

[Note: This is a new template. Information from the 2017 Annual Agenda was imported, but not replicated exactly. While ongoing projects are essentially the same, they now include fiscal information, and have been reorganized so that they are grouped by funding source.]

Court Security Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2018
Approved by E&P: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Lead Staff:	Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Facilities Services
<p>Committee’s Charge/Membership: <i>Insert charge from Cal. Rules of Court, or the specific charge to the Task Force. Hyperlink rule number to courts public site. Insert total number of members and number of members by category.</i></p> <p>Rule 10.61 of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Court Security Advisory Committee, which is to make recommendations to the council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning.</p> <p>The Court Security Advisory Committee currently has 10 members. The attached term of services chart provides the composition of the committee.</p>	
<p>Subcommittees/Working Groups²: <i>List the names of each subcommittee or working group, including groups made up exclusively of committee/task force members and joint groups with other advisory committees/task forces. To request approval for the creation of a new subgroup, include “new” after the name of the proposed subgroup and describe its purpose.</i></p> <p>N/A</p>	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources.

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body’s duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects³ [Group projects by priority number.] [If there are no new or one-time projects, delete this table.]	
1.	Project Title <i>Short and descriptive</i>	Priority <i>X⁴</i>
<p>Project Summary⁵: <i>Provide a brief summary of the project and its key objective(s). Be specific about what the project entails and what it is expected to accomplish. If the proposal is for rules or forms, describe the problem to be addressed, or what the new law is and why it requires new/revised forms and/or new or amended rules of court. Origin of project may also be included [for example, is it required by statute or Judicial Council direction, did it result from a suggestion from a court, judge, or attorney; etc.].</i></p> <p>Status/Timeline: <i>Include status and projected completion date, or state “Ongoing” if applicable.</i></p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: <i>Include JCC staff/fiscal resources, fiscal impact to JCC, trial court, etc., and other relevant resource needs.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: <i>Include any specific JCC staff resources needed, such as Fiscal, Legal, Education, Security, etc. Also include external stakeholders and partners.</i></p> <p>AC Collaboration: <i>Note any committee, task force, subcommittee/working group involvement.</i></p>		

³ All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

⁴ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

⁵ A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities [Group projects by priority number.]	
1.	<i>Emergency- and Security-Related Concerns for the Branch</i>	<i>Priority 1</i>
<p>Project Summary: Consider new and continuing emergency- and security-related concerns for the branch, and make additional recommendations as needed. The <u>origin</u> of this project is the committee’s charge under rule 10.61. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council’s Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be reports to Judicial Council, which may include recommendations that the council direct its facilities and budget advisory committees on specific or urgent priorities.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Recommendations that may have a fiscal impact will be discussed with appropriate Judicial Council staff and advisory bodies first.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Depending on recommendations, stakeholders could include Judicial Council offices (Governmental Affairs, Budget Services, Appellate Court Services, Center for Judicial Education & Research, Court Operations Services, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, and Legal Services). The Facilities Services office’s Security Operations unit will always be a resource/stakeholder. External stakeholders include the trial courts and appellate courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Depending on recommendations, collaborators could include the Court Executives Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee, and the CJER Governing Committee.</p>		
2.	<i>Trial Courts’ Screening Equipment Replacement</i>	<i>Priority 1</i>
<p>Project Summary: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit’s Screening Equipment Replacement Program for trial courts, which replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function, and a lack of sufficient funding to support and improve the program. This project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council’s Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related Budget Change Proposals (BCPs), for the Judicial Council’s facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project 2 has a budget of \$2.286 million funded annually through the Trial Court Trust Fund, and as the budget has not increased with costs, there is a shortfall that has resulted in a shift of some costs to the courts. Funding/cost changes could necessitate additional costs to courts.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Security Operations (administrator) and trial courts (primary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities [Group projects by priority number.]	
3.	Trial Courts' Security Equipment and Systems	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Trial Court Security Grant Program for trial courts, which provides and maintains systems such as access, camera, duress, etc. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function, and a lack of dedicated funding to support and improve the program. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related BCPs, for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project 3 had a budget of \$1.2 million funded through the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. Limited funding was provided for maintenance and repairs but it was one-time only. Without a dedicated funding source, trial court needs for new equipment and systems may go unmet, and existing equipment and systems may age out, become unsupported by the manufacturers, and ultimately fail completely. Dedicated funding to maintain existing programs is preferable to making purchases and maintenance an additional court cost that may not be viable.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Security Operations (administrator) and trial courts (primary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time. The Judicial Branch Budget Committee reviews BCPs.</p>		
4.	Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning Program, which provides and maintains online planning system and trainings. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function, and a lack of dedicated funding to support and improve the program. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related BCPs, for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project 4, and related module in project 5, were originally paid through budget from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. Limited funding for maintenance of the online planning system has since been paid by the Facilities Services office's Security Operations unit General Fund budget. While system training and exercises were originally provided, a lack of sufficient funding shifted that cost to the courts.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Security Operations (administrator), trial courts (primary users), and Judicial Council/appellate courts (secondary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities [Group projects by priority number.]	
5.	Trial Courts' Court Security Plans	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Court Security Plan services—specifically, through a module included in the online planning system mentioned in Project 4, and annual review of summary data by this committee under rule 10.172(e). The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this service as a necessary and appropriate function, and rule 10.172 on Court Security Plans. This project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related BCPs, for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project 4, and related module in project 5, were originally paid through budget from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. Limited funding for maintenance of the online planning system has since been paid by the Facilities Services office's Security Operations unit General Fund budget. A lack of sufficient funding has prevented staff from requesting changes to the module that would streamline work.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Security Operations (administrator and contact), trial courts (primary users of module), and our members.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None at this time.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

[Provide highlights and achievements of completed projects that were included in the 2017 Annual Agenda.]

#	Project Highlights and Achievements <i>[Provide brief, broad outcome(s) and completed date.]</i>
1.	<p>We met objectives to make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch, and to advocate for funding to support those functions/existing emergency- and security-related programs. For <i>ongoing</i> projects summarized as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial Courts’ Screening Equipment Replacement <p>The related program has a budget of \$2.286 million funded annually through the <u>Trial Court Trust Fund</u>; however, the program budget has not increased since its inception in 2006, while costs for equipment and service increased. That resulted in a shortfall, a delay in equipment replacement cycles, and an ongoing shift of the cost for service agreements to the courts starting in FY 2015–2016. Committee actions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 2017: we included information about program status, and trial court needs and priorities, in a letter (described in item 2, below).
2.	<p>For <i>ongoing</i> projects summarized as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial Courts’ Security Equipment and Systems • Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning • Trial Courts’ Court Security Plans <p>Related programs had a budget from the <u>State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund</u>; however, the Trial Court Security Grant Program was eliminated when its \$1.2 million budget was redirected effective Fiscal Year 2015–2016. Staff attempted to regain dedicated funding for trial court security system installation, maintenance, and replacement through the BCP process, but their BCPs for FY 2015–2016, 2016–2017, and 2017–2018 were not successful. A limited amount of operations and maintenance funding was made available on a one-time basis to address minimum maintenance and repairs, but funding to continue limited service was not identified. As systems age, components become obsolete and cannot be repaired, and costs increase. Committee actions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 2017: we provided input to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee regarding an Initial Funding Request (IFR). A \$3 million request was included in the Judicial Council’s Fiscal Year 2018–2019 BCP request to the State Department of Finance. • May 2017: we wrote to the chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee, with a cc to chairs of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Judicial Branch Budget Committee, to share information gathered from trial courts about their security needs and priorities for the next year. We focused on security equipment and systems (such as x ray machines, magnetometers, and video surveillance, access control, and duress alarm systems) that were affected by the underfunding of the Screening Equipment Replacement Program and elimination of funding for the Trial Court Security Grant Program. The information included statistics on the status of security equipment and systems, and presented an undeniable need for assistance—e.g., through support for established Judicial Council programs. • September 2017: we reviewed summary data on trial courts’ Court Security Plan submissions and notifications under rule 10.172(e).

Attachment – Term of Services Chart

	Position	County	Member Name	1st Term Start	1st Term End	Current Term Start	Current Term End	Replaced	Previous
	<i>Chair</i>	<i>Los Angeles</i>	<i>Hon. Charlaïne F. Olmedo</i>						
	<i>Vice-Chair</i>	<i>6th District</i>	<i>Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian</i>						
1	Appellate Court Justice	6th District	Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian	2/14	9/17	9/17	9/20		
2	Trial Court Judge	Ventura	Hon. Jeffrey G. Bennett	2/14	9/16	9/16	9/19		
3	Trial Court Judge	Sacramento	Hon. Jaime R. Román	9/15	9/18			Hon. Frederick Paul Horn (2/14 to 9/15, Orange)	
4	Trial Court Judge	Santa Barbara	Hon. Patricia L. Kelly	9/17	9/20			Hon. Thomas M. Maddock (2/14 to 9/17, Contra Costa)	
5	Trial Court Judge	Los Angeles	Hon. Charlaïne F. Olmedo	2/14	9/16	9/16	9/19		
6	Appellate Court Administrator	4th District	Ms. Diana Herbert * retiring at end of December; nominations being solicited	8/16	9/19			Ms. Deena Fawcett (11/14 to 7/16, Third District)	Mr. Michael Yerly (2/14 to 7/14, Sixth District)
7	Court Judicial Administrator	Orange	Mr. Justin Mammen	9/16	9/19			Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley (2/14 to 9/16, Shasta)	
8	Court Judicial Administrator	Plumas	Ms. Deborah W. Norrie	2/14	9/15	9/15	9/18		
9	Court Judicial Administrator	Shasta	Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley * current member of CFAC and from court that uses a marshal	9/17	9/20			Mr. Darrel Parker (2/14 to 9/17, Santa Barbara)	
10	Court Judicial Administrator	Merced	Ms. Linda Romero-Soles * current member of TCFMAC	9/17	9/20			Mr. Michael M. Roddy (2/14 to 9/17, San Diego)	

* Under rule 10.61, the committee must include at least one member from each of these categories:

- Appellate court justice;
- Appellate court administrator;
- Trial court judge;
- Trial court judicial administrator;
- Member of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC); and
- Member of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC).

At least one member should be from a trial court that uses a marshal for court security services.