Bill Kasley, Mr. Gary Kitajo, Ms. Leanne Kozak, Mr. Chris Magnusson, Mr. Lee Morhar, Mr. Stephen Nash, Ms. Diane Nunn, Ms. Susan O'Brien, Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Mr. Ronald G. Overholt, Ms. Jody Patel, Ms. Christine Patton, Ms. Mary Roberts, Ms. Rona Rothenberg, Ms. Michelle Simone, Ms. Sonya Smith, Ms. Kim Taylor, Ms. Marcia M. Taylor, Ms. Karen M. Thorson, Ms. Phyllis Treige, Mr. Courtney Tucker, Mr. Jack Urquhart, Ms. Bobbie Welling, Ms. Daisy Yee, and Ms. Patricia M. Yerian; **media representatives:** Ms. Cheryl Miller, *The Recorder,* and Ms. Savannah Blackwell, *San Francisco Daily Journal.*

Except as noted, each action item on the agenda was unanimously approved on the motion made and seconded. (Tab letters and item numbers refer to the binder of Reports and Recommendations dated February 24, 2006, that was sent to members in advance of the meeting.)

Public Comment Related to Trial Court Budget Issues

Chief Justice George introduced Mr. Michael W. Boggs, president of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 910 in Los Angeles, and invited him to address the council on several bills that are being introduced on behalf of AFSCME Local 910 and would, if successful, affect trial court budgets.

Mr. Boggs commented on several bills that are being introduced on behalf of AFSCME Local 910.

Approval of Minutes of the November 4, 2005, and December 2, 2005, Business Meetings

The minutes of the November 4, 2005, and December 2, 2005, business meetings were approved.

Judicial Council Committee Presentations

Executive and Planning Committee
Justice Richard D. Huffman, chair of the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P), reported that the committee met five times since the last council meeting.

On January 13, 2006, the committee, on behalf of the Judicial Council, extended the grace period by 12 months to February 1, 2007, for currently registered interpreters of newly certified languages to pass the certification examination. The committee also reviewed materials and made recommendations to be sent to the Chief Justice regarding vacancies on the Advisory Committee on Criminal Jury Instructions and the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER).

On February 1, 2006, the committee reviewed materials and set the agenda for the council business meeting on February 24, 2006. The committee discussed the meeting processes for educational meetings as well as other types of meetings and plans to report back to the council at a future meeting regarding that issue.

Also in February, the committee reviewed with staff Phase II of the Public Trust and Confidence assessment. Committee members discussed the study with AOC staff and the project's researchers, and offered suggestions aimed at ensuring that the project's product is reliable and accurately communicates needed information to the council.

On February 14, 2006, the committee reviewed additional materials and set the agenda for the council business meeting on February 24, 2006.

E&P began to undertake its process of reviewing the work plans for the advisory committees it oversees on Thursday, February 23 and is working to engage the committee chairs in a more meaningful dialogue regarding their work plans this year.

Committee members reviewed the work plans of the following committees: Judicial Service Advisory Committee, Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research, Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, Court Technology Advisory Committee, Court Interpreters Advisory Panel, and the Court Executives Advisory Committee.

Justice Huffman also reported that the Chief Justice assigned oversight of the new Probate Conservatorship Task Force to the E&P. At its February 23 meeting, E&P met with staff of the task force.

Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee
Justice Marvin R. Baxter, chair of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC), reported that the committee met twice since the last council meeting.

At the January 6, 2006, meeting, legislative proposals on probate conservatorships were brought before the committee.

On February 9, 2006, the committee took positions on a proposal concerning limited-term employees of trial courts and two proposals on conservatorships. The legislative deadline to introduce bills is February 24, 2006. Staff of the AOC Office of Governmental Affairs are now reviewing these bills. In future reports, Justice Baxter will keep members of the Judicial Council informed on the progress of bills of interest, including council-sponsored bills.

On Tuesday, February 28, 2006, the Judicial Council will host the 12th annual Judicial-Legislative-Executive Forum at the state Capitol. The Bench-Bar Coalition's day in Sacramento is also planned for Tuesday, February 28, 2006.

Rules and Projects Committee
Judge Suzanne N. Kingsbury, chair of the Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO), reported that the committee met three times in person since the last council meeting.

On December 14, 2005, the committee met to review 12 proposals to circulate for public comment during the winter cycle. Following public circulation and further review by the advisory committees and RUPRO, these proposals will come before the Judicial Council at the April 2006 business meeting.

On January 10, 2006, the committee met to review the rules reorganization proposals to circulate for public comment. Following public circulation and further review by the

advisory committees and RUPRO, these proposals will come before the Judicial Council at the June 2006 business meeting. The deadline for public comment on the proposals is March 3.

On February 22, 2006, RUPRO met to review the 2006 work plans proposed by 12 advisory committees and task forces for which RUPRO has oversight responsibility. Lead staff for each of the advisory committees and task forces were present. Advisory committee and task force chairs were invited to the meeting. Committee members discussed each proposed work plan with lead staff, made revisions, and approved the plans as revised.

Members of RUPRO also communicated by e-mail to recommend two proposals on the consent agenda. The first is a proposal for amendment of rule 38.3 of the California Rules of Court to correct a clerical error in subdivision (g) and revision of form JV-820 to correct an unintended conflict with rule 38(e)(5). This is item 3 on today's consent agenda. The second is a proposal for a minor revision to update the *Information Sheet on Waiver of Court Fees and Costs* (form 982(a)(17)(A)), item 6 on the consent agenda.

Administrative Director's Report
Mr. William C. Vickrey reported on the search conducted to fill the regional administrative director position vacated by Mr. Michael M. Roddy in the Northern/Central Region. Ms. Jody Patel was introduced as the new regional administrative director as of March 1, 2006. Mr. Ronald G. Overholt also commented on the search process and noted how pleased he was that Ms. Patel had accepted the position.

Mr. Vickrey reported on attending an education and orientation workshop for court interpreters in Southern California, held at the AOC Southern Regional Office.

Mr. Vickrey also announced the presentation of a joint resolution to acknowledge Presiding Judge William A. MacLaughlin and Assistant Presiding Judge J. Stephen Czuleger of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, on being named the *Los Angeles Metropolitan News-Enterprise* "Persons of the Year" for 2005, in recognition of their leadership in enhancing the Los Angeles County court's collaboration with the state judicial branch and other agencies involved in the justice process. (A copy of the resolution is attached to these minutes.)

Chief Justice's Report
Chief Justice Ronald M. George announced that resolutions had been prepared recognizing judicial branch individuals, courts, and organizations that made extraordinary efforts to provide relief following the hurricanes in the southern United States at the end of 2005. (A copy of the resolution is attached to these minutes.) Resolutions were presented to:

- *Judge William C. Pate and the Superior Court of San Diego County*
  The Chief Justice noted that Judge Pate personally drove a truckload of surplus office furniture and supplies 2,000 miles to southern Mississippi. This was the first shipment other than federal aid to arrive to help courts rebuild in that region. With help from the county district attorney, the local bar association, the County of San Diego, and the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Judge Pate and the superior court organized a second shipment of equipment to Mississippi—this time filling a semi trailer with three times the amount of supplies as the first trip. Including both trips, the court estimates that several copiers, a couple dozen desks, a couple dozen file cabinets, 3 conference tables, 30 computers, and 50 office chairs, along with miscellaneous office supplies, were delivered to the coastal courts in Mississippi.

  The Chief Justice also mentioned a letter received from Chief Justice James Smith of the Supreme Court of Mississippi, praising the efforts of the Superior Court of San Diego County, and the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District.

- *Superior Court of Alameda County*
  The Chief Justice noted that staff from the Superior Court of Alameda County donated more than $15,000 to the American Red Cross relief effort.

  Presiding Judge George C. Hernandez, Jr., received the resolution on behalf of the court. Council member Judge Barbara J. Miller was the presiding judge in the Superior Court of Alameda County at the time.

- *Superior Court of Ventura County*
  The Chief Justice reported that staff from the Superior Court of Ventura County made a generous contribution of several thousand dollars and nearly 300 bags of clothing toward the relief effort.

  Mr. Michael D. Planet, executive officer, received the resolution on behalf of the court.

- *Superior Court of Riverside County*
  The Chief Justice noted that staff from the Superior Court of Riverside County donated several thousand dollars of funds to the American Red Cross relief effort.

  Council member and Presiding Judge Sharon J. Waters received the resolution on behalf of the court. Chief Justice George mentioned that Ms. Sue Martin, who had been invited to accept the resolution, was unable to attend.

- *Administrative Office of the Courts and Foundation of the State Bar*
  The Chief Justice reported that staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Foundation of the State Bar of California worked to establish the Courts and Families

Hurricane Recovery Fund, which collected more than $5,000 from judges and staff in the superior courts and staff in the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Ms. Diane Nunn, Director of the AOC's Center for Families, Children & the Courts, and Ms. Leslie Hatamiya, Executive Director of the Foundation of the State Bar of California, accepted the resolution on behalf of their respective organizations.

- Chief Justice George noted that the actions mentioned in the resolutions were representative of many relief efforts undertaken by those in the court system, including those of court staff in Humboldt, Merced, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Siskiyou, and other counties. Resolutions will be mailed to these named courts.

The Chief Justice then briefly welcomed a Daily Journal reporter covering the work of the Judicial Council, Ms. Savannah Blackwell.

The Chief Justice reported that since the council's last meeting, he had several speaking engagements including the Chancery Club in Los Angeles, the Italian-American Bar Association, the Contra Costa County Bar Association, the Sonoma County Court, and the Sonoma County Bar. He noted that at these engagements he had emphasized the importance of the council's legislative agenda, particularly the need for new judgeships and to have courthouses included in the infrastructure bond measure.

The Chief Justice then reported that a groundbreaking ceremony was held for the construction of a new courthouse in Fresno for the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District on January 5, 2006. The courthouse is expected to be complete by the spring of 2007.

Chief Justice George also reported that he attended a conference of the Chief Justices of the fifty States and territories. He noted that a primary concern at that meeting were recent manifestations of the continuing threat to the independence of the judiciary. Among such manifestations is a movement that is currently taking place in South Dakota which seeks to establish special grand juries to review judicial decisions. The organizers' intent is to implement a punitive process that would have repercussions for judges whose decisions have been reviewed and called into question. The movement began in Ventura, California, and if its organizers are successful in South Dakota, it is thought that they may try to establish a similar program in California.

The Chief Justice and Justice Marvin R. Baxter attended a meeting with the Sheriff's Association in an effort to work collaboratively in providing courthouse security.

The Chief Justice also reported regarding meetings with legislative leaders to discuss the need for new judgeships and courthouse facilities. He also noted the appointment of Justice Carol A. Corrigan to the California Supreme Court in January.

Chief Justice George then commented about the passing of Mr. James Pfeiffer, the husband of AOC staff member Ms. Bonnie Hough and founding executive director of the Foundation of the State Bar. He noted that Mr. Pfeiffer showed great commitment to improving the justice system through the foundation's law related grants, scholarships, education efforts, and outreach programs. Mr. Pfeiffer also successfully increased corporate sponsorships over the time of his service as director.

Additionally, Mr. Pfeiffer served as executive director of the California Supreme Court Historical Society, where he was dedicated to the recovery, presentation, and promotion of California's judicial and legal history. The Chief Justice concluded his comments by noting that Mr. Pfeiffer was admired and loved for his warm personality as well as his diverse interests and talents. He announced that the council would adjourn the day's meeting in Mr. Pfeiffer's memory.

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 1–6)

Item 1 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program: Midyear Funding Reallocation for Fiscal Year 2005–2006

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the council approve the reallocation of non–trial court funding to local courts for the child support commissioner and family law facilitator program. The funds for this program are provided by a cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council. Two-thirds of these funds are federal and the remaining one-third is from the state General Fund (non–trial court funding).

Council action
The Judicial Council, effective immediately,

1. Approved the reallocation for funding of child support commissioners for fiscal year 2005–2006; and
2. Approved the reallocation for funding of family law facilitators for fiscal year 2005–2006.

Item 2 A Review of California's Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2005

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the council approve the attached report entitled Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2005 and direct staff to forward it to the Legislature.

Council action
The Judicial Council approved the report entitled *Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2005* and directed AOC staff to forward it to the Legislature.

Item 3 Juvenile Law: Correction of Rule 38.3(g) Regarding Stay of a Posttermination Placement Order Pending Appeal of Placement Order After Termination of Parental Rights (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.28); Clarification of Notice on Form JV-820 (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26(1); Rule 38) (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 38.3(g); revise form JV-820)

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends amendment of a rule and revision of a form. Rule 38.3 of the California Rules of Court would be amended regarding stays of posttermination placement orders to correct a clerical error from the spring 2005 Rules and Projects Committee comment cycle, which resulted in the wrong language being inserted into the rule. The Notice of Intent to File Writ Petition and Request for Record (form JV-820) would be revised to assure consistency between rule 38(e)(5)and the form.

Council action
The Judicial Council, effective February 24, 2006:

1. Amended rule 38.3(g) of the California Rules of Court to correct a clerical error; and
2. Revised form JV-820 to correct an unintended conflict with rule 38(e)(5).

Item 4 Annual Report of Fiscal Year 2004–2005 Trial Court Expenditures

AOC staff recommends that the council approve the Annual Report of Trial Court Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2004–2005.

Council action
The Judicial Council approved the *Annual Report of Trial Court Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2004–2005* for subsequent submission to the Legislature.

Item 5 Court Facilities Planning: Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2007–2008

AOC staff recommends adoption of the updated Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, Fiscal Year 2007–2008 for AOC and court facilities and submission of the updated plan to the state Department of Finance, under Government Code section 70391. AOC staff also recommends delegation of authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to make technical corrections to the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, as necessary. Annual

submission of an updated Five-Year Infrastructure Plan complements the state budget process for appropriating state funds for infrastructure.

Council action
The Judicial Council:

1. Adopted the *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, Fiscal Year 2007–2008* and directed staff to submit it to the Department of Finance; and
2. Delegated authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to make technical corrections to the AOC's *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan,* as necessary.

Item 6 Update of the *Information Sheet on Waiver of Court Fees and Costs* (revise form 982(a)(17)(A))

AOC staff recommends that the Judicial Council revise the Information Sheet on Waiver of Court Fees and Costs to reflect 2006 increases in the federal poverty guidelines. The information sheet provides monthly income figures on which a court may base a decision to grant in forma pauperis status.

Council action
The Judicial Council, effective immediately, revised the *Information Sheet on Waiver of Court Fees and Costs* (form 982(a)(17)(A), to conform to the 2006 federal poverty guidelines.

DISCUSSION AGENDA (ITEMS 7–10)

Item 7 Judicial Branch Education: Recommendation for Judicial Education on Science and Technology

The Science and the Law Steering Committee recommends approval of guidelines for judicial education on science and technology. The recommendation directs the Science and the Law Education Committee, appointed by the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER), to administer a statewide judicial education plan.

Council action
The Judicial Council established a statewide judicial education plan on science and technology by:

1. Approving the following guidelines for judicial education on science and technology, congruent with the ethical standards applicable under the California Code of Judicial Ethics:

A. Judicial education on science and technology should be made as widely available as possible to the California judiciary, including appellate justices, trial judges, subordinate judicial officers, and judges participating in the Assigned Judges Program, to assist them in their evaluation of scientific evidence and expert testimony, and to further the administration of justice.
B. The focus of judicial education on science and technology should be on increasing the "science literacy" of jurists in subject-matter areas that arise in the courtroom and court administration, including, but not limited to, the following key areas:

   (1) Computer Science and Digital Technology—education to assist in the evaluation of technological evidence, the presentation of evidence in the courtroom, and the use of computers in case and court administration.
   (2) Medical Science—education to assist in the evaluation of medical evidence and physician testimony.
   (3) Pharmacology—education on drugs to assist in the evaluation of addictive disorders and treatment issues.
   (4) Genetics—education on DNA and related science such as biochemistry and molecular biology as it relates to identification, privacy, predictive behavior, and other forensics issues.
   (5) Environmental Science—education to assist in the evaluation of environmental issues, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), land use, and water rights cases.
   (6) Agricultural Science—education on agronomy, genetically modified foods, and agricultural engineering.
   (7) Science and Business—education on commercial applications of science, such as biotechnology, nanotechnology, and other high-technology industries, as well as privacy issues implicated by certain applications.
   (8) Physics and Engineering—education on science underlying failure analysis, accident reconstruction, and forensics.

C. The educational framework for study of each of the key subject-matter areas should include the following components:

   (1) Glossary and vocabulary builders.
   (2) Primers for scientific literacy on the application of concepts and principles relating to life science, physical science, and technology.
   (3) Explanation and analysis of the scientific method, such as the use of observational data and mathematics (e.g., probabilities and statistics) as it relates to judicial inquiry (e.g., admissibility, burden of proof) and legal issues that arise in cases (e.g., causation).
   (4) Compendium of cases and statutes.
   (5) Case management practices, tips, and techniques.

(6) Judicial ethics and fairness colloquy.
(7) Codes of ethics and conduct for physicians, scientists, engineers, and other scientific professionals (e.g., bioethics and medical ethics).
(8) Case studies and applications for different court assignments (e.g., civil, criminal, juvenile, family, probate, and collaborative courts).

2. Directing the Science and the Law Education Committee, appointed by the Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER), to:

A. Establish an ad hoc panel of judges and scientists to identify and consult on emerging issues in science and technology.
B. Develop a process for identifying and recruiting educators in science and technology who are able to communicate balanced information in plain English.
C. Liaison with the Judicial Technology Education Committee on judicial education.
D. Adopt a blended delivery mechanism for judicial education on science and technology.
E. Develop an online Science and the Law resource and Web site to give the judiciary access to a wide variety of materials.
F. With guidance from the Office of the General Counsel, build partnerships with scientific organizations and institutes of higher learning to maximize beneficial educational opportunities. Key considerations include the following:

(1) Potential partners share values consistent with those of the courts.
(2) Partnerships are structured to avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest that could result from partnering with an entity
(a) That currently is, or is likely to become involved, in litigation before the court;
(b) That does or seeks to do business with the court; or
(c) Whose interests or the interests of its funding sources currently are, or are reasonably likely to come, before the court.
(3) Ethical considerations under the California Code of Judicial Ethics for judicial officers attending co-sponsored educational opportunities.

G. Cooperate and coordinate with the federal judiciary on judicial education.

Item 8 Judicial Council Advisory Committee Short-Term Response Plans and Recommendations for Improving Public Trust and Confidence in the California Courts

AOC staff reported on specific advisory committee projects, tasks, initiatives, endorsements, and recommendations for addressing the issues raised by the Judicial Council's 2005 Public Trust and Confidence Survey.

> ***Council action***
> This was an information item only.

Item 9 Funding to Plan, Implement, and Improve Self-Help Assistance

AOC staff reported on initiatives to support the trial courts in planning, implementing, and improving assistance to self-represented litigants.

> ***Council action***
> This was an information item only.

Item 10 Update and Discussion of Pending Council Initiatives

AOC staff reported on new and ongoing council initiatives in the following areas:

- Interpreters in civil cases
- Probate conservatorships
- Domestic violence cases
- Foster care
- Infrastructure review

> ***Council action***
> This was an information item only.

Circulating Orders

Copies of appointment orders are for information only; no action was necessary.

Appointment Orders

Copies of appointment orders are for information only; no action was necessary.

Mandated Reports

The *Annual Report of Fiscal Year 2004–2005 Court Reporter Fees Collected and Expenditures for Court Reporter Services in Superior Court Civil Proceedings*, which was submitted to the legislature on January 27, 2006, was distributed with meeting materials for council information only; no action was necessary.

There being no further public business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. in the memory of Mr. James E. Pfeiffer, founding executive director of the Foundation of the State Bar of California and former executive director of the California Supreme Court Historical Society, who passed away on January 14, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts and
Secretary of the Judicial Council

Judicial Council of California

Administrative Office of the Courts

Resolution

—COMMENDING—

Hon. William A. MacLaughlin
&
Hon. J. Stephen Czuleger

Whereas the Judicial Council of California and the Administrative Office of the Courts wish to congratulate Presiding Judge William A. MacLaughlin and Assistant Presiding Judge J. Stephen Czuleger of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles on being named the *Los Angeles Metropolitan News-Enterprise* "Persons of the Year" for 2005, in recognition of their leadership in enhancing the Los Angeles court's collaboration with the state judicial branch and other agencies involved in the justice process;

Whereas at the awards ceremony, Judges MacLaughlin and Czuleger were lauded by leaders from the state court system, state and local bar associations, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and Los Angeles County government for their efforts to strengthen positive working relationships for the benefit of the public and all justice system stakeholders;

Whereas they have been, in particular, tremendous partners with the Chief Justice and the Judicial Council, as well as with their colleagues, the presiding judges of the other 57 counties in California, in an effort to protect a strong, impartial, fair, and accessible court system;

Whereas their commitment to achieving an appropriate balance between the need to improve the judicial branch's ability to ensure the consistent administration of justice statewide and the ability of local courts to effectively manage resources to best serve their communities has contributed to identifying and resolving many challenging issues for the branch; and

Whereas each possesses the personal and professional qualities that make an exceptional judicial leader: Judge McLaughlin's intelligence, pragmatism, decisiveness, and unflappable demeanor and Judge Czuleger's analytical skill, passion, directness, and optimism personify the dynamic, forward-thinking, and progressive leadership that is evident throughout California's court system and is vital for advancing judicial administration reform;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Judicial Council of California and the Administrative Office of the Courts commend Judge MacLaughlin and Judge Czuleger and express our great appreciation for their outstanding collaborative leadership on behalf of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, the judicial branch of government, and the people of California.

I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-fourth day of February, 2006

Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council of California

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts

Judicial Council of California

Administrative Office of the Courts

Resolution

—COMMENDING—

The California Court System for Aiding Hurricane Victims

Whereas in August and September of 2005, residents of the states of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi were victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, two of the most catastrophic natural disasters in the history of the United States;

Whereas the court systems in those states sustained massive damage to their facilities and equipment as a result of the storms' devastation;

Whereas Judge William C. Pate, Superior Court of San Diego County, personally drove a truckload of supplies to southern Mississippi; and with help from the district attorney, the local bar association, the County of San Diego, and the Fourth Appellate District of the Court of Appeal, Judge Pate and the superior court organized a second, larger shipment of equipment to Mississippi;

Whereas staff from the Superior Court of Alameda County donated more than $15,000 to the American Red Cross's relief effort;

Whereas staff from the Superior Court of Riverside County donated over $6,600 in vacation, annual, and sick leave to the American Red Cross's relief effort;

Whereas staff from the Superior Court of Ventura County collected more than $6,000 and clothing for the relief effort;

Whereas court staff from Humboldt, Merced, San Luis Obispo, San Bernardino, Shasta, Siskiyou, and other California counties contributed to the relief effort; and

Whereas staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the Foundation of the State Bar of California worked together to establish the Courts and Families Hurricane Recovery Fund, which collected $5,120 from the AOC, the courts, the bar, and other justice system partners;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Judicial Council of California and the Administrative Office of the Courts recognize the time and generosity of the aforementioned individuals, courts, and organizations for their tireless efforts to help victims in the Gulf Coast region. Their efforts represent the philanthropic spirit of those working in the California courts and striving for equal access to justice for all.

I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-fourth day of February, 2006

Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council of California

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts