

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 meeting of October 27, 2011. 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 <http://www.courts.ca.gov>.

>> ...for the delay, but we had a tremendous opportunity to visit with Chief Justice George and his wife in conjunction with this building, the Ronald State Complex. At this time we'll turn it over to Justice Miller.

>> Thank you, Chief Justice. And welcome to all those who are here now and those who may be listening to our public education session which is open to the public and being broadcast. I believe that all of you know from the agenda that was posted for today's education session that we had reserved most if not all of our time to receive an update in discussion about the case management system. Including the alternatives and options that we had asked them at our July meeting to come back and discuss with us, including funding costs, deployment and different alternatives and options. However, there have been some what I believe new and very exciting positive developments. We're going to hear about those in a moment from the participants today. And to a great extent those developments -- and that is, this possibility, as you'll find out of new funding sources for deployment -- have in essence eclipsed the report that was submitted for our meeting today.

At our July meeting the Judicial Council approved a drastic reduced level of funds for CCMS. In essence we redirected almost if not more than 50 million dollars to trial court operations, leaving them with a budget of 14.2 million dollars. We also directed CCMS and the committees to return to the council at this particular meeting with options for moving forward within the budget constraints that we all know have impacted this year and in the years to come. And you've seen the report. And they did that. They provided us an extensive report with options and associated potential costs. However, because of these new and recent developments, that could substantially change how we approach CCMS, including potential substantial reduction in the costs of deployment. I've asked them to put those reports aside and for the time being just deal with the various alternatives and the potential for new funding that we will hear about and focus particularly and specifically on this recent development. In addition, with our approval, as we will find out today, we're going to ask them to take 90 days, 12 weeks approximately, to conduct an investigation and due diligence into this new potential funding and then come back to us in a meeting either in December or January or when they are prepared to detail the information concerning this new funding opportunity and then with their recommendation. So for the session today we will hear from justice Terence Bruiniers, Judge Herman, others from the CCMS team and they will brief us on this new funding opportunity. And again, as I have indicated, these that -- at our business meeting will require our approval to move forward in that particular direction.

So again, they will talk to us today about the review of recent activities within CCMS since July and to date, they will talk about the warranty issues and how that impacts CCMS in deployment, they'll talk about technical needs of the trial courts, trial courts estimates of

maintaining current systems and those courts which have failing systems or ill equipped technical systems. There are many of us as I look around the room on the Judicial Council who were not around when this project began or during most of the development. But as we have heard from July and as you will hear today, it's now been completely developed, it is a project and a commodity which we own. This, as you all know, was a collaborative effort. And I want to congratulate Justice Terence Bruiniers and your team of committee members and staff, because you have done an excellent, excellent job over this last year in getting this to the position where we are today. And I know that that has involved a group of many people, 22 judges, 19 CEOs, 27 trial court representatives, 5 appellate justices, and 13 justice partner members. You are to be congratulated. You have done a great job in getting us to the position we are today. Having said that, though, the ultimate responsibility is ours as a Judicial Council. We are the ultimate governing committee. And what ever issues may have occurred in the past, we now have a governance process, we now have a system that allows us to provide appropriate oversight and provide direction and policy with regards to this very important issue. And in addition we've been tasked with providing significant prudent oversight of the product while at the same time making sure that we constrain ourselves within the budget limitations and protect the public taxpayer investment.

Again, in July the Council approved in essence what we've all called a life support funding for CCMS for this current fiscal year. And tomorrow as a council we'll be asked to provide additional policy and direction with regards to a potential new funding source that will hopefully provide that mechanism to expedite deployment to those courts that we all know that are in dire need of assist -- a system that works and that can provide an appropriate basis to conduct the work that they do we know there are courts that are ready, able and willing to become earlier adopters and provide the completed testing for this product.

So again, Justice Terence Bruiniers, we want to thank you for being here and for the work that you and others have done. And we look forward to hearing from you now with regards to this new potential funding source and update and review on where we are and how we got here. So thank you.

>> Hon. Terence Bruiniers: Thank you Justice Miller, Chief Justice, members of the Council. As Justice Miller indicated we were prepared to come here today with some fairly detailed and specific recommendations to make to you on how we could deploy CCMS within our very limited existing budget and as Justice Miller also mentioned we've had what I think is a major development that we should focus on today. I will focus on today in my remarks. I will begin by updating you on what has happened since the last council meeting. There have been quite a few developments.

The first is that we completed on August 26th our external component product acceptance testing. And that was all of the external components with one single exception. And that was the -- our JIPSUS reporting systems. That issue we ran into a little problem on when we recognized that we had developed the system with a prior version of JIPSUS in mind, and we were now trying to test to a more recent version of JIPSUS that required a little separate track to pursue those. But the -- if you will recall, the external components are -- we refer to as the -- our justice partner interfaces, the document management system, our electronic filing, the -- all of those pieces that beyond the core product we had accepted the core product back in April of this year.

So over the past month the work has been proceeding on the JIPSUS reports. As of this week all of the final testing has been completed on the JIPSUS reports and successfully completed. So we should be accepting the product or be in a position where we are required to accept the product within the -- perhaps the next week. We're now reviewing all of the receivables under the contract to confirm that we have those in our possession. But the development work is effectively done. The product works. It will do what we designed it to do. On August 31st we received the independent reports which were requested by both the legislature and by this council. We briefly discussed those with the council the last occasion that we -- and we provided you with copies of the reports, obviously on fairly short notice.

Integrated Systems Diagnostics did the -- referred to as the scampy evaluation, the benchmark testing for Deloitte and Deloitte's processes, K3 solutions did the assessment report. Those vendors were selected in consultation with the bureau of state audits, and the state technology agency. The scope of work was defined in cooperation with the bureau of state audits and the state technology agency. Those reports indicated that there were some gaps in Deloitte's processes that needed to be addressed going forward on future activities. And K3 solutions included we had -- we still had a few gaps in our processes that we needed to address going forward. We have prepared action plans to deal with both the Deloitte issues and the branch issues. Those action plans are nearly complete. We ask K3 as an outside independent party to review those action plans much that's in process now. Bottom line, however, was that K3 solutions concluded that this is a product that will work as designed when we deploy it.

Now, because we only had limited time to provide the reports to you before the last meeting, we did ask representatives from ISD and K3 to be here with us today. Mr. Paul Byrnes from ISD and Miss Donna Crull from K3 are here to respond to or answer any questions that any member of the council might have regarding those reports.

Are there any questions that members of the Council would like to direct to either Mr. Byrnes or Ms. Crull?

>> I did notice there were some things that were raised in these reports. But are you saying that everything's now been addressed and is going to be fixed, or however you want to put it? Because all --

>> Hon. Terence Bruiniers: All of the issues addressed in both the report, that is ISD report and the K3 report are encompassed within separate action plans, one for Deloitte, one for our own project management office. And Mark --

>> The court -- so on the reports, there were no findings that required remediation. Actually, there was one. And that was to add comments to certain sections of the code. Which we were working on already.

>> Explain, Mark, in this context the difference between mediation and the advice go forward in terms of what to -- what to address in terms of future process.

>> Mark: Sure. So in the scampy report, just to give you some background, the scampy report reviewed all of the Deloitte processes throughout the life cycle of the software development process. And identified as justice Terence Bruiniers said certain structural weaknesses in their process. And they also said, as a result of those weaknesses, there may or may not be issues

with the existing application. And K3 came in, and they did their own evaluation. They took the scampy report and focussed specifically on those areas of weakness identified in the scampy report to determine are there any structural weaknesses in the application as a result of weaknesses in the process? If there were, they -- they would say there are remediation -- in other words, you have to fix those right now. Or are those processes and weaknesses --

>> Can you hear -- (recording.)

>> I hope I didn't -- I have a tendency to do that. And I apologize.
(Laughter)

>> The bottom line is that are these -- are these weaknesses -- did these weaknesses result in any defects in the application?
And the answer is no.

>> Just -- it's just hard to know from -- these reports are difficult for a layperson to understand. I mean, when they say in the K3 report -- (recording voice.)
(Laughter)

>> There are desire -- comments, median problems here and there. And in the other report there's high risks here and there. I mean, it doesn't -- it doesn't really --

>> Judge Fine --

>> What the reports are designed to do, first of all let's just talk about the ISD report with respect to Deloitte. That report essentially benchmarked Deloitte's processes against this -- what's referred to as CMMI capability and maturing model to see whether there were gaps. And if so, where -- were those -- where those gaps were, what sort of risk they posed. gain, not retrospectively, but going forward with -- with this product and process. o those issues -- all of them needed to be addressed prospectively. And that's what the action plans are designed to do. The scampy process is a process improvement. The idea is to make sure that you are meeting the best practices and industry standards and that to the extent you're not, what do you have to do to fix it? And to -- to come up to that level. So I think the -- the important message was that while they were gaps, nothing there resulted in any defect being problem, or issue with the product. And going forward as we go into deployment and maintenance, there are things that we needed to address that would continue to present risks if we didn't deal with them.

So that's what the action plans are designed to do. We made sure that all of those issues are addressed. And that's why we ask K3 to review those action plans to make sure that they were adequate for that purpose.

>> And they're saying these plans are adequate?

>> We don't have the action plans completed, but we're close, I think.

>> They are. It's --

>> I don't know.

>> You're -- you're representing to us the system works, there were no significant problems, is that what you're telling us?

>> That's correct. And for the action plans going forward -- and remember, that's -- so when we're working with Deloitte, if we choose to work with Deloitte, what they're saying is we need to make sure that as they develop new functionality, and they work with the application, they address the areas of weakness that were -- that were present prior to that. And so we have a detailed action plan. It was just completed yesterday. And K3 is satisfied with it. And Mark Dustman reviewed it. He's satisfied with it. I reviewed it. I'm satisfied with it. And now we're going to present it to the executive committee.

And again, all that work is, when we move forward with the application and do further development, there's nothing required to go in and fix the application.

>> But as I said, we do have the representatives from both ISD and K3 here. If you want completely unfiltered information from them, they're here to answer your questions.

>> I don't know, I don't want to do -- to take up a lot of time if -- if -- if the people are satisfied. I just noted -- I wouldn't say these reports gave you a clean bill of health across the board and everything. They both identified some weaknesses and problems.

>> Absolutely.

>> So I just wanted to know -- you know, what this means and what it means going forward. If you're saying everything's fine now, both -- both these companies are satisfied and have full confidence in this project, then that may be enough.

I defer to what other people want.

>> Two things, Justice Hull?

>> Thank you, Chief. Perhaps, Justice.

>> Hon. Terence Bruiniers: In response to Justice Pine's question -- I'm sorry, Judge Pine.

>> Battlefield promotion.

>> He's so close to retirement, he deserves elevation.

(Laughter)

>> But --

>> Reconsider.

>> In response to Judge Pine's question, you seem to draw a distinction between what you referred to as gaps that were identified versus things that had to be remediated, fixed, however you want to do it. Could you explain what a gap is under the circumstance?

>> What I refer to as a gap is a failure to comply entirely. In most cases there was at least partial compliance. Failure to comply entirely with a CMMI standard or benchmark. And in most of the areas the way for example, supplied fully or partially. There were some areas where they did not. Where ISD identified -- (lost audio --) forward. And both product development and maintenance, continuing development of the product, and deployment, if we did not deal with those gaps -- closed those gaps, there would be continuing risks that we would face in the process and therefore we needed to address those. And we have. And those -- the action plans to which you refer address the gaps.

>> Exactly. Thank you.

>> Justice Terence Bruiniers and Mark, can I suggest that we ask our consultants to come up and give that brief in their own words? Kind of statement.

>> Let me ask them to come up first. They did the work.

>> I promise that we weren't going to ask them to do a presentation, only respond to question, but I'm sure that Mr. Byrnes --

>> There you go. This is court.
(Laughter)

>> Pardon me for my little lack of voice. I had a little laryngitis. Justice Terence Bruiniers did an excellent job of describing it, frankly.

>> Can you introduce yourself?

>> I'm Paul Verens from Integrated Systems Diagnostics, I was on the team that did the benchmark. As a benchmarking event it's really a snapshot in time. And we were looking back all the way, you know, not just for the current time but we were looking back at the beginning of the life cycle as well. When there were significant issues that were uncovered and then were beginning to be remediated. And kind of the point in time that we were at in the summer, the last 18 months of the program fixing issues in the program, and in their processes was significantly better than what had been done in the early part of the program. So you had a trend of already correcting a lot of the issues that have been found over time. Some of them found by the project management office, some found internally.

What we did is identified current gaps that -- not so much were an issue with operational functionality of the program, but rather the efficiency of how they would manage that application and deployment and maintenance going forward. And that's where we identified the higher risk items. Not that there -- to be clear, not that there would be an issue with the operations, but more or less would the effectiveness or efficiency, but how they would do that

over time. So there were key issues that were identified that would reflect potential cost savings over time if they addressed the gaps.

>> Now, he was here to answer questions. Any questions from those comments?

>> Well, I guess as an action plan which you now have to review, but --

>> K3 is doing that, Judge Pens --

>> I mean, can you give us any kind of overall assurance that we've got a system here that is going to do what we want it to do and that it works as represented?

>> That's really the -- the K3 scope of work that what they've focussed on. The -- Mr. Byrnes' company focussed strictly on Deloitte and its internal processes and -- and benchmarking it on the scampy system.

>> Maybe we'll have to hear from him.

>> Just one observation, Judge Pines, and that is -- and this is a little bit separated from this particular fray, but whenever there's a large enterprise system being developed and deployed, you want independent validation and verification. And we've had all the way along independent validation and verification. But every pair of eyes can help you go forward. So this document really helps us in terms of the go-forward, identifying project risks that can be avoided.

>> I think to directly respond to your question, Judge Pine, I can ask Ms. Crull to come up, unless anybody has any questions for Mr. Byrnes.

>> No.

>> Thank you. Thank you very much. Ms. Crull?

>> Ms. Donna Crull: I'm Donna Crull, I'm the director of Quality Assurance for K3 Solutions. I was not involved on the assessment team, however I spent a good bit of time with Victor Coup, who managed the assessment team, discussing what was found and agreeing with him or coming to concurrence with him on the findings.

>> And your question, Judge Pines, I think is best directed to Ms.Crull.

>> Did you hear my question before? I see here there are comments here about some problems that have been identified on Pages 5 to 6 and 24 through 31. I just -- it's hard for me to understand how significant these are. Just that you've red flagged a number of things here, so we're trying to make some decision on -- on this system and the -- for all of us, given the investment that's been made here, we want to know that your company as independent auditor/reviewer, has confidence in this system and can give us some assurance that it's going to do what it was intended to do.

>> Ms. Donna Crull: Based on -- so Victor and I have sat down, him and I went through these findings one by one. Based on what I saw and the areas that were identified, I cannot say that there is a major risk to you going forward with this system. There are some issues that need to be addressed, there are some opportunities for improvement. But overall I believe that the system does what it's supposed to do.

>> But there's some -- there's some minor risks?

>> Ms. Donna Crull: There are. And they're identified in the report. But there are things that were mentioned that are nice to have. So there's -- those are what I'm calling opportunities for improvement. So you have the nice to have's, you have some minor areas that need to be addressed.

>> And you -- you have reviewed the -- the action plan. Can you address that?

>> Ms. Donna Crull: I have. That's part of what I was talking about. So part of what I saw in the action plan, the actions that are there are sufficient to address the concerns as well.

>> Assuming those actions are taken and performed.

>> Ms. Donna Crull: Correct.

>> Is that what you mean?

>> Ms. Donna Crull: Correct.

>> Are there any other questions for Ms. Crull?

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Ms. Donna Crull: Thank you.

>> Do you understand? -- I don't understand...

>> We have met since the third party evaluations have come in with the Bureau of State audits. They have copies of our reports. We will be giving them copies of our action plan as well. We have met with the legislative staff to review the findings in both reports. I met with them, Mark met with them.

We have a second meeting with legislative staff for those who couldn't attend the first meeting on I believe November 8th. And we will have representatives from ISD and K3 with us at those meetings as well. At the first meeting Victor coup from K3 joined us at that meeting and he was able to respond to any questions or issues by legislative staff as well.

So I think that... I think both the -- the K3 and the ISD reports together with our action plans should, in my view, be reasonably satisfactory to anybody looking at those. And frankly, demonstrates that we have dealt with or are in the process of dealing with issues that were raised or presented by the audit and by the -- by the technology audits.

On September 23rd the executive governance committee and the internal council committee met to review and consider some of the alternatives for CCMS deployment. And we've had Mark Moore and his staff and Rene Hatcher working on these very hard, trying to sharpen their pencils as finely as they could to come up with realistic alternatives within the budget constraints that -- that we face. That was a directive from the Council.

At that meeting the committee asked Mark and his staff to further refine those, come up with some additional alternatives. They -- those were presented to the internal committees on October 20th. We had some detailed recommendations. We were prepared to present today. These were deployment alternatives that were refined after consultation with the early adoptive courts with San Luis Obispo and with Ventura.

The -- in the intervening time, as I discussed with the committee and executive session, we have an additional alternative available to us that I think is literally a game-changer, that gives us an opportunity to proceed with CCMS deployment on a faster timeline and to expand our deployment to include not only San Luis Obispo, and Ventura, but to also replace the V2 criminal and traffic system in the Fresno superior court, which would result in an additional cost savings to us of 6 million dollars a year.

That is a potential grant opportunity that we discussed this morning. The -- as I mentioned to the council, that the genesis of that grant opportunity was the former administrative director, Bill Vickery, having seen a published report about some efforts by Dr. Patrick Soon-Shiong, and his efforts to develop a national healthcare and medical research grid. Mr. Vickery had some meetings with Dr. Soon-Shiong, those were fast I will dated by former Senator Jim Dunn, who had some personal contacts with Dr. Soon-Shiong. We did issue a request for information in January of last year, January 2010. At least soliciting general interest and potential outside funding sources I think our situation was certainly uncertain at that point in time and certainly wasn't conducive to trying to follow up or pursue those possible alternatives.

But we did keep in contact with Dr. Soon-Shiong in the meantime. Now that we have a -- developed and a satisfactory product, I think all parties were interested in moving forward. Those discussions resulted in a meeting on October 5th. And Los Angeles, that meeting was attended by Dr. Soon-Shiong, by his IT staff, and by the chairs of our governance committees. The. We also had representatives of the senior leadership of the State Bar including Senator Dunn. The result is a proposed letter of intent that will be circulated to members of the council if it has not been already, that we will be asking the council to address and consider further tomorrow but we have an offer of grant funding from the Chan Soon-Shiong Foundation, which is a 501(c)(3) philanthropic organization that was founded by Dr. Soon-Shiong and his wife, funded to something over I think 1 billion dollars. The foundation has pledged approximately a billion dollars already for healthcare and healthcare information projects around the country. They've -- they're currently in a joint venture with the University of Arizona and Arizona State University. And the healthcare transformation institute.

Dr. Soon-Shiong himself is an interesting individual. He is an M. D. He was born in South Africa. He immigrated here from apart tide South Africa. He was a medical researcher at UCLA when he first came here.

And developed and subsequently sold two medical equipment companies. And the -- he is on the fortune 100 list. His personal net worth is estimated to be approximately 7 billion dollars. I think that puts him about No. 39 on that list.

Since he has sold his companies, Dr. Soon-Shiong has focused his attention and efforts on trying to develop an integrated national healthcare and medical research grid.

He's used his personal wealth to fund construction of data centers in Phoenix and Tuscan, Arizona, and recently agreed to build a super computer in Phoenix, Arizona, which will be part of this healthcare grid.

He also invested his personal resources to essentially rescue what is known as the national land to rail. It's a 12,000 mile national grid, both in the state of California and elsewhere across the country of fiber optic network that is -- was designed to serve government and educational institutions.

When that entity was in danger of failing for lack of funding from the government, he stepped in, provided assistance and he now serves as the chair of the entity which operates the national land to rail.

His family foundation and his companies are prepared to offer us assistance both in -- both financial assistance, use of his data centers, use of the national land to rail to connect our courts to those data centers -- and again, these are for the early adopter courts at this point -- and some of the technical expertise of his staff to work with us and to leverage our resources to proceed with deployment.

This gives us the opportunity to move forward not only with the two early adopter courts, but to add Fresno to that list to install the CCMS version of criminal and traffic in that court.

Our grant objectives, again, this allows us to maximize the very limited resources we currently have available to us. It allows us to access the land to rail and the fiber optic network. It allows us to access his data centers. It allows us to access his technical resources. And again, it augments the limited cash that we do have available to us.

It will significantly, dramatically lower the cost of CCMS deployment. It leverages what resources we have available to us. It offers the opportunity for further collaborations with both the foundation and State Bar to approve -- to improve access to justice and -- and I do want to mention that Senator Dunn not only has been very helpful in both maintaining the discussions and negotiations, but in arriving at this agreement. And Senator Dunn, as I mentioned, was present at our October 5th meeting with senior bar leadership. They are also interested in collaborating with us, providing their support and assistance for CCMS deployment; recognizing how important this effort is to the administration of justice in the State of California.

The concept would, again, proceed with the early adopter courts. If we agree to execute the letter of intent, we would have a 12-week due diligence and planning phase. Resulting in a definitive and detailed agreement and budget this project that would of course be subject to approval by the council before we proceed further.

The schedule as you see here, we would hope that we would be in a position to -- with council approval, to execute the letter of intent. We will ask the council to authorize that tomorrow. We would proceed with the due diligence phase if the definitive agreement is approved by the council. We would be ready to start with actual deployment activities right after the first of the year.

We would begin the early adopter deployments with a target of completing those deployments by the end of 2013, early 2014.

Before I move on from that, as I said, it's -- we've -- we did have an opportunity probably not enough opportunity, to review this with the council in executive session this morning. Are there any questions or comments that people wanted to address at this point with regard to the grant opportunity?

>> Justice Terence Bruiniers, thank you for your report. For those who are learning for the first time about this injection of funds, would you comment on what interest Dr. Chan Sue Sun has in case court management systems having dedicated his career to healthcare management?

>> Well, what he has expressed in the meetings that I participated in is his interest in ensuring that for public safety and public welfare reasons that we have the ability within the judicial branch to share material information that is critical to our decision-making. And that's entirely consistent with the interest that he has had in the medical and healthcare grid for a physician or for a Judge to make competent and reasoned decisions, we need to have accurate, current, reliable information.

This project is entirely consistent with his view of the need for the courts as well as the medical community to have that sort of information.

>> Do -- sorry. Could you share with us -- I just might add that Justice Ashman Girsh, and I, also attended that meeting on behalf of the committee along with Justice Miller. Could you share with us -- I think he came in with a specific example that's illustrative of why he might have a cross interest in -- working with the courts.

>> I think the specific issue you're referring to is the -- is the fatality in the foster care.

>> The newspaper article.

>> Certainly that was one of the issues that got his attention on this. It's one of the areas that he has -- is interested in. And thought -- actually it's one of the reasons that Justice Moreno joined us at this meeting. Dr. Sue Sun does have an interest in ensuring child welfare and -- particularly the foster care system is -- has current adequate and accurate information.

>> He also ran through with us a PowerPoint presentation of the horizontally and vertically integrated case management system, if you will, that he has developed in order to bring all the spokes of the healthcare wheel to one hub to allow secured data exchange between a patient, a patient's doctor, all kinds of health hospitals and other healthcare givers. And showed as he walked through it what the parallel was to the system that he had developed to what we're doing on the CCMS side and even suggested through donation of expertise just off the bat some of the things that we could look at in terms of product improvement on our side.

And so he had -- just so everyone knows, his group of technicians went through the CCMS system software and applications and before we even advanced to the point of having this conversation, they had reviewed and confirmed that the -- addresses Judge Pine's question as well -- that the product does work, it's robust, it does what it's supposed to do. And is a positive and -- and competent product.

>> I had -- Mark and his PMO staff have been working with Dr. Sue Sun's IT staff extensively over the course of the last couple months as we tried to move forward on this proposal. We certainly gave them a thorough look under the hood on the product. Mark can perhaps address this a little more. But I said -- again, I was struck as Judge Herman was at this meeting about their very positive assessment of CCMS and they -- they have been impressed with the quality of the product. Mark, did you want to talk about that a little bit?

>> Mark: I think you really covered and got right to the meat of it. The \$1 comment that Mike Travino, the principal I'm working with in Dr. Soon-Shiong's -- what he referred to this is the type of application that Oracle or Microsoft or SAP developed. He thinks it's that good and that sound. And he's impressed about the correlations -- really what he's getting to is what we're trying to accomplish with our case management system has so many parallels to what he's trying to do with his national grid. He thinks it fits really well and that he can help --

>> Can I also ask after the conclusion of some of the comments by Justice Ashman Girston, and Kim Turner, I'd like to hear from the State Bar Senator Dunn's position on this letter of intent. Because they are -- would otherwise be a partner in this collaborative grant. But please, Justice Ashman Girst?

>> As indicated, I was there at the meeting and just reinforce the fact that he became interested in the courts because of his concern about the foster care system and the lack of an integrated information capability throughout the state. At the meeting, by the way, Judge Riser from Ventura was there and gave a demonstration of CCMS to Dr. Patrick Sue Sun and his staff. May have done that previously, they may have seen it. But he gave a -- Judge Riser gave a complete demonstration of the CCMS system. And just on a -- it's a good question. I mean, why would he be involved in this? He's so involved in the medical integration. Why is he involved in this?

And just -- I have personal knowledge that he is an extremely philanthropic individual and that he and his wife are involved in a variety of different charitable interests. So...

>> Thank you. Kim?

>> Yes. So I am so excited about the opportunity that this presents for -- I'm on the CCMS Internal Committee. And also a member of one of the committees that reports to the executive committee.

And I think what's really -- strikes me is that, you know, one of the real synergies we get from CCMS is the ability to link up various systems. DO J and DMV and so forth. But all of us have concerns about data privacy and data integrity and how that runs across various systems and I think it's just so intriguing and exciting to have a partner, a potential strategic partner that's figured out how to do it in healthcare, which is perhaps the most difficult area in which to make sure that you've addressed all of the HIPAA issues and other medical privacy issues.

And so if they've already tackled and figured out a way to get through some of the -- I'm sure -- amazing roadblocks in those systems, I'm sure that they would be an excellent, excellent partner for our venture as we try to figure out how to link up with the foster care network and social services and some of the stakeholders where privacy is a very, very big concern.

>> Well, and one of the things that Dr. Soon-Shiong has mentioned previously is his data centers have the highest level of data security required by the federal government. The -- it's -- it's also interesting for those of us who had a chance to talk to Dr. Sue Sun -- again, I think he's a fascinating individual -- he certainly is a person with -- with broad vision and is extremely enthusiastic about the projects in which he has been involved.

Chief and I saw his presentation on his concept on the national healthcare grid. You sit down to talk with him and he immediately pulls out his diagrams and wants to -- to tell you about it and -- in great detail. Because he is enthusiastic about it and he has put so much of his effort and his own resources into that effort.

And I think he -- he shares that enthusiasm in this effort as well.

>> Thank you. Senator Dunn, Judge Dialba asked a question earlier about this connection of Dr. Patrick sue Sun and his connection earlier. And if you can answer that -- and in your interest in the State Bar in this collaborative grant.

>> Happy to do so, Chief. I will be brief, as I can.
(Laughter)

>> Or cannot be. The State Bar is a relatively new addition to the discussions over the past -- only over the past few months. Our interest, and more specifically, our -- the State Bar's board and our current president, John Streeter, who many of you know, are driven really by two primary factors. The first, which of course is no surprise to any of the individuals around the dais, is the interest of the legal community as represented first by the State Bar Board and its president. As well as in all probability virtually every other legal organization up and down the state, which is over 280 of them -- believe that our state court system should have a case management system yesterday. Or more appropriately, 15 years ago.

And so the passion and interest in seeing a case management system deployed and implemented in our state judiciary is an extremely high priority for our board and for -- I dare to go out on a branch here -- for most of the practicing lawyers throughout the state of California. So that they can serve the interests of their clients efficiently and hopefully less expensively through the implementation of a case management system in our state judiciary.

Second, the State Bar and our board and our president are interested in exploring the possibility of a case management system through this proposal in our State Bar Court, as well as potential other IT upgrades that are subject for future discussions.

Those are the primary two driving forces of the State Bar. And if I had to put it in one sentence, it is basically what Justice Terence Bruiniers indicated before, it is a very strong desire on behalf of the leadership of the State Bar of California to assist in this process of implementing and deploying a case management system in our state judiciary to advance the interests of Judicial Administration.

Thank you, Chief.

>> Chair Cantil-Sakauye: Judge Pine?

>> Just to follow up, Senator, do you envision these discussions going along that there might be a possible financial contribution by the State Bar to make this happen? Because I -- I hear all

the time that lawyers want this. But they expect the courts to basically fund it. Is there a possibility here?

>> Senator Dunn: There's a possibility, Judge, yes.

>> Okay.

>> I'm sorry. There's also -- we often have discussions about fines and fees. And I know that if there's anything that the bar is willing to pay for, it is access to electronic records.

>> Chair Cantil-Sakauye: Judge Kaufman?

>> We need to sum up in a sense, so we all have a viable product that's been past all the performance tests so to speak, correct? That we have an angel in the wings so to speak who is going to give 20 million dollars. And this is not just a gift of money, but basically this person has a long history of -- of IT work and he has had his people look at this system. He wouldn't have given money just if the system didn't work; correct?

>> I think that Dr. Sue Sun is certainly a far more than sophisticated IT expert. That has been his focus certainly for the last several years. In his national healthcare grid. And again, he's connecting not just data centers, but super computers to make all of this work. And I think we can say confidently he would not be supporting this and offering his resources if he did not have confidence in both the concept and the product.

>> So what you're going to be asking the council to do is to take a 90-day period of time to look at this offer -- is that correct?

>> Well, we're going to be asking Council to do is authorize execution of the letter of intent to allow us to proceed with the due diligence efforts over the next 12 weeks as well as our preplanning and predeployment activities within the scope of our existing budget and --

>> Can I stop you there? That letter of intent would not commit us to anything other unanimous it gives us -- an expression of -- that we're interested.

>> The letter of intent obligates us to move forward in good faith to try and reach a definitive agreement on this to the extent we are able to do so. And subject to Council approval.

>> That would also clarify, I assume, the nature and extent of the foundation's contribution. The manner in which that would occur.

>> Correct. And again part of the process we'll be finalizing a budget going forward for these three courts. The figure Judge Kaufman mention the, 20 million, we will be receiving a combination of grant funding and services that are worth at least 20 million dollars. Particularly -- one of the major expenses that we incur in establishing and setting up CCMS is - is setting up and standing up the enterprise environment. And that's not just for the early adopter courts, this is the environment that we need to be able to bring additional courts on

going forward. Just the -- the data center expenses are a major cost driver for us. I think the data center just using tech center alone would be about 16 and a half million dollars to set up that environment.

So having access to what should be a superior environment with better data connection is worth a substantial amount to us. So the extent of the contribution in term the of how it's going to be allocated and how it's going to be valued, that will be part of the due diligence period here as well but Dr. Sue Sun has said that he's committed to helping us get this through, to seeing this project through to completion. Not just for this year, but to work with us to make sure that this happens.

>> I have a question. This is certainly an intriguing development. Let me ask you a hypothetical question. Let's assume that Council does approve the letter of intent and let's assume that the 12-week period progresses and in good faith discussions there is a meeting of the minds, which is subsequently approved by all parties including the council; and let's assume further that this goes forward for a year with regard to these three courts, the early adopter courts that you've identified; and let's assume, finally, that everything is just proceeding swimmingly and all parties are happy. What about the remaining 50 -- 55 courts?

>> Well, the -- certainly the -- this system was designed conceptually and technically to be an enterprise system for the branch. We derive our return on investment here as the grant thorn study outlines, when we have all courts up and running on all case types in CCMS. Obviously our deployment schedule has been slowed dramatically by the budget situation. And the fact that every dollar we spend is subject to scrutiny, legitimately so. We have no commitment from him to provide funding beyond the early adopter courts, but I think that he has also expressed interest in trying to help us raise funds from other sources to -- to assist with these efforts. Again, his -- as I said, he's a man of pretty broad vision and what he would like to see us do is not simply have three courts up and running on CCMS, but to have the promise of CCMS realized by a broader deployment.

So we're -- and again, that's part of the strategies that we're going to need to develop going forward. After we get the foundation established through the early adopter courts, is where do we go next? How can we maximize the use of the resource? How do we get this to the courts that have immediate and critical need? How do we get this in courts where we get the maximum cost benefit? How do we get this in courts where we have the maximum benefit to our justice partners from the data integration? So those are issues that we will be coming back to the council with. At the moment I think we have a rather full plate in dealing with this.

>> When you're talking about the Data Center Hostings, is that replacing -- is that the same thing as the place in Arizona?

>> The Tech Center? Yes.

(Laughter)

>> We have -- we have a contract right now for our data center hosting. That contract expires in September of next year. Whether we remain there, whether we use other sources, whether we use Dr. Sue Sun's sources will depend on whether they prove to be superior for our purposes. And they may well. And that may be an opportunity to do that. But what he's providing is the data center resources and the high speed data communications for the early adopter courts.

>> Okay.

>> And whether we stay with that beyond the early adopter courts, that, frankly, I think would require an RFP. I think we would have to certainly do a direct comparison on both long term costs, short term costs, and performance. Before we can --

>> What happens with the other courts that are not going to be the three early adopter courts but are using parts of CCMS now?

>> Well, to the extent --

>> For data hosting.

>> To the extent that they're on the tech center they would stay on the tech center at least through the current contract. And then we would make a decision at that time whether we stayed with SAIC, or whether we decided to go to either Dr. Sue Sun's data centers or elsewhere.

>> Someplace else.

>> Again, I -- just to summarize where we are, we -- we have a completed product. It has been functionally tested. It is ready for acceptance. Should be ready for acceptance within the next week or so. Mark was showing me today the final checklist on the deliverables that we have from Deloitte. Judge Herman and I will be going down to Deloitte next Wednesday for a wrap-up and lessons learned meeting. With Deloitte. So we are there. We're at the finish line on the product development. Our third party reviews --

>> (Recorded voice).

(Laughter)

>> Elvis is in the building. There he is.

(Laughter)

>> Listening to the whole thing.

(Laughter)

>> That's your seat right here.

>> Chair Cantil-Sakauye: We welcome you in person. Judge Baker has arrived.

(Laughter)

>> Our third party tests have been completed and completed successfully. Confirmed that CCMS will work as designed. As intended. We are addressing the opportunities for

improvement to make sure that going forward that we mitigate or eliminate any risks in what we're doing. The Bureau of State audit findings and recommendations have been addressed and implemented. We're now in a position where we have a valuable tool, a valuable asset that will establish the infrastructure that we need for the future in the branch.

We know from the Grant Thornton study and the survey that they did of the courts they were going to have 47 courts requiring the systems by 2020. CCMS is the only system that will meet all Judicial Branch needs and requirements for a case management system. There's nothing on - off the shelf product that comes close. There is nothing that provides us with the integration, both within the branch and with our justice partners, and with the bar, that CCMS does. So the question is how do we put it to work? I think this certainly is the opportunity that we have to -- to make it work. And to demonstrate what it can do for us going forward. And we will ask the Council tomorrow to approve execution of the letter of intent to let us start the due diligence period. To let us proceed with our preplanning activities.

Again, emphasizing that this is within our existing budget. We are not asking for any other funding at this point on the -- on the project. That assuming we can reach acceptable agreement, definitive agreement, that we'll be in a position, hopefully, by the end of the year or early January to move forward and to move forward -- move forward quickly.

Are there any other questions?

>> Well, I appreciate what you're saying. And in my mind the bigger question in the end is whether we can afford this. I grant you that it may solve a lot of problems and meet a lot of needs. But according to the -- the estimates originally provided by the OC, this is a 1.9 billion dollars project. I don't know, we spent 500 million so far, whatever it is. There's at least a billion left. I've got a real question whether in the end this is affordable. Now, what you've -- you mentioned here today offers us some hope of everything's -- everything's very nebulous as to what can be eventually provided through this opportunity. I certainly want you to explore it. Let me just ask, so what's going to be done between now and the next 90 day, whenever this is going to come back? What are you going to be -- what are you going to be doing and how much is being spent in this process?

>> Well, Mark can address what we will be spending in the interim. But again, we will spend nothing that has not been previously authorized or approved. Judge Pines, and what we are he is going to be doing is not only the due diligence with Dr. Sue Sun and his organization, but doing the necessary preparation for the deployment activities so that if we do have an acceptable agreement, we can move forward and get this deployed within the warranty period.

I do want to emphasize too that one of the considerations in getting this product deployed and getting it deployed quickly is that our warranty period begins to run 8 months from the date of product acceptance. We're going to be at the point of product acceptance probably within a week, no later than two weeks where we're going to be required contractually to accept the product. 8 months thereafter the warranty begins to run for a period.

What we want to make sure that we have our critical path deployment activities done within that warranty period so that if there are any issues that need to be addressed, we can have Deloitte address them at no cost to us.

In terms of costs, let me back up a little bit. Because again we keep talking about these 1.9 billion dollars numbers. Let me just remind you and members of the council what that consists of.

1.9 billion dollars includes what the BSA says we should consider as the maintenance costs. So 600 million dollars of that number are long term maintenance costs. They are not costs that we incur short term at all. And we are spending 100 million dollars a year now, today, across the branch to support existing and failing systems.

So that is a cost that will be supplanted by the cost of the -- of maintaining CCMS. So that is essentially a wash. There's -- there's no -- and we can probably reduce that number substantially and with CCMS implemented spend less across the branch annually than we're doing now.

\$1.3 billion is and always has been our development and deployment cost. We have repeatedly told the legislature that that is a ceiling that we would not exceed.

Our development costs for V3 and V4 have been \$319.1 million. And I verified that number with department of finance. So --

>> That's over what period of time?

>> Over six --

>> Yeah, about six, seven --

>> Almost seven years. I've seen people quote numbers at 560 --

>> I was quoting from the May 18th, 2011 communication to Mark and Bob Bloomenfeld and others from the judicial council. And it listed the costs as of the end of 2009-2010 at \$454 million.

>> Those included all operations costs for those systems as well.

Our 1.3 billion dollars --

>> I was -- I understand your -- I wasn't. Wasn't just dealing with just the development cost. But what it's cost this project to date. That -- and it's more than the 300 million.

>> Well, I would disagree -- I would disagree --

>> So you say we're going to operate within existing budget. So what does that mean and what are you going to be -- how much are you going to be spending in the next 90 days?

>> To date, since July 1 when the fiscal year started, we have spent through September.

>> Does that include internal staff?

>> That's all in.

>> On temporary people and all else?

>> Yeah. What we've spent. I went right to oracle system and I've vetted this with finance. Our finance division. Two million dollars I would expect -- and it all depends on what type of

contracts we enter into and those sorts of things much but I would expect on a straight run rate you could expect over the next three months about 2 million dollars as well. Is -- in my mind the best way to estimate what we'd be doing. The things that we'll be doing in decision to the next 12 week activities, we'll continue to work on blueprints, we'll continue to work with the courts that have involved in the first release that incorporates all of the legislative changes that have happened while we've been developing. All of the lessons learned and the extra things that judges have said they wanted. So we'll continue to make progress on those things. As well as doing the due diligence. Just so you know what kinds of things we're going to be doing.

>> I think the other thing that we need to remember as well is that there is a cost, a real hard dollar cost to doing nothing. And we considered and presented the budget alternatives for essentially -- and walking away from it, we had allocated in this fiscal year in addition for maintenance for V2 and V 3 but 14.2, 14.3 million dollars in the shut down scenario. The walk away scenario we would have spent about 11 and a half million dollars just to walk away from it. In the scenarios we've presented to the budget committee and to the counsel, we -- we showed the costs in increases that we -- that we have to deal with in future fiscal years as a result of delay or definitely and the current fiscal years.

That's over what period of time?

>> Over six --

>> Six, seven --

>> Six, almost seven years. So, you know, I've seen people quote numbers at 560 or 400--

>> I was quoting from the May 18, 2011 communication to Mark and Blumenfeld and others. It listed the cost at the end of 2009, 2010 at \$454 million.

>> Our \$1.3 billion --

>> I understand, I wasn't dealing with just the development cost but what it cost this project to date.

>> I would disagree with you.

>> You say we'll operate with an existing budget. What does that mean and what are you going to be doing the next -- how much are you going to be spending in the next 90 days?

>> Since the fiscal year started we have spent through September almost \$2 million.

>> Does that include internal staff?

>> That's all in.

>> Temporary people and everything else?

>> Yeah, yes. It's what we've spent. I went right to oracle system and I vetted this with our finance division, \$2 million. I would expect -- and it all depends on what type of contracts we enter into. I would expect on the next run rate about \$2 million as well. Judge Pines, the things we'll be doing is we'll continue to work on blueprints. We'll continue to work with the courts that are involved on the first release that incorporates all of the legislative changes that have happened while we've been developing, the lessons learned and the extra things that judges have said they wanted. We'll continue to make progress on those things as well as doing the due diligence just so you know what kinds of things we're going to be doing.

>> I think the other thing we need to remember as well is that there is a cost, a real hard dollar cost to doing nothing. If we -- and we considered and we presented the budget alternatives for shutting down ccms and walking away from it. We had allocated in this fiscal year, in addition to maintenance for v2 and v3, 14.2, \$14.5 million. In the shutdown walk-away scenario, 11 1/2 million dollars just to walk away from it. We showed the cost increases that we -- that we have to deal with in future fiscal years as a result of delay or deferral in current fiscal years. As you know we had to spend money to buy a replacement system for Nevada County last year and to make a special appropriation for that. Sonoma County had to replace a system because they had no choice. San Luis Obispo is on an old system. The Grant Thornton system just to replace existing systems with existing functionality, system cost only, they estimated about \$342 million. The choice is not between CCMS or spending nothing. We incur costs if we don't go forward with CCMS. We don't have the benefits of CCMS. We lose our investment in CCMS and we -- again, we do not have a system, if -- there is no off-the-shelf system that will do what this system will do. So it is -- and it is a necessary investment in my view in the future of the branch. This is where we need to be going forward. If -- all of the reasons that we started this project, you know, since now almost ten years ago, with legislative and executive urging, by the way, all the reasons that we started this project are still valid today. This addresses and solves this.

>> Justice Ashmann-Gerst?

>> I wanted to address what the Justice just said. The cost to maintain systems, buy new systems for the courts who have failing systems as indicated by the Grant Thornton report, we're not going to be saving money if we don't go forward, we're going to be spending money as indicated in that report.

>> Alan Carlson?

>> I think the added thing to me on this is, now we have an opportunity to stop all the speculating and frankly some of it's wild speculating about whether this works and how much it costs. Now we have an opportunity to put this thing in a court, start using it and see if it works and see how much costs it is and how much real cost to deploy this system which I think will be less than speculated and how it works. Boeing put together a dreamliner and yesterday it made its first flight with paying customers and it was a controlled landing, not a crash. We need to get to that point. We aren't at that point. I want to be able to see a clerk and a judge who I would say what would you do to me if I took it away from you and they said I'd lock you up. This opportunity will allow us to get to that point in year, year and a half's time period.

>> As I was looking at the audit reports that we will be looking at tomorrow, I was struck by the fact that if those three courts had this system in their traffic -- most of those audit results would go away.

>> Kim Turner?

>> I just wanted to say one thing, which is that Justice Bruiniers said they saw this technology debacle coming down the track. At that time there were 10, 15, 20-year-old systems already identified as archaic. Now we're ten years worse off than ten years ago. Now my system is 32, not 22. If we look around the room, David Yamasaki, I know, Judge O'Malley, we all have those ancient and I do mean ancient green screen Cobol systems that will not continue to go on. So to say that, you know, even what Grant Thornton said I don't think actually captures the urgency that many of us feel about getting our technology updated so that we can run a modern, efficient court system leveraging the power of technology to do many of the things that we currently still do with pencil and paper and, you know, interoffice envelopes all around the building.

So this is an opportunity for the bar, for the courts, for the people of California and I think it would be foolhardy to turn away from this golden moment. That's what I want to stress now.

>> Listen carefully to this order. Senator Dunn, Judge Rosenfeld, Mark Robinson and Judge Friedman.

>> What?
[laughter]

>> I'll be brief, it's a personal privilege, I think it's important to point out the wise and insightfulness of the governor and legislators.
[laughter]

>> Any particular ones?

>> Judge Rosenberg.

>> I want to focus on the issue that's before us now and will be before the Council tomorrow, and that is the issue raised by this new development. The public challenges government at all levels to be creative, to be smart, to be innovative. We have to be these days. And this offers us a remarkable opportunity. I don't know if it'll work out, but certainly it makes sense to do the 12-week due diligence and see what comes out of that. If it works, it's a remarkable achievement and it is government acting smart and creative and innovative so I commend all the parties that have been working hard on this.

>> Thank you. Mark Robinson?

>> I just have a question to follow up on the Judge's remarks. What's the down side? Of going into this 12-week analysis, discussion? All we can do is learn more. And we can do our due diligence on the relationship, on the collaboration, the people, et cetera, but what's the down side? From what I'm hearing here it's all an up side. And we might learn a lot more from these people even if we don't go into a final relationship with them.

>> Thank you. Judge Friedman?

>> The sooner we do this, the sooner that victims of domestic violence who fall through the cracks because protective orders and when counties court aren't accessible, another court will be protected. The sooner we do this, foster kids who are protected by visitation orders in one county that isn't accessible in another county will be protected. The sooner we do this, the sooner the people of the state of California will be safer.

>> I would just like to --

>> I'd like to take the time to compliment Justice Bruiniers and the others not only for the presentation today but from over the past few months, I think it's so refreshing to have information brought to us as you have to inform us. Many of us are not that knowledgeable about high-tech issues. But I can tell you it's very reassuring to listen to your presentation. I think the fact that the foundation is willing to pursue this after having their I.T. people examine in depth this product is the proof of the pudding that the product's good. Anyway, my compliments to you for the presentation and the work you've done.

>> Thank you. I can't claim a great deal of credit for that. I certainly as I've said before think that Mark Moore as project manager and his office have done a remarkable job with ever-constrained resources as we've gone forward here. And with respect to this grant proposal. I think the people that really deserve the credit for that are Senator Dunn and Vickrey.

>> Any more questions before we stand in recess for coffee or refreshments?

>> I appreciate all the work that's been done. The reason I ask some of these questions is just to satisfy myself to use Mark Robinson's comments that there wasn't much of a down side exploring this. I think we should go forward and see what comes about from this. I was just trying to deal with some of the ultimate issues that the council will have to address. Ten years ago I was there at the meeting with the governor and I can tell you no one at that time ever envisioned that the costs would be this much.

And times have changed. I grant you that this is a desirable system, and it can provide a lot of good functions for our courts, but I think in the end you're going to have to decide whether we can afford it if we're at the same time having to close courts. It doesn't do any good if we have information on domestic violence orders if we don't have a domestic violence court or any other court. Those are the ultimate issues. I just wanted to say that to give some perspective to my comments, but I think we should certainly go forward and take a look at this. Hopefully it'll solve a lot of problems.

>> Again, as to the cost of the system, and costs we have incurred, Judge Pines, I've also said before, and I think that it's certainly appropriate, that we do a retrospective look at our entire contract procedures here and have an independent look at that to assure ourselves that we have not wasted money. But I've pointed out the people who talk about the so-called cost overruns on this contract, there has never been one dime of cost overrun. There has never been any request by Deloitte to change the scope of the contract. It's all been at our request. Did we spend too much? The 319.1, which I think is accurate for the development cost of the product, I know I've been told that these DCSS system developed for the state, that the development costs for that were about \$350 million just for development costs, and that was one case type.

So did we spend too much on that? Did we -- could we have done better? Those are fair questions and I think questions that we need to look at and answer. But where we are today is with a product in hand. In terms of cost going forward, and Mark and I have talked about this at length, we have assured the legislature and this council that the \$1.3 billion figure is a cap on what it will cost to do it. Mark is fairly confident and we've had confirmation on this from Dr. Soon-Shiong as well that we can reduce it by at least 30% if not more. We're using numbers today based on our experience today, but I think we have a fairly high degree of confidence that going forward, particularly as we development the processes to get this deployed, we can bring those costs down dramatically.

>> Judge Waters and then Judge Herman.

>> I don't know if it's possible but I'm going to hope and urge the parties through this letter of intent to complete their due diligence in less than 12 weeks, because I'm of the view that we cannot afford not to go forward with deployment. And thank you as well for all the work that you've done.

>> Thank you. Judge Herman?

>> You know, we talk about keeping the courthouse doors open. And the fact of the matter is, having talked to Kings County, having members in our neighboring counties, others in electronic express, that we cannot keep the courthouse doors open without a case management system. Our choices long-term are employing a system that we own which can link us together throughout the state versus continuing to pay licensing fees for systems on a year by year basis that increase and ratchet up over time. This is a robust system. In terms of the cost for deployment to the three courts that we're talking about, Dr. Soon-Shiong and his team went over the numbers and verified that we were within close range of what they penciled out in terms of cost. Again, this is a tremendous opportunity to work, I think go forward in a collaborative sort of way that's going to be beneficial to the people of the state.

>> I know we all thank you for this interesting report and bringing us up to date. Appreciate this. And what we'll do is several things. First, the letters of intent that were passed out, we'd like you to leave them at your place so we can redistribute them for action tomorrow. Nancy will pick those up. We have a 15-minute break with refreshments. We will return here at 3:35, please. Thank you.

>>> And that's the end of today's session.

