

# **Court Security Advisory Committee**

As of January 22, 2019

**Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo**  
**Chair**

Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles

**Mr. Daniel Potter**

Clerk/Executive Officer  
Court of Appeal  
Second Appellate District

**Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian,**  
**Vice-Chair**

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal  
Sixth Appellate District

**Ms. Linda Romero-Soles**

Court Executive Officer  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Merced

**Hon. Jeffrey G. Bennett**

Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Ventura

**CENTER FOR JUDICIAL EDUCATION  
AND RESEARCH ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE LIAISON**

**Hon. Rodney A. Cortez**

Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of San Bernardino

**Hon. Darrell S. Mavis**

Judge of the Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles

**Ms. Kimberly Flener**

Court Executive Officer  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Butte

**TRIAL COURT PRESIDING JUDGES  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE LIAISON**

[to be assigned]

**Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley**

Court Executive Officer  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Shasta

**GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS LIAISON**

**Mr. Cory Jaspersen**

Director, Governmental Affairs  
Judicial Council of California

**Hon. Patricia L. Kelly**

Presiding Judge  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Santa Barbara

**LEGAL SERVICES LIAISON**

**Ms. Dawn Payne**

Attorney, Legal Services  
Judicial Council of California

**Mr. Justin Mammen**

Emergency and Security Services Manager  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Orange

**FACILITIES SERVICES LIAISON**

**Mr. Mike Courtney**

Director, Facilities Services  
Judicial Council of California

# **Court Security Advisory Committee**

As of January 22, 2019

## **JUDICIAL COUNCIL LEAD STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE**

### **Mr. Edward Ellestad**

Supervisor, Security Operations  
Facilities Services  
Judicial Council of California

### **Ms. Lisa Gotch**

Analyst, Security Operations  
Facilities Services  
Judicial Council of California



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT SECURITY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/courtsecurityadvcomm.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/courtsecurityadvcomm.htm)  
[courtsecurityadvcomm@jud.ca.gov](mailto:courtsecurityadvcomm@jud.ca.gov)

## COURT SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

April 26, 2018

12:15 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.

877-820-7831/ Passcode: 285-6918 (listen only)

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo, Chair, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, Vice-Chair, Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Shasta

Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara

Mr. Justin Mammen, Emergency and Security Services Manager, Superior Court of California, County of Orange

Ms. Deborah Norrie, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Plumas

Mr. Daniel Potter, Clerk/Executive Officer, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

Ms. Linda Romero-Soles, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Merced

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Jeffrey G. Bennett, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Ventura

Hon. Jaime R. Román, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

**Others Present:** Hon. Darrell S. Mavis, Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Ms. Dawn Payne, Attorney, Legal Services, Judicial Council of California

Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Facilities Services, Judicial Council of California

Ms. Lisa Gotch, Analyst, Security Operations, Facilities Services, Judicial Council of California

---

**OPEN MEETING**

---

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m., and took roll call.

**Approval of Minutes**

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the January 31, 2018, Court Security Advisory Committee meeting. Judge Kelly abstained as she was not present at that meeting.

---

**INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)**

---

**Info 1**

**Member Update**

Information was shared about the solicitation for nominations to fill upcoming vacancies, which recently closed. Judge Olmedo will make recommendations to the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) by April 27, 2018. E&P will make recommendations to the Chief Justice and new members will be appointed effective September 15, 2018.

**Info 2**

**In-Person Meeting**

Information was shared about shifting the fourth quarterly meeting scheduled for Wednesday, October 24, 2018, to an in-person meeting at the Judicial Council's San Francisco office. Members discussed the possibility of holding the meeting in Sacramento instead; staff will follow up to verify availability and most efficient/effective location.

**Info 3**

**Annual Agenda Update**

Information was shared about the chair's meeting with E&P to discuss the proposed projects in the Court Security Advisory Committee's draft 2018 Annual Agenda. The discussion was promising. The draft was approved with changes: at the request of E&P, additional information was added under project 3 on page 4 under Fiscal Impact/Resources.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

**Court Security Advisory Committee**  
**Annual Agenda<sup>1</sup>—2019**  
**Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]**

**I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

<b>Chair:</b>	Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
<b>Lead Staff:</b>	Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Facilities Services
<b>Committee's Charge/Membership:</b> <a href="#">Rule 10.61(a)</a> 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.  <a href="#">Rule 10.61(b)</a> sets forth the membership position categories of the committee. The Court Security Advisory Committee currently has 10 members. The current committee <a href="#">roster</a> is available on the committee's web page.	
<b>Subcommittees/Working Groups<sup>2</sup>:</b> None.	

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>3</sup>	
1.	<b>Project Title: Emergency- and Security-Related Concerns for the Branch</b>	<b>Priority 1<sup>4</sup></b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>5</sup>:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> Recommendations that may have a fiscal impact will be discussed with appropriate Judicial Council staff and advisory bodies first. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit of the Facilities Services office.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Depending on recommendations, stakeholders could include Judicial Council offices (Governmental Affairs, Budget Services, Appellate Court Services, Center for Judicial Education &amp; Research, Court Operations Services, Leadership Support Services, and Legal Services). External stakeholders include the trial courts and appellate courts.</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> 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 Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee.</p>		

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

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

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>3</sup>	
2.	<b>Project Title: Trial Courts' Screening Equipment Replacement</b>	<b>Priority 1<sup>4</sup></b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>5</sup>:</b> 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><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p>		
<p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> The program in project #2 has a budget of \$2.286 million funded annually through the Trial Court Trust Fund. However, competitively bid contracts, which include lower pricing for some equipment, were executed in fiscal year (FY) 2017–18, resulting in a lower estimated expenditure in FY 2018–19, allowing for a one-time budget reduction to \$1.9 million. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p>		
<p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts (primary users).</p>		
<p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None anticipated at this time.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>3</sup>	
3.	<b>Project Title:</b> Trial Courts' Security Equipment and Systems	<b>Priority</b> 1 <sup>4</sup>
<p><b>Project Summary</b><sup>5</sup>: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's provision and maintenance of duress alarm systems, access control systems, and video surveillance systems. 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. 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 for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> The service in project #3 (previously known as the Trial Court Security Grant Program) had a budget of \$1.2 million funded through the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. One-time limited funding has been provided for maintenance and repairs each year, starting in FY 2015–16. A BCP requesting an annual augmentation of \$6 million was submitted to the State Department of Finance and was included in the Governor's budget proposal for FY 2019–20. This dedicated funding will be used to maintain and improve current programs and services, including, but not limited to projects that refresh, maintain, and replace security systems; such as video surveillance, electronic access control, duress alarm, and specialized systems used to control access to secure court holding areas. The committee will resume oversight responsibility for projects related to the expenditure of these funds. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts (primary users).</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None anticipated at this time.</p>		



#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>3</sup>	
4.	<b>Project Title: Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning</b>	<b>Priority 1<sup>4</sup></b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>5</sup>:</b> 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. 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 for the Judicial Council’s facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> The program in project #4, and related module in project #5, were originally funded 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 General Fund budget of the Security Operations unit. While system training and exercises were originally provided, a lack of sufficient funding eliminated the ability to provide these services. With the dedicated funding described in project #3, these services can be resumed. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts (primary users) and Judicial Council/appellate courts (secondary users).</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None anticipated at this time.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities <sup>3</sup>	
5.	<b>Project Title:</b> Trial Courts' Court Security Plans	<b>Priority 1<sup>4</sup></b>
<p><b>Project Summary<sup>5</sup>:</b> 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 for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p><b>Status/Timeline:</b> Ongoing.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</b> The program in project #4, and related module in project #5, were originally funded 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 General Fund budget of the Security Operations unit. A lack of sufficient funding has prevented staff from requesting changes to the module that would streamline work. With the dedicated funding described in project #3, the necessary changes to the web-based tool can be pursued. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p><b>Internal/External Stakeholders:</b> Trial courts (primary users of module).</p> <p><b>AC Collaboration:</b> None at this time.</p>		

### III. LIST OF 2018 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>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"> <li>• <b>Trial Courts’ Security Equipment and Systems</b></li> <li>• <b>Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning</b></li> <li>• <b>Trial Courts’ Court Security Plans</b></li> </ul> <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 FY 2015–16. Staff attempted to regain dedicated funding for trial court security system installation, maintenance, and replacement through the BCP process, but their BCPs for FY 2015–16, 2016–17, 2017–18, and 2018–19 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"> <li>• March 2018: Provided input to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee regarding an Initial Funding Request (IFR). A \$6 million request was included in the Judicial Council’s FY 2019–20 BCP request to the State Department of Finance.</li> <li>• October 2018: At an in-person meeting, received presentation from BOLDplanning, the company that the Security Operations unit worked with in 2006 to design a customized online planning system for the courts. That system is located at <a href="http://coop.courts.ca.gov">coop.courts.ca.gov</a>; the unit provides it at no cost to the courts and it allows them to create and maintain various types of plans. The unit facilitated five user workshops for the courts after; however, ongoing trainings and annual exercises are at the cost of the courts, as the unit’s planner position was eliminated. Due to staff changes, many court logins may be outdated and new users may require Continuity of Operations Plan guidance. Members agreed on the need to have discussions at the top level of each court and to share information about best practices. Members may examine the topic at future meetings and develop recommendations.</li> <li>• October 2018: At the same in-person meeting, received information about the system module that courts can use to create court security plans and the status of trial court conformance with California Rules of Court, <a href="#">rule 10.172</a> on plan submission, notification, and content. The Security Operations unit contacted trial courts to obtain current information about the format and location of their plans and provided members with information on that and the technical conformance of the courts to plan content requirements. Staff time to obtain the quantitative compliance information is extensive; qualitative reviews are not practicable or required. Members discussed methods for improving compliance, such as sharing information with court leaders at institutes, and creating or updating best practices and guidelines. Members may examine the topic at future meetings and develop recommendations.</li> <li>• October 2018: At the same in-person meeting, received information about the provision and maintenance of security systems. The BCP for FY 2019–20, requesting \$6 million, with options for alternate funding levels of \$4 million and \$2 million, was</li> </ul>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
	<p>submitted to the State Department of Finance, and is currently under consideration for approval. This BCP would provide funding to refresh, maintain, and replace security systems; including, but not limited to, video surveillance, electronic access control, duress alarm, and specialized systems used to control access to secure court holding areas. If the BCP is successful, the Security Operations unit will begin a security system “refresh and replace” process. To aid in prioritization of systems, the unit is using consultants to compile information about system locations, age, type, cost to refresh as opposed to replace, and alternatives. [The BCP described above was successful, resulting in a \$6 million annual augmentation included in the Governor’s budget proposal for FY 2019–20.]</p>

DRAFT