



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION AGENDA

Open to the Public Unless Indicated as Closed (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1) and (d)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

OPEN PORTION OF THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: December 14, 2017
Time: 12:10–1:10 p.m.
Public Call-In Number 877-820-7831; passcode 846-8947 (listen only)

Meeting materials for the open portion of the meeting will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the October 26, 2017, Executive and Planning Committee open meeting with closed session.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento, California, 95833, Attention: Donna Ignacio Only written comments received by 12:10 p.m. on Wednesday, December 13, 2017, will be provided to committee members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Subordinate Judicial Officer Conversion – Request from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Action Required)

Review request from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County to convert two subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships.

Presenter: Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin and Mr. David Smith

Item 2

Agenda Setting for the January 11–12, 2018 Judicial Council Meeting (Action Required)

Review draft reports and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in January.

Presenters: Various

Item 3

2018 Annual Agenda: Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (Action Required)

Review draft 2018 annual agenda of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee.

Presenter: Hon. Patricia M. Lucas

Item 4

2018 Annual Agenda: Court Executives Advisory Committee (Action Required)

Review draft 2018 annual agenda of the Court Executives Advisory Committee.

Presenter: Ms. Kimberly Flener

Item 5

2018 Annual Agenda: Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (Action Required)

Review draft 2018 annual agenda of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.

Presenter: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to Closed Session

V. CLOSED SESSION (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(D))

Item 1

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(d)(1)

Recommendation for Advisory Committee Appointments

Review materials and develop recommendations to be sent to Chief Justice regarding advisory committee appointments

Adjourn Closed Session



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE AND
PLANNING COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/epmeetings.htm
executiveandplanning@jud.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

Thursday, October 26, 2017

12:10 to 1:10 p.m.

Teleconference

Committee Members Present: Justice Douglas P. Miller (Chair); Judge Marla O. Anderson, (Vice Chair); Justice Harry E. Hull, Jr.; Presiding Judge Patricia M. Lucas; Judges Stacy Boulware Eurie, Samuel K. Feng, Gary Nadler, and David M. Rubin; and Ms. Kimberly Flener and Ms. Gretchen Nelson

Other Attendees: Hon. Dennis M. Perluss

Committee Staff Present: Ms. Amber Barnett

Staff Present: Ms. Heather Anderson, Ms. Deirdre Benedict, Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Mr. Bobby Brow, Ms. Deborah Brown, Ms. Tina Carroll, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Ms. Shelley Curran, Ms. Kimberly DaSilva, Ms. Natalie Daniel, Mr. Douglas Denton, Ms. Charlene Depner, Ms. Maureen Dumas, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Mr. Patrick Farrales, Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Deborah Genzer, Ms. Nicole Giacinti, Ms. Ann Gilmour, Ms. Angela Guzman, Mr. Bruce Greenlee, Ms. Bonnie Hough, Ms. Donna Ignacio, Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Mr. Cory Jaspersen, Mr. Doug Kauffroath, Ms. Shelly La Botte, Ms. Andi Liebenbaum, Ms. Maria Lira, Ms. Tara Lundstrom, Mr. Chris Magnusson, Ms. Anna Maves, Ms. Susan McMullan, Ms. Donna Newman, Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Mr. Corey Rada, Ms. Sharon Reilly, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Ms. Jamie Schechter, Mr. Brian Simeroth, Ms. Christy Simons, Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Mr. Gary Slossberg, Mr. David Smith, Ms. Laura Speed, Mr. Michael Sun, Ms. Elizabeth Tam, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Jane Whang, Mr. Catrayel Wood, Ms. Josely Yangco-Frona, and Ms. Martha Wright

OPENING MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. and committee staff took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The committee voted to approve the following minutes:

- August 24, 2017, Executive and Planning Committee open meeting with closed session
- September 1, 2017, Executive and Planning Committee action by e-mail

New members abstained from voting on the minutes as they were not on the committee at the time. Justice Hull abstained from voting on the August 24, 2017 meeting minutes as he was absent.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Review of Judicial Sabbatical Request (Action Required)

Review request from the Hon. John P. Doyle, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, for a judicial sabbatical and make a recommendation to the Judicial Council.

Action: The committee reviewed and approved the recommendation for an unpaid judicial sabbatical request from Hon. John P. Doyle, and agreed to forward the recommendation to the Judicial Council for approval.

Item 2

Update on Governance Policies (Action Required)

Discussion of the review and revisions to the Governance Policies and make a recommendation to the Judicial Council.

Action: The committee reviewed and approved the revisions to the Governance Policies and agreed to recommend approval in a report to the Judicial Council.

Item 3

Agenda Setting for the November 16-17 Judicial Council Meeting (Action Required)

Review draft reports and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in November.

Action: The committee reviewed draft reports and materials, and set the agenda for the Judicial Council meeting in November.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

C L O S E D S E S S I O N

Item 1

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(d)(1)

Recommendation for Advisory Subcommittee Appointments

Review recommendations submitted by the advisory committee chair regarding subcommittee appointments.

Action: The committee approved recommendations for subcommittee appointments.

Item 2

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(d)(1)

Recommendation for Advisory Committee Appointment and Proposed Rule Amendment

Review nominations and propose rule amendment for an advisory body and develop recommendations to be submitted to the Chief Justice and the committee chair.

Action: The committee developed recommendations for submission to the Chief Justice. The committee also approved a proposed rule amendment for an advisory body.

Adjourned closed session at 1:00 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on _____.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date

November 29, 2017

To

Members of the Executive and Planning
Committee

From

Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager
David Smith, Senior Analyst
Office of Court Research
Budget Services, Judicial Council

Subject

Conversion of Two Vacant Subordinate
Judicial Officer Positions in the Superior
Court of Los Angeles County

Action Requested

Review Request for SJO Conversions

Deadline

December 14, 2017

Contact

David Smith
415-865-7696 phone
david.smith@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

Staff recommend that the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) confirm the conversion of two vacant subordinate judicial officer (SJO) positions in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The court has notified council staff of these vacancies and requested that the positions be converted to judgeships. Confirming this request for conversion is consistent with established council policy of improving access to justice by providing constitutionally empowered judges who are accountable to the electorate in matters that are appropriately handled by judges.

Recommendation

Judicial Council staff recommend that E&P confirm the conversion of two vacant SJO positions in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The two vacancies are the result of the retirement of the commissioners serving in these positions on November 2, 2017. The conversions will take effect on the date on which E&P approves the court's request.

Council staff also recommend that E&P acknowledge that the Superior Court of Los Angeles County may treat these converted positions as positions that the court may temporarily fill until judges are named and sworn to fill them.

Previous Council Action

The 2002 report of the Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group led the Judicial Council to sponsor legislation to restore an appropriate balance between judges and SJOs in the trial courts. The 2002 report found that many courts had created SJO positions out of necessity in response to the dearth in the creation of new judgeships during the 1980s and 1990s. As a result, many SJOs were working as temporary judges. This imbalance between judges and SJOs was especially critical in the area of family and juvenile law.¹

In 2007, the Judicial Council approved a methodology for evaluating the workload appropriate to SJOs relative to the number of SJOs working in the courts. In the same year, the Legislature passed Assembly Bill 159, which adopted the Judicial Council's methodology. This resulted in a list of 25 courts in which a total of 162 SJO positions would be converted. Government Code section 69615(c)(1)(A) allows for the annual conversion of up to 16 SJO vacancies upon authorization by the Legislature in courts identified by the Judicial Council as having SJOs in excess of the workload appropriate to SJOs.²

Subsequent council action established and refined guidelines for expediting the conversion of SJO vacancies. These guidelines included:

- The adoption of four trial court allocation groups and a schedule that distributes the 16 annual SJO conversions across these groups in numbers that are proportional to the total number of conversions for which the groups are eligible;
- The delegation of authority to E&P for confirming SJO conversions;
- The establishment of guidelines for courts to notify the council of SJO vacancies and timelines for the redistribution of SJO conversions across the allocation groups; and
- The establishment of criteria for E&P to use in evaluating and granting requests by courts to exempt SJO vacancies from conversion.³

¹ See Judicial Council of Cal., Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group Rep., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Duties and Titles* (July 2002), www.courts.ca.gov/7476.htm.

² See Judicial Council of Cal., *Update of the Judicial Workload Assessment and New Methodology for Selecting Courts with Subordinate Judicial Officers for Conversion to Judgeships* (Feb. 14, 2007), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/022307item9.pdf; and the update of this report and SJO allocation list, Judicial Council of Cal., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Update of Conversions Using More Current Workload Data* (Aug. 21, 2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemL.pdf (as of June 7, 2017).

³ See Judicial Council of Cal., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Update of the Policy for Deferrals of Conversions to Judgeships* (Aug. 26, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4625050&GUID=80FC1733-CB19-4468-9822-E63668EBC1C4> (as of June 7, 2017).

In addition to the above policies to expedite conversions, in 2015, the council refreshed the workload data used to determine the courts with eligible conversions. A list of eligible positions was established for the remaining conversions, and courts were notified of any changes in status based on the updated workload assessment.⁴

Rationale for Recommendation

The Superior Court of Los Angeles County is eligible for a total of 79 of the 162 conversions authorized by the Legislature and has previously converted 63 positions, with the last set of conversions occurring in fiscal year (FY) 2016–17. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County is the sole member of Allocation Group 1, which is allotted 7 conversions each year. The confirmation of the present request would result in the conversion of 2 of the 7 SJO positions for which the court is eligible in FY 2017–18, and would allow the court reasonable certainty and clarity concerning staffing and judicial workload over the next few years.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

This proposal, which is consistent with the original tenets of council policy on SJO conversions, did not circulate for comment. Confirming these conversions is consistent with well-established council policy on SJO conversions.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

To date, there have been minimal implementation costs for the trial courts. Upon appointment of a new judge to sit in a converted position, funding equal to the judge's estimated compensation—which includes salary and benefits but does not include retirement—is removed from the trial court's allocation where it previously funded the SJO position. This funding is then transferred to the statewide fund for judicial salaries and benefits, Program 45.25.

Attachment

1. Attachment A: November 21, 2017, letter from Presiding Judge Daniel J. Buckley, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, to Justice Douglas P. Miller, Chair, Executive and Planning Committee, regarding the conversion of vacant SJO positions

⁴ See Judicial Council of Cal., *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Update of Conversions Using More Current Workload Data* (Aug. 21, 2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemL.pdf (as of June 7, 2017).



The Superior Court

STANLEY MOSK COURTHOUSE
111 NORTH HILL STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
CHAMBERS OF
DANIEL J. BUCKLEY
PRESIDING JUDGE

TELEPHONE
(213) 633-0400

November 21, 2017

The Honorable Douglas P. Miller, Chair
Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Re: Request for Conversion of Two Commissioner Positions

Dear Justice Miller:

I am writing to request that you forward to the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee our request to approve the conversion of two vacant commissioner positions in the Los Angeles Superior Court (LASC) to judgeships in the 2017-2018 fiscal year, pursuant to Government Code Section 69615.

These vacancies were created by the following events:

Commissioner Nicole M. Heeseman
Commissioner Amy Yerkey

Appointed Judge November 2, 2017
Appointed Judge November 2, 2017

LASC is scheduled to convert seven such vacancies this fiscal year. As the above positions are instantly available, and as we have a pressing need for judges, I hope and trust that the Committee will approve this request and promptly forward notice of the resulting vacancies to the Governor's office.

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daniel J. Buckley".

DANIEL J. BUCKLEY
Presiding Judge

DJB:BB:rm

c: Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California
Leah Rose Goodwin, Judicial Council, Office of Court Research



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA
94102-3688

Meeting Agenda

Judicial Council

Meeting materials
are available through
the hyperlinks in
this document.

*Open to the Public Unless Indicated as Closed
(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.6(a))*

*Requests for ADA accommodation should be directed to
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov*

Friday, January 12, 2018

9:00 AM

San Francisco

CLOSED SESSION (RULE 10.6(B))—PLANNING, PERSONNEL, AND DISCUSSION PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

Session 9:00 – 9:30 a.m.

Transitional Break 9:30 – 9:35 a.m.

OPEN SESSION (RULE 10.6(A)) — MEETING AGENDA

Session 9:35 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Public Comment

30 minutes

The Judicial Council welcomes public comment on general matters of judicial administration and on specific agenda items, as it can enhance the council's understanding of the issues coming before it.

Please see our public comment procedures at:

<http://www.courts.ca.gov/28045.htm>

- 1) Submit advance requests to speak by 4:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 9, 2018.
- 2) Submit written comments for this meeting by 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 10, 2018.

Contact information for advance requests to speak, written comments, and questions:

E-mail:

judicialcouncil@jud.ca.gov

Postal mail or delivery in person:

Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Attention: Donna Ignacio

Approval of Minutes

18-005 **Minutes of the November 16-17, 2017, Judicial Council meeting.**

Chief Justice's Report

10 minutes

Administrative Director's Report

18-006 **Administrative Director's Report**

10 minutes

Judicial Council Committee Presentations

[18-008](#) **Judicial Council Committee Reports**

Summary:

Executive and Planning Committee
Hon. Douglas P. Miller, Chair
Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee
Hon. Kenneth K. So, Chair
Rules and Projects Committee
Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr., Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair
Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Hon. David M. Rubin, Chair

30 minutes

Judicial Council Members' Liaison Reports

18-009 **Judicial Council Members' Liaison Reports**

Summary:

Judicial Council members report on their visits to the superior courts.

20 minutes

Break 11:15 – 11:30 a.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

A council member who wishes to request that any item be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Discussion Agenda is asked to please notify Roma Cheadle at 415-865-7640 at least 48 hours before the meeting.

[18-002](#)

Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2017 (Action Required)

Summary:

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee recommend that the Judicial Council receive and accept the report entitled *Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline 2017* and the report cover letter, which includes suggested modifications to the report's observations, and direct staff to forward them to the Legislature. The review of California's statewide uniform child support guideline is legislatively mandated. Family Code section 4054 states that any recommendations for revision to the guideline must be made to ensure that the guideline results in appropriate child support orders, limits deviations from the guideline, or otherwise helps to ensure that the guideline is in compliance with federal law. The review provides a basis for the Legislature to periodically reassess California's child support guideline and evaluate its impact on children and families.

[18-012](#)

Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation: Interpreters in Small Claims Actions (Action Required)

Summary:

The Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force and Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council sponsor legislation to: (1) amend Government Code section 68560.5(a) to delete an exception stating that interpreters are not required in small claims proceedings; and (2) amend Code of Civil Procedure section 116.550 to authorize courts to appoint certified and registered interpreters in small claims proceedings. The latter amendment also provides judicial officers with discretion to appoint a temporary interpreter to assist a court user during a small claims hearing if an attempt to secure a certified/registered or provisionally qualified interpreter was not successful either: (1) after the matter was continued to allow for a further search; or (2) at the first hearing if the judicial officer determines that appointment of a temporary interpreter is appropriate without a further postponement, depending on the complexity of the case. The amendments support Recommendations 71 and 72 in the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*, adopted by the council in January 2015.

[18-013](#)

Traffic and Criminal Procedure: Ability to Pay in Traffic and Other Infraction Cases (Action Required)

Summary:

The Traffic Advisory Committee, the Criminal Law Advisory Committee, and the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness propose two optional, plain-language Judicial Council forms - an application form and a judicial order form -

to assist in implementing existing rule 4.335 of the California Rules of Court on ability-to-pay determinations in traffic and other infraction cases. They also recommend a new rule stating the forms' intended use, their optional nature, and the confidential status of the application form.

[18-015](#)**Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve one new request and one amended request for Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts. Under the Judicial Council-adopted process, a court may request that funding reduced as a result of a court exceeding its 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the TCTF for the benefit of that court. The total amount requested by the trial courts that would be reduced from their 2017-18 allocations for exceeding the cap is \$619,413.

[18-016](#)**Trial Court Allocations: Final Reduction Related to Statutory 1 Percent Cap on 2016-17 Fund Balance Carryover (Action Required)****Summary:**

Under Government Code section 77203(b), a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year. The Judicial Council staff recommends approving a final reduction allocation of \$7,483,465 related to the fund balance in 2016-17 and prior-year excluded funds, as required by Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A).

[18-021](#)**Judicial Council: Advisory Committee Membership and Terms (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Judicial Council's Rules and Projects Committee proposes amending several rules of court relating to memberships on advisory committees. The amendments would amend rule 10.31, the general rule on memberships, to clarify the terms of the chairs, members, and advisory members. It would also amend the rules relating to four specific advisory committees to add new or modify existing categories of membership.

DISCUSSION AGENDA[18-003](#)**Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (Action Required)****Summary:**

In order to continue making progress towards equity of funding based on workload and, taking into consideration the continued lack of adequate and stable funding provided to the trial courts, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council adopt new policy parameters for the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology that will go into effect in 2018-19. The original Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology was submitted to and approved by the Judicial Council on April 26, 2013 and became effective July 1,

2013. The council approved a five-year implementation schedule, incrementally shifting funds using a recalculation of historical base each year, which concluded in 2017-18. New policy parameters are needed for the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology effective 2018-19 and beyond to further the objectives of the Judicial Branch in reaching workload-based equitable funding.

Speakers:

Hon Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and
Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Judicial Council Budget Services

40 minutes

[18-004](#)

Judicial Branch Education: 2018-2020 Education Plan (Action Required)

Summary:

The Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) recommends approving the 2018-2020 Education Plan, effective July 1, 2018.

Through the work of its standing curriculum committees, the CJER Governing Committee developed this plan for CJER education programs and products that will enable its judicial branch constituencies to fulfill the education requirements and expectations outlined in rules 10.451-10.491 of the California Rules of Court.

Speakers:

Hon. Theodore M. Weathers, Chair, CJER Governing Committee

Ms. Karene Alvarado, Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER)

30 minutes

[18-014](#)

Revisions to the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) (Action Required)

Summary:

The Court Executives Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the revised statistical reporting definitions for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) effective July 1, 2018. JBSIS is the statistical reporting system that defines and electronically collects summary information from Superior Court case management systems for each major case processing area of the court. JBSIS is authorized through California Rule of Court 10.400 and is the source of court operational data for the judicial branch, the Legislature, and other state agencies consistent with article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 68505.

Speakers:

Mr. Jake Chatters, Chair, CEAC JBSIS Working Group

Ms. Kimberly Flener, Chair, Court Executives Advisory Committee

Mr. Chris Belloli, Office of Court Research,

20 minutes

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)[18-001](#)**Government Code Section 68604: Standards of Timely Disposition Published in the 2017 Court Statistics Report****Summary:**

The Judicial Council shall direct staff to transmit the already-published 2017 *Court Statistics Report* to the Legislature. Doing so fulfills the requirements of Government Code section 68604, which requires the Judicial Council to report biennially regarding the standards of timely disposition adopted pursuant to section 68603. The 2017 *Court Statistics Report* contains case-processing and time-to-disposition statistics that meet the requirements of Government Code section 68604.

[18-010](#)**Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Report on California Rules of Court, rule 10.75 (Meetings of Advisory Bodies)****Summary:**

The *Supplemental Report of the 2013-2014 Budget Package* requires that the Judicial Council report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on implementation of the open meetings rule, rule 10.75 of the California Rules of Court. Under subdivision (p) of the rule, the Judicial Council must review the rule's impact periodically to determine whether amendments are needed. No amendments are needed at this time.

[18-011](#)**Government Code Section 68106: Public Notice by Courts of Closures or Reduced Clerks' Office Hours (Gov. Code, § 68106-Report No. 45)****Summary:**

Government Code section 68106 directs (1) trial courts to notify the public and the Judicial Council before closing courtrooms or clerks' offices or reducing clerks' regular office hours, and (2) the council to post all such notices on its website and also relay them to the Legislature. This is the 45nd report to date listing the latest court notices received by the council under this statutory requirement; since the previous report, four superior courts- Modoc, Alameda, Stanislaus, and Sierra Counties-have issued new notices.

[18-017](#)**Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Allocation of New Judgeships Funding in Fiscal Year 2016-2017****Summary:**

The Budget Act of 2007 requires that this report be submitted each year until all judgeships are appointed and new staff hired.

[18-018](#)**Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Standards and Measures That Promote the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice****Summary:**

This report satisfies the requirements of Government Code section 77001.5, which requires the Judicial Council to adopt and annually report on judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice, including, but not limited to, the following subjects: (1) providing equal access to courts and respectful treatment for all court participants; (2) case processing,

including the efficient use of judicial resources; and (3) general court administration.

[18-019](#)

Report to the Legislature: Trial Court Trust Fund Revenue, Expenditure, and Fund Balance Constraints for Fiscal Year 2016-2017

Summary:

Government Code sections 68502.5(b) and 77202.5(b) require the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature the following financial data from all fund sources, by individual trial court, with totals for all trial courts and each trial court: revenues; expenditures at the program, component, and object levels; and fund balances. The report must be submitted on or before December 31 after the end of each fiscal year.

[18-020](#)

Receipts and Expenditures from Local Courthouse Construction Funds: Report to the Budget and Fiscal Committees of the Legislature

Summary:

Government Code section 70403(d) directs the Judicial Council to submit a report of all receipts and expenditures from the local courthouse construction funds to the budget and fiscal committees of the Legislature based on the information received from counties pursuant to this section on or before January 1 of each year. The *Receipts and Expenditures from Local Courthouse Construction Funds: Report to the Budget and Fiscal Committees of the Legislature* provides information for the reporting period of July 1, 2016, to June 30, 2017.

There were no Circulating Orders since the last business meeting.

Appointment Orders since the last business meeting.

18-022

Appointment Orders since the last Judicial Council business meeting.

Adjournment (approx. 1:00 p.m.)

Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC)
Annual Agenda¹—2018

Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P): [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Santa Clara County
Lead Staff:	Cliff Alumno, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.46(a) of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC), which is to contribute to the statewide administration of justice by monitoring areas of significance to the justice system and making recommendations to the Judicial Council on policy issues affecting the trial courts. In addition to this charge, rule 10.46(b) sets forth the additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>Per rule 10.46(c), the TCPJAC is comprised of the presiding judges of all 58 superior courts. Additionally, rule 10.46 (d) establishes an Executive Committee consisting of the committee chair, vice-chair, and members in the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) All presiding judges from superior courts with 48 or more judges;(b) Two presiding judges from superior courts with 2 to 5 judges, who are elected by the members in this court category;(c) Three presiding judges from superior courts with 6 to 15 judges, who are elected by the members in this court category; and(d) Four presiding judges from superior courts with 16 to 47 judges, who are elected by the members in this court category. <p>The attached term of service charts provide the composition of the committee.</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.

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

1. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
2. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
3. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee
4. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group to Assess Issues Related to Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement
5. (*New*) TCPJAC Emergency Response Working Group

DRAFT

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 Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: <i>Assess Issues Related to the Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement</i>	Priority 2 ⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group to Assess Issues Related to Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement is charged with assessing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues relating to the presence of body-worn cameras brought into the court by officers appearing on legal matters. Review and recommend policies and procedures for trial courts; and • Other related issues that may arise as the working group delves into this subject. <p>Status/Timeline: Projected completion date is 2018. Charge of the working group was reassessed and revised in light of the Digital Evidence Workstream established by the Information Technology Advisory Committee in August 2017.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Collaboration with the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) and Information Technology Advisory Committee. Possible consultation with the Court Security Advisory Committee and the Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</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.

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
2.	Project Title: Propose Amending Penal Code Section 808 to include “court commissioners” within the definition of “magistrate.”	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: This proposal was developed at the request of presiding judges to expand the pool of judicial officers who are authorized to perform magistrate duties, provide courts with greater flexibility to equitably address judicial workloads, and increase access to justice.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Projected completion date is unknown. As of May 2, 2017, the bill, AB 745 (Reyes), was amended to authorize only the presiding judges of the Superior Courts of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties to allow court commissioners to perform specified criminal magistrate duties until January 1, 2021. As of September 18, 2017, the bill is held under submission by the Assembly Appropriations Committee.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Criminal Justice Services, Governmental Affairs, and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</p>		
3.	Project Title: Develop Resource for Presiding Judges for Responding to Emergency Situations	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: In light of the significant impact the recent fires have had on trial court operations, and following up on the presentation by Assistant Presiding Judge Gary Nadler, Superior Court of Sonoma County, to the Judicial Council during its November 2017 business meeting, through a new working group, develop a resource for presiding judges, an Emergency Response Playbook. Compile checklists for presiding judges to follow. Included would be information on what presiding judges need to consider and address before, during, and after a disaster. The playbook would include an evaluation of what happens resulting from a disaster and a compilation of procedures and processes already in place in several courts. Judge Nadler would serve as a resource and be consulted throughout this project.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2018.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Legal Services, Human Resources, Information Technology, and Facilities Services.</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
	<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Superior Courts.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> CEAC and the Information Technology Advisory Committee.</p>	
4.	<p>Project Title: Provide Input to CEAC During Its Review of the Standards of Judicial Administration to Clarify and Improve Access to Justice Measures</p>	<p>Priority 2</p>
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> As needed, provide input to CEAC as it reviews the existing Standards of Judicial Administration and recommends additions, deletions, and/or revisions to performance measures. CEAC is conducting this review to improve the branch’s ability to communicate the trial courts’ objectives and uniform performance measures to each other, other branches of government, and the public. This effort would seek to expand existing performance measures that focus solely on time to disposition to include broader access measures (e.g., potential standards for self-help center hours, clerks’ office hours, etc.). This project was conceived as a way to assist with developing responses to Department of Finance inquiries regarding how increased and decreased funding impacts trial court operations and services.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> 2020.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> CEAC.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
5.	Project Title: Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS) monitors proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. The subcommittee also reviews proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Governmental Affairs and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: CEAC.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
6.	Project Title: Develop, Review, and/or Provide Input on Proposals to Establish, Amend, or Repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards on Judicial Administration, and Forms; Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS) develops, reviews, and provides input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts. The subcommittee focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee makes recommendations to the Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) concerning the overall rule making process.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Legal Services and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: CEAC.</p>		
7.	Project Title: Legislative Advocacy of Increased Funding for the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF)	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: Develop strategies on how presiding judges can strengthen their role and be better prepared to both advocate for and assist the Judicial Council, including Governmental Affairs, in advocating for increased funding to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Governmental Affairs, Budget Services, and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: CEAC and the Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
8.	Project Title: Review and Make Recommendations on Court Technology Proposals and Recommendations	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee reviews and provides, on an as-needed basis, early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. The subcommittee also provides input and feedback on various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee. The subcommittee is charged with providing preliminary feedback on technology proposals on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC. Input on more substantive technology policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented to the TCPJAC and CEAC for final review.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		
<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Legal Services, Information Technology, and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p>		
<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p>		
<p>AC Collaboration: CEAC.</p>		
9.	Project Title: Serve as a Resource	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to development of recommendations for council action.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		
<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p>		
<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p>		
<p>AC Collaboration: CEAC.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee. Remained active throughout 2017, holding 11 conference calls to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and make recommendations on proposed and existing legislation that had a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. In December 2017, the subcommittee will set its schedule for 2018 and continue to meet to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts. The subcommittee will continue to recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p>
2.	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee. Remained active throughout 2017 to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and input on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, and submit comments on rules, standards, and form proposals that may have a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. This subcommittee will continue to be active in 2018 and meet as needed.</p>
3.	<p>Legislative Advocacy for the Increased Funding of the Trial Courts. In March 2017, TCPJAC and CEAC leadership, with input from Judicial Council staff, developed the document <i>Protecting the Vulnerable through California's Courts</i> with the goal of providing a realistic, concise, and direct overview of the suffering and damaged lives caused by rendering courts unable to timely serve their users. It also describes the services that courts can and should be able to provide to vulnerable Californians at the most difficult times in their lives. During visits with legislators, this document was provided to them to support budget advocacy discussions.</p>
4.	<p>Educational Opportunities. TCPJAC and CEAC leadership collaborated with Judicial Council staff to provide 11 educational breakout sessions on 8 key areas of court operations as part of the August 2017 TCPJAC/CEAC Statewide Business Meetings. The topics of the educational breakout sessions included: Collaborative Courts; Court Budgeting – Techniques and Tools; Effective and Efficient Traffic Procedures; Evidence-Based Practices in Misdemeanors; Facilities Management & Maintenance; Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) and the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Model; New Budget Advocacy Strategies for Fiscal Year 2018–19; and Workload Allocation Funding Model (WAFM). Participants included presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executive officers, and assistant court executive officers.</p>

Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee

	Position	County	Member Name	1st Term Start	1st Term End	Current Term Start	Current Term End	Replaced	Previous
	<i>Chair</i>	<i>Santa Clara</i>	<i>Hon. Patricia M. Lucas</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>9/18</i>			<i>J. B. Barton</i>	<i>B. L. McCabe</i>
	<i>Vice Chair</i>	<i>Nevada</i>	<i>Hon. B. Scott Thomsen</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>12/31/17</i>			<i>P. M. Lucas</i>	<i>D. C. Byrd</i>
1	Presiding Judge	Alameda	Hon. Morris Jacobson	1/16	12/17			W. Y. Smith	C. D. Clay
2	Presiding Judge	Alpine	Hon. Thomas Kolpacoff	1/13	12/16	1/17	12/22	D. L. DeVore	R. Specchio
3	Presiding Judge	Amador	Hon. J. S. Hermanson	1/14	1/2/18			S. C. Harlan	D. S. Richmond
4	Presiding Judge	Butte	Hon. Robert A. Glusman	1/16	12/17			K. A. Lucena	S. E. Benson
5	Presiding Judge	Calaveras	Hon. Timothy S. Healy	9/22/17	12/17			G. V. Barrett	T. S. Healy
6	Presiding Judge	Colusa	Hon. Jeffrey A. Thompson	6/10	12/11	1/17	12/22	J. Tiernan	W. S. Abel
7	Presiding Judge	Contra Costa	Hon. Jill C. Fannin	1/17	12/18			S. Austin	B. P. Goode
8	Presiding Judge	Del Norte	Hon. William H. Follett	1/11	12/11	1/17	12/18	R. W. Weir	W. H. Follett
9	Presiding Judge	El Dorado	Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury	1/01	12/01	1/17	12/18		
10	Presiding Judge	Fresno	Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab	1/16	12/17			J. B. Conklin	G. D. Hoff
11	Presiding Judge	Glenn	Hon. Donald Cole Byrd	1/15	12/16			P. B. Twede	D. C. Byrd
12	Presiding Judge	Humboldt	Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs	1/15	12/16	1/17	12/18	D. A. Reinholtzen	W. B. Watson
13	Presiding Judge	Imperial	Hon. Christopher J. Plourd	1/16	12/17			P. Flores, Jr.	W. D. Lehman
14	Presiding Judge	Inyo	Hon. Dean T. Stout	1/16	12/17			B. Lamb	D. Stout
15	Presiding Judge	Kern	Hon. Charles R. Brehmer	1/17	12/19			J. S. Somers	C. M. Humphrey
16	Presiding Judge	Kings	Hon. Steven D. Barnes	1/16	12/17			T. DeSantos	J. LaPorte
17	Presiding Judge	Lake	Hon. Andrew S. Blum	1/16	12/18			D. Herrick	R. C. Martin
18	Presiding Judge	Lassen	Hon. Michele Verderosa	1/13	12/17			F. D. Sokol	S. Bradbury
19	Presiding Judge	Los Angeles	Hon. Daniel J. Buckley	1/17	12/18			C. B. Kuhl	D. S. Wesley
20	Presiding Judge	Madera	Hon. Joseph A. Soldani	1/17	1/1/19			E. LiCalsi	D. L. Jones
21	Presiding Judge	Marin	Hon. Kelly V. Simmons	1/16	12/17			F. D'Opal	J. R. Ritchie
22	Presiding Judge	Mariposa	Hon. F. Dana Walton	1/17	12/17			W. R. Parrish	F. D. Walton
23	Presiding Judge	Mendocino	Hon. John A. Behnke	1/16	12/17			D. E. Nelson	R. J. Henderson
24	Presiding Judge	Merced	Hon. Donald J. Proietti	1/2/17	12/18			B. L. McCabe	J. D. Kirihara
25	Presiding Judge	Modoc	Hon. Francis W. Barclay	1/07	12/08	1/17	12/17	L. L. Dier	J. Baker
26	Presiding Judge	Mono	Hon. Mark G. Magit	1/17	12/22			S. L. Eller	E. Forestenzer
27	Presiding Judge	Monterey	Hon. Mark E. Hood	1/16	12/17			M. Anderson	T. P. Roberts
28	Presiding Judge	Napa	Hon. Mark Boessenecker	1/16	12/17			R. G. Stone	D. Price
29	Presiding Judge	Nevada	Hon. B. Scott Thomsen	1/16	12/17			C. S. Heidelberger	T. M. Anderson
30	Presiding Judge	Orange	Hon. Charles Margines	1/16	12/17			G. Sanders	T. J. Borris
31	Presiding Judge	Placer	Hon. Alan V. Pineschi	5/7/09	12/09	1/16	12/17	R. P. McElhany	L. D. Gaddis
32	Presiding Judge	Plumas	Hon. Janet Hilde	1/17	12/17			I. R. Kaufman	J. Hilde
33	Presiding Judge	Riverside	Hon. Becky Lynn Dugan	1/17	12/18			H. W. Hopp	M. A. Cope
34	Presiding Judge	Sacramento	Hon. Kevin R. Culhane	1/16	12/17			R. C. Hight	L. Earl
35	Presiding Judge	San Benito	Hon. Steven R. Sanders	1/17	12/18			H. J. Tobias	S. R. Sanders
36	Presiding Judge	San Bernardino	Hon. Raymond L. Haight, III	1/16	12/17			M. G. Slough	R. Christianson
37	Presiding Judge	San Diego	Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton	1/16	12/17			D. J. Danielsen	R. J. Trentacosta
38	Presiding Judge	San Francisco	Hon. Teri L. Jackson	1/17	12/18			J. K. Stewart	C. M. Lee
39	Presiding Judge	San Joaquin	Hon. Jose L. Alva	1/16	12/17			L. D. Holland	D. Warner
40	Presiding Judge	San Luis Obispo	Hon. Barry T. LaBarbera	1/16	12/17			M. J. Tangeman	D. A. Harman
41	Presiding Judge	San Mateo	Hon. Susan I. Etezadi	1/17	12/19			J. L. Grandsaert	R. D. Foiles
42	Presiding Judge	Santa Barbara	Hon. Patricia L. Kelly	1/17	12/19			J. Herman	A. A. Garcia
43	Presiding Judge	Santa Clara	Hon. Patricia M. Lucas	1/17	12/18			R. J. Pichon	B. Walsh
44	Presiding Judge	Santa Cruz	Hon. Denine J. Guy	1/16	12/17			P. M. Marigonda	J. S. Salazar
45	Presiding Judge	Shasta	Hon. Gary G. Gibson	1/17	12/18			G. S. Gaul	M. Bigelow
46	Presiding Judge	Sierra	Hon. Charles H. Ervin	11/4/16	1/11/17			J. P. Kennelly	W. W. Pangman
47	Presiding Judge	Siskiyou	Hon. William J. Davis	7/15	6/30/17			L. J. Masunaga	R. Kosel
48	Presiding Judge	Solano	Hon. Robert Fracchia	1/16	12/17			E. B. Neslon	P. L. Beeman
49	Presiding Judge	Sonoma	Hon. Raima Ballinger	1/16	12/17			K. J. Gnos	R. A. Chouteau
50	Presiding Judge	Stanislaus	Hon. Ricardo Cordova	1/17	12/18			M. S. Silveria	L. M. Begen
51	Presiding Judge	Sutter	Hon. Brian R. Aronson	1/15	12/16			S.E. Green	C. R. Chandler
52	Presiding Judge	Tehama	Hon. C. Todd Bottke	12/8/15	12/18			J. J. Garaventa	R. Scheuler
53	Presiding Judge	Trinity	Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson	1/7/13	12/13	1/17	12/18	A. C. Edwards	J. P. Woodward
54	Presiding Judge	Tulare	Hon. Bret D. Hillman	1/17	12/18			G. Paden	L. L. Hicks
55	Presiding Judge	Tuolumne	Hon. Donald Segerstrom	1/15	1/17	1/17	12/19	E. Provost	E. L. DuTemple
56	Presiding Judge	Ventura	Hon. Patricia M. Murphy	1/2/17	12/18			D. D. Coleman	B. J. Back
57	Presiding Judge	Yolo	Hon. Janet Gaard	1/17	12/18			K. M. White	S. M. Basha
58	Presiding Judge	Yuba	Hon. Debra L. Givens	7/08	6/10	7/16	7/18	J. Curry	

Membership (Rule 10.46): The committee shall consist of:

The presiding judge of each county

Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee

	Position	County	Member Name	1st Term Start	1st Term End	Current Term Start	Current Term End	Replaced	Previous
	<i>Chair</i>	<i>Santa Clara</i>	<i>Hon. Patricia M. Lucas</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>9/18</i>			<i>J. B. Barton</i>	<i>B. L. McCabe</i>
	<i>Vice Chair</i>	<i>Nevada</i>	<i>Hon. B. Scott Thomsen</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>12/31/17</i>			<i>P. M. Lucas</i>	<i>D. C. Byrd</i>
1	Presiding Judge	Alameda	Hon. Morris Jacobson	1/16	12/17			W. Y. Smith	C. D. Clay
2	Presiding Judge	Alpine	Hon. Thomas Kolpacoff	1/13	12/16	1/17	12/22	D. L. DeVore	R. Specchio
3	Presiding Judge	Amador	Hon. J. S. Hermanson	1/14	1/2/18			S. C. Harlan	D. S. Richmond
4	Presiding Judge	Butte	Hon. Robert A. Glusman	1/16	12/17			K. A. Lucena	S. E. Benson
5	Presiding Judge	Calaveras	Hon. Timothy S. Healy	9/22/17	12/17			G. V. Barrett	T. S. Healy
6	Presiding Judge	Colusa	Hon. Jeffrey A. Thompson	6/10	12/11	1/17	12/22	J. Tiernan	W. S. Abel
7	Presiding Judge	Contra Costa	Hon. Jill C. Fannin	1/17	12/18			S. Austin	B. P. Goode
8	Presiding Judge	Del Norte	Hon. William H. Follett	1/11	12/11	1/17	12/18	R. W. Weir	W. H. Follett
9	Presiding Judge	El Dorado	Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury	1/01	12/01	1/17	12/18		
10	Presiding Judge	Fresno	Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab	1/16	12/17			J. B. Conklin	G. D. Hoff
11	Presiding Judge	Glenn	Hon. Donald Cole Byrd	1/15	12/16			P. B. Twede	D. C. Byrd
12	Presiding Judge	Humboldt	Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs	1/15	12/16	1/17	12/18	D. A. Reinholtzen	W. B. Watson
13	Presiding Judge	Imperial	Hon. Christopher J. Plourd	1/16	12/17			P. Flores, Jr.	W. D. Lehman
14	Presiding Judge	Inyo	Hon. Dean T. Stout	1/16	12/17			B. Lamb	D. Stout
15	Presiding Judge	Kern	Hon. Charles R. Brehmer	1/17	12/19			J. S. Somers	C. M. Humphrey
16	Presiding Judge	Kings	Hon. Steven D. Barnes	1/16	12/17			T. DeSantos	J. LaPorte
17	Presiding Judge	Lake	Hon. Andrew S. Blum	1/16	12/18			D. Herrick	R. C. Martin
18	Presiding Judge	Lassen	Hon. Michele Verderosa	1/13	12/17			F. D. Sokol	S. Bradbury
19	Presiding Judge	Los Angeles	Hon. Daniel J. Buckley	1/17	12/18			C. B. Kuhl	D. S. Wesley
20	Presiding Judge	Madera	Hon. Joseph A. Soldani	1/17	1/1/19			E. LiCalsi	D. L. Jones
21	Presiding Judge	Marin	Hon. Kelly V. Simmons	1/16	12/17			F. D'Opal	J. R. Ritchie
22	Presiding Judge	Mariposa	Hon. F. Dana Walton	1/17	12/17			W. R. Parrish	F. D. Walton
23	Presiding Judge	Mendocino	Hon. John A. Behnke	1/16	12/17			D. E. Nelson	R. J. Henderson
24	Presiding Judge	Merced	Hon. Donald J. Proietti	1/2/17	12/18			B. L. McCabe	J. D. Kirihara
25	Presiding Judge	Modoc	Hon. Francis W. Barclay	1/07	12/08	1/17	12/17	L. L. Dier	J. Baker
26	Presiding Judge	Mono	Hon. Mark G. Magit	1/17	12/22			S. L. Eller	E. Forestenzer
27	Presiding Judge	Monterey	Hon. Mark E. Hood	1/16	12/17			M. Anderson	T. P. Roberts
28	Presiding Judge	Napa	Hon. Mark Boessenecker	1/16	12/17			R. G. Stone	D. Price
29	Presiding Judge	Nevada	Hon. B. Scott Thomsen	1/16	12/17			C. S. Heidelberger	T. M. Anderson
30	Presiding Judge	Orange	Hon. Charles Margines	1/16	12/17			G. Sanders	T. J. Borris
31	Presiding Judge	Placer	Hon. Alan V. Pineschi	5/7/09	12/09	1/16	12/17	R. P. McElhany	L. D. Gaddis
32	Presiding Judge	Plumas	Hon. Janet Hilde	1/17	12/17			I. R. Kaufman	J. Hilde
33	Presiding Judge	Riverside	Hon. Becky Lynn Dugan	1/17	12/18			H. W. Hopp	M. A. Cope
34	Presiding Judge	Sacramento	Hon. Kevin R. Culhane	1/16	12/17			R. C. Hight	L. Earl
35	Presiding Judge	San Benito	Hon. Steven R. Sanders	1/17	12/18			H. J. Tobias	S. R. Sanders
36	Presiding Judge	San Bernardino	Hon. Raymond L. Haight, III	1/16	12/17			M. G. Slough	R. Christianson
37	Presiding Judge	San Diego	Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton	1/16	12/17			D. J. Danielsen	R. J. Trentacosta
38	Presiding Judge	San Francisco	Hon. Teri L. Jackson	1/17	12/18			J. K. Stewart	C. M. Lee
39	Presiding Judge	San Joaquin	Hon. Jose L. Alva	1/16	12/17			L. D. Holland	D. Warner
40	Presiding Judge	San Luis Obispo	Hon. Barry T. LaBarbera	1/16	12/17			M. J. Tangeman	D. A. Harman
41	Presiding Judge	San Mateo	Hon. Susan I. Etezadi	1/17	12/19			J. L. Grandsaert	R. D. Foiles
42	Presiding Judge	Santa Barbara	Hon. Patricia L. Kelly	1/17	12/19			J. Herman	A. A. Garcia
43	Presiding Judge	Santa Clara	Hon. Patricia M. Lucas	1/17	12/18			R. J. Pichon	B. Walsh
44	Presiding Judge	Santa Cruz	Hon. Denine J. Guy	1/16	12/17			P. M. Marigonda	J. S. Salazar
45	Presiding Judge	Shasta	Hon. Gary G. Gibson	1/17	12/18			G. S. Gaul	M. Bigelow
46	Presiding Judge	Sierra	Hon. Charles H. Ervin	11/4/16	1/11/17			J. P. Kennelly	W. W. Pangman
47	Presiding Judge	Siskiyou	Hon. William J. Davis	7/15	6/30/17			L. J. Masunaga	R. Kosel
48	Presiding Judge	Solano	Hon. Robert Fracchia	1/16	12/17			E. B. Neslon	P. L. Beeman
49	Presiding Judge	Sonoma	Hon. Raima Ballinger	1/16	12/17			K. J. Gnos	R. A. Chouteau
50	Presiding Judge	Stanislaus	Hon. Ricardo Cordova	1/17	12/18			M. S. Silveria	L. M. Begen
51	Presiding Judge	Sutter	Hon. Brian R. Aronson	1/15	12/16			S.E. Green	C. R. Chandler
52	Presiding Judge	Tehama	Hon. C. Todd Bottke	12/8/15	12/18			J. J. Garaventa	R. Scheuler
53	Presiding Judge	Trinity	Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson	1/7/13	12/13	1/17	12/18	A. C. Edwards	J. P. Woodward
54	Presiding Judge	Tulare	Hon. Bret D. Hillman	1/17	12/18			G. Paden	L. L. Hicks
55	Presiding Judge	Tuolumne	Hon. Donald Segerstrom	1/15	1/17	1/17	12/19	E. Provost	E. L. DuTemple
56	Presiding Judge	Ventura	Hon. Patricia M. Murphy	1/2/17	12/18			D. D. Coleman	B. J. Back
57	Presiding Judge	Yolo	Hon. Janet Gaard	1/17	12/18			K. M. White	S. M. Basha
58	Presiding Judge	Yuba	Hon. Debra L. Givens	7/08	6/10	7/16	7/18	J. Curry	

Membership (Rule 10.46): The committee shall consist of:

The presiding judge of each county

Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)
Annual Agenda¹—2018

Approved by the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P): [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Ms. Kimberly Flener, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Butte County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Claudia Ortega, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership
Committee's Charge/Membership: Under rule 10.48(a) of the California Rules of Court, the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) is charged with making recommendations to the council on policy issues affecting the trial courts. In addition to this charge, rule 10.48(b) sets forth the additional duties of the committee. Per rule 10.48(c) , CEAC consists of the court executive officers from the 58 California superior courts. Rule 10.48(d) establishes the Executive Committee of CEAC. The Executive Committee consists of 18 members. The attached term of service charts provide the composition of CEAC and its Executive Committee.	

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 Judicial Council staff resources.

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

1. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee
2. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee
3. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee
4. TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group to Assess Issues Related to Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement
5. *(New) Child Support Services Subcommittee (formerly an ad hoc working group)*
6. *(New) JBSIS Subcommittee (formerly a working group)*
7. Nominations Subcommittee
8. Records Management Subcommittee
9. *(New) Court Security Services for the Trial Courts Working Group*
10. *(New) Standards of Judicial Administration Working Group*
11. Trial Court Facilities Working Group

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 Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: Assess Issues Related to the Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement	Priority 2⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Working Group to Assess Issues Related to Body Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement is charged with assessing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues relating to the presence of body-worn cameras brought into the court by officers appearing on legal matters. Review and recommend policies and procedures for trial courts; and • Other related issues that may arise as the working group delves into this subject. <p>Status/Timeline: Projected completion date is 2018. Charge of the working group was reassessed and revised in light of the Digital Evidence Workstream established by the Information Technology Advisory Committee in August 2017.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Collaboration with the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) and Information Technology Advisory Committee. Possible consultation with the Court Security Advisory Committee and the Criminal Law Advisory Committee.</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.

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
2.	Project Title: Review and comment on issues related to Child Support Services, such as the Plans of Cooperation (POCs) and Agreements between the Department of Child Support Services, the Judicial Council, and the trial courts	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: Through the new Child Support Services Subcommittee, CEAC will work in consultation with the Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) and the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to review and comment on future iterations of the model Plans of Cooperation (POCs) between the trial courts and DCSS. In response to issues that arose with the 2015 DCSS model POC, CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to meet with State DCSS representatives and CFCC staff to discuss and resolve concerns prior to the POC’s distribution to the trial courts and local child support agencies. CEAC is requesting that this former ad hoc working group be converted to a subcommittee as the review of future model POCs will be ongoing and the additional work charged to the new subcommittee is also of an ongoing nature.</p> <p>The additional work charged to the subcommittee includes providing input on the language in the Agreements between DCSS and the Judicial Council that could have a significant fiscal and/or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee will develop comments and/or recommendations (for CEAC’s approval) concerning recommendations proposed by the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee regarding the development of AB 1058 data for the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). The subcommittee will also convene to address any other critical issues related to the POCs and AB 1058 that might arise in the interim.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Center for Families, Children & the Courts; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Court Research.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Department of Child Support Services.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee; and Workload Assessment Advisory Committee.</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
3.	Project Title: Identify Issues and Develop Recommendations Concerning the Provision of Court Security Services for the Trial Courts	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC, through a new working group, will assess the statewide scope of a growing problem concerning inadequate sheriff staffing levels in the trial courts or potential reduction of current security staffing levels by the sheriff. This working group is also charged with analyzing solutions and developing recommendations, for CEAC’s approval, regarding court security services for the trial courts. In recent years and in an increasing number of counties, county sheriff’s offices have provided fewer officers than provided for in the courts’ MOUs with these offices. Other courts have experienced decreased court security services for other reasons, such as the opening of new and larger court facilities. Because decreased levels of sheriff’s presence has significant implications for the safety of judicial officers, court employees, and the public, CEAC has determined that it is essential to begin assessing the statewide scope of this problem and to develop recommendations.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: 2018.</p>		
<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; Legal Services; and Security Operations.</p>		
<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: California State Association of Counties (CSAC); California State Sheriffs' Association (CSSA); and Department of Finance.</p>		
<p>AC Collaboration: Court Security Advisory Committee; Judicial Branch Budget Committee; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee; and TCPJAC.</p>		
4.	Project Title: Review Standards of Judicial Administration that Relate to Trial Court Performance Measures	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC, through a new working group and in consultation with TCPJAC (as needed), will review the existing Standards of Judicial Administration and recommend additions, deletions, and/or revisions to performance measures to improve the branch’s ability to communicate the trial courts’ objectives and uniform performance measures to each other, other branches of government, and the public. This effort would seek to expand existing performance measures that focus solely on time to disposition to include broader access measures (e.g., potential standards for self-help center hours, clerks’ office hours, etc.). This project was conceived as a way to assist with developing responses to Department of Finance inquiries regarding how increased and decreased funding impacts trial court operations and services.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: 2020.</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects ³
	<p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; Legal Services; and other related Judicial Council divisions.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO); TCPJAC; and other related advisory bodies.</p>

DRAFT

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
1.	Project Title: Develop, Review, Comment, and Make Recommendations on Proposed Legislation to Establish New and/or Amend Existing Laws	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee (JLS) monitors proposed and existing legislation that has a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. The subcommittee also reviews proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts and recommend proposals for future consideration by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC).</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Governmental Affairs; and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: TCPJAC.</p>		
2.	Project Title: Develop, Review, and/or Provide Input on Proposals to Establish, Amend, or Repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards on Judicial Administration, and Forms; Make Recommendations on the Rule Making Process	Priority 1
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS) develops, reviews, and provides input on proposals to establish, amend, or repeal the California Rules of Court, Standards of Judicial Administration, and forms to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the trial courts. The subcommittee focuses on those proposals that may lead to a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. Additionally, the subcommittee makes recommendations to RUPRO concerning the overall rule making process.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: RUPRO; chair and/or staff of proposing advisory committees when necessary; and TCPJAC.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
3.	Project Title: Review and Make Recommendations on Court Technology Proposals and Recommendations	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: The TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Technology Subcommittee reviews and provides early presiding judge and court executive officer input on court technology proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations. The subcommittee also provides input and feedback on various technology issues being addressed by the Judicial Council Technology Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee. The subcommittee is charged with providing preliminary feedback on technology proposals on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC. Input on more substantive technology policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented to the TCPJAC and CEAC for final review.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		
<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Information Technology; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Legal Services.</p>		
<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p>		
<p>AC Collaboration: TCPJAC.</p>		
4.	Project Title: Support the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force; Focus on Local Operational Matters Related to the Future Implementation of the Language Access Plan in All Trial Courts; and Consider Amending Judicial Council Form INT-120	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC will support the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force in fulfilling its charge by providing any needed data, fiscal and other estimates, and input on its proposals and recommendations when requested by its chair.</p>		
<p>As the task force continues with its work, CEAC will also focus on local operational matters related to the future implementation of the Language Access Plan in all trial courts. These local operational matters include the following:</p>		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify local resources and strategies for the expansion of justice services to limited English proficient litigants; 2. Evaluate and recommend opportunities for trial courts to share and leverage innovations and enhancements related to the expansion of justice services to limited English proficient litigants; and 3. Recommend best practices related to the local management of language access resources and services including how best to integrate them into other areas of local court operations in a manner that increases interpreter and other language access effectiveness. 		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>CEAC, via an ad hoc working group, will also review and possibly propose amendments to Judicial Council Form INT-120 (Certification of Unavailability of Certified or Registered Interpreter) based on a recommendation of the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel and per Recommendations 9, 19, 69, and 70 in the <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i>.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2018.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Court Interpreters Program; and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Interpreters and litigants.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Court Interpreters Advisory Panel; and Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force.</p>	
5.	Project Title: Trial Court Facilities Working Group	Priority 2
	<p>Project Summary: Through this new working group, CEAC will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and provide, on an as needed basis, early court executive officer input on facility related proposals and recommendations that have a direct impact on court operations; and • Discuss strategies and best practices for courts facing delayed court construction projects and provide input, as appropriate, to the Court Facility Advisory Committee (CFAC) on advocacy efforts. <p>The working group will also provide input and feedback on various facility issues being addressed by the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) and CFAC. The working group is charged with providing preliminary feedback on facility proposals on behalf of CEAC. Input on more substantive facility policy decisions will first be vetted by the subcommittee and then presented CEAC for final review.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2018.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Facilities Services; and Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Possible consultation with CFAC and TCFMAC.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
6.	Project Title: Strengthen the Role of Court Executive Officers in Outreach to the Legislative and Executive Branches	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: CEAC will conduct outreach with the legislature with a focus on legislative staff in both the local districts and in the Capitol. This effort will entail the development of outreach materials for court executive officers and perhaps educational sessions with legislative staff to educate them on the judicial branch budget and the fiscal/operational needs of the trial courts.</p>		
<p>CEAC will also seek to strengthen communication with the Executive Branch and with the Department of Finance in particular. It will do so in consultation with the Judicial Council’s Administrative Director, Governmental Affairs, and Budget Services.</p>		
<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p>		
<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; Judicial Council’s Administrative Director; Budget Services; and Governmental Affairs.</p>		
<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p>		
<p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		
7.	Project Title: Update the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) and Review and Make Recommendations to Statutes and Rules of Court Governing Trial Court Records Management	Priority 2
<p>Project Summary: Through the Records Management Subcommittee, CEAC will continue to develop and publish subsequent updates to the Trial Court Records Manual (TCRM) with a focus on sections concerning electronic records and promoting best practices. It will also continue to review and make recommendations on various statutes and rules governing trial court records management.</p>		
<p>The subcommittee identified the following projects:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop standards and guidelines governing electronic signatures on documents filed by the parties and attorneys for inclusion in the TCRM. The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) developed a legislative proposal to amend Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(b)(2) in 2016. To conform to this legislative proposal, ITAC will also develop a rule proposal in 2017 to amend California Rules of Court, rule 2.257, to authorize electronic signatures on documents filed into the courts by the parties and attorneys. 		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³
	<p>If the legislative proposal is enacted by the Legislature and rule proposal is adopted by the Judicial Council, the amendments will take effect January 1, 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and develop standards and guidelines for electronic court records maintained as data in case management systems. Determine what statutory and rule changes may be required to authorize and implement the maintenance of court records in the form of data. • Review statutes and rules of court pertaining to the contents of registers of action and indexes to determine whether amendments to statutes or rules are necessary. The subcommittee would also like to develop additional guidelines on the contents of indexes and electronic registers of action remotely accessible by the public for inclusion in the TCRM to provide clarity and consistency among courts statewide. Currently, courts from different jurisdictions have varying practices on what to include in the electronic registers of action that are remotely accessible by the public. • Determine the need to propose amendments to Government Code section 68152 to clean up the records retention statutes. The technical amendments will include fixing statutory conflicts regarding the retention of original wills and codicils, retention of Prop 47 petitions, retention of criminal realignment filings, and retention periods for Family and Juvenile cases. • Develop best practices in maintaining original paper court records. Provide guidance on whether certain court records should be maintained in paper form. Several courts have approached Legal Services office with questions about specific types of court records that the original paper document need to be retained for policy reasons. • Develop additional guidelines for exhibits management. • Monitor the progress of proposed 20178 Judicial Council-sponsored legislations, which include amendments to Government Code section 68153, which eliminates the reporting requirement that superior courts must report destroyed court records to the Judicial Council and Government Code section 68152(a)(6), which include a retention period for court records in gun violence cases. <p>Status/Timeline: TCRM Updates – Ongoing. GC §§ 68152(a)(6) and 68153 – 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Information Technology; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Legal Services.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: None.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Possible consultation with Information Technology Advisory Committee; and Probate Mental Health Advisory Committee.</p>
8.	<p>Project Title: Update JBSIS Filing Definitions and Implementation of New Reporting Standards</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Priority 2</p>

Ongoing Projects and Activities³

Project Summary: CEAC will continue to provide input to a subcommittee (staffed by the Judicial Council’s Court Research) that is reviewing and updating the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) filings information definitions. The existing JBSIS Working Group is focusing on these higher priority definitions, rather than reviewing and updating all definitions in the JBSIS manual. Because of the ongoing nature of its work, the CEAC leadership requests that this working group be converted to a subcommittee.

The working group has developed a final set of JBSIS revised definitions and reporting categories based on court input and comment. These new definitions and reporting categories will be presented to CEAC along with a final report and recommendations for approval. Upon approval by CEAC, these new definitions and reporting categories will be presented to the Judicial Council for approval in January 2018 with a recommended effective date of July 1, 2018. Court Research will work with the JBSIS Subcommittee to update and release a new JBSIS Manual based on these revised definitions and new reporting categories.

The JBSIS Subcommittee will continue to provide input and support for courts during implementation of these new definitions and reporting categories in JBSIS. The subcommittee will establish a subgroup of court staff with subject-matter expertise in JBSIS to review and respond to questions about the revised definitions. Court Research will coordinate all court questions about JBSIS during the implementation process and convene the subgroup to determine the appropriate JBSIS reporting practice. The JBSIS Subcommittee will develop a formal Dispute Resolution process where courts can bring disagreements about JBSIS reporting and/or responses to their questions by the subgroup. Issues identified during the subgroup review and dispute resolution process will guide areas for future study by the JBSIS Subcommittee.

The subcommittee will also assist courts in coordinating these changes to JBSIS reporting with their case management system vendors. Staff from Court Research has already been providing ongoing support to a separate JBSIS subcommittee of the California Tyler Users Group (CATUG), and will continue to support CATUG in implementing these changes to JBSIS. The subcommittee and Court Research will work with other courts using different case management systems than Tyler to ensure that their vendors implement these JBSIS changes in a consistent and accurate manner across courts and different systems.

Status/Timeline: Ongoing.

Fiscal Impact/Resources: Information Technology; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Court Research.

Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts; and case management system vendors.

AC Collaboration: None.

# Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
9.	<p>Project Title: Provide Input on JBSIS Data Verification Standards</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Priority 2</i></p> <p>Project Summary: Under California Rules of Court, rule 10.48(b)(3), CEAC has a responsibility to “review and make proposals concerning the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) or other large-scope data collection efforts.” Given the importance of court-reported case filing data (via JBSIS) as a key input to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) — and ultimately to court budget allocations—CEAC would like to assist with providing the Judicial Council with recommendations on data quality and documentation standards that could enhance efforts to audit and verify the reported data.</p> <p>Further, California Rules of Court, rule 10.63 establishes the Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability for the Judicial Branch (audit committee). The Judicial Council’s Audit Services periodically performs audits of the superior courts where each audit’s scope is guided by an annual audit plan that is approved by the audit committee. One audit scope area listed in the annual audit plan for fiscal year 2017-18 is the review of court-reported case filing data for compliance with existing JBSIS rules.</p> <p>To further improve data quality, Audit Services will periodically notify the Court Research of JBSIS-related audit findings and the potential need for CEAC to develop further guidance on data quality standards. On behalf of CEAC, Court Research will take the lead role with guidance from the JBSIS subcommittee in developing recommendations on new policy and JBSIS reporting standards for CEAC’s consideration and ultimate approval. Audit Services will be available to consult with Court Research and CEAC, upon request, to further describe the specific circumstances surrounding JBSIS-related audit findings at the superior courts.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: 2019.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Audit Services; Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership; and Court Research.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Superior Courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability.</p>
10.	<p>Project Title: Review and Recommend Court Administrator Candidates for Membership on the Judicial Council, CEAC Executive Committee, and Other Advisory Groups</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Priority 1</i></p> <p>Project Summary: Pursuant to rule 10.48(e)(2), the Executive Committee of CEAC must review and recommend to the council’s Executive and Planning Committee candidates for the following:</p>

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of CEAC’s Executive Committee; • Nonvoting court administrator members of the council; and • Members of other advisory committees who are court executives or judicial administrators. <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Executive and Planning Committee.</p>	
11.	Project Title: Serve as a Resource	Priority 2
	<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Serve as a subject matter resource for Judicial Council divisions and other council advisory groups to avoid duplication of efforts and contribute to the development of recommendations for council action.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Respective Judicial Council divisions.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> None.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Respective advisory bodies.</p>	

III. LIST OF 2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Budget Advocacy. Throughout the year, CEAC leadership worked closely with the Judicial Council’s executive level staff to advocate for appropriate funding of the judicial branch and to provide input on other critical proposals. As part of this effort, CEAC leadership worked with Budget Services staff to develop educational sessions for Department of Finance representatives concerning the history of trial court budgets and current trial court fiscal challenges. CEAC leadership and Judicial Council executive level staff also arranged for DOF representatives to meet with them and several CEOs at various courts to discuss the fiscal goals and challenges of the judicial branch. CEOs from the following courts participated in these in-person meetings: Butte; Contra Costa; El Dorado; Glenn; Lake, Los Angeles; Merced; Orange; Placer; San Bernardino; San Diego; San Francisco; San Joaquin; Santa Barbara; Santa Clara; Shasta; and Ventura. The meetings were held at the following trial courts: El Dorado; Glenn; San Bernardino; San Francisco; Santa Barbara; and Ventura.</p>
2.	<p>Educational Opportunities. TCPJAC and CEAC leadership collaborated with Judicial Council staff to provide eleven educational breakout sessions on eight key areas of court operations as part of the August 2017 TCPJAC/CEAC Statewide Business Meetings. The topics of the educational breakout sessions included: Collaborative Courts; Court Budgeting – Techniques and Tools; Effective and Efficient Traffic Procedures; Evidence-Based Practices in Misdemeanors; Facilities Management & Maintenance; Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) and the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Model; New Budget Advocacy Strategies for Fiscal Year 2018–2019; and Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM). Participants included presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executive officers, and assistant court executive officers.</p>
3.	<p>Mentoring Program. To assist a growing number of newer court executive officers, CEAC leadership developed an informal mentoring program that connects experienced court executive officers with newer peers.</p>
4.	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Legislation Subcommittee. Remained active throughout 2017, holding 11 conference calls to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and make recommendations on proposed and existing legislation that had a significant operational or administrative impact on the trial courts. In December 2017, the subcommittee will set its schedule for 2018 and continue to meet to review proposals to create, amend, or repeal statutes to achieve cost savings or greater efficiencies for the trial courts. The subcommittee will continue to recommend proposals for the future consideration of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee.</p>
5.	<p>TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee. Remained active throughout 2017 to, on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, provide review and input on behalf of the TCPJAC and CEAC, and submit comments on rules, standards, and form proposals that may have a significant fiscal or operational impact on the trial courts. This subcommittee will continue to be active in 2018 and meet as needed.</p>
6.	<p>JBSIS Working Group. The working group and staff from Court Research are in the process of reviewing and updating the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) filings information definitions for: Civil (Unlimited, Limited, and Small Claims); Family Law; Felony; Juvenile Delinquency; Juvenile Dependency; Mental Health; Misdemeanor and Infractions; and Probate. CEAC is expected to submit a final report to the Judicial Council for its review and approval at its January 12, 2018, business meeting.</p>
7.	<p>Trial Court Facilities Working Group. The working group convened by conference call twice to provide input on proposed updates to the Judicial Council’s 2001 Energy Conservation Guidelines. Most of this input was incorporated in the final version. The Trial Court</p>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
	Facility Modification Advisory Committee proposed updates to these guidelines as part of a statewide effort to reduce utility costs in courthouses and conserve monies in the Court Facilities Trust Fund.
8.	New Ad Hoc Working Group Regarding Child Support Services. In response to the issues that arose with the 2015 Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) model Plan of Cooperation (POC), CEAC formed an ad hoc working group to meet with State DCSS representatives and staff in the Judicial Council’s Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) to discuss and resolve such issues prior to the POC’s distribution to the trial courts and local child support agencies (LCSAs). The working group met several times by telephone to review the DCSS’s 2017 draft model POC proposal over several weeks. Its members then met in person with the State DCSS Chief Counsel and CFCC staff to recommend a large number of changes that would better meet the needs and requirements of the trial courts, as well as foster a more effective approach of mutual support and cooperation at the local level. It was hoped that doing so would ultimately contribute to increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of child support case processing throughout the state. With the exception of one, all of the working group’s suggested changes were accepted by DCSS.
9.	Study Issues Related to Courts Charging Government Entities, Other Courts, and the Public for Services and Records. [Disbanded in September 2017.]
10.	Encourage Cost Savings and Greater Efficiencies for the Trial Courts. [Disbanded in September 2017.]

Date: 12/01/17

	Position	County	Member Name	1st Term Start	1st Term End	Current Term Start	Current Term End	Replaced	Previous
	<i>Chair</i>	<i>Butte</i>	<i>Ms. Kimberly Flener</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>9/18</i>			<i>J. Chatters</i>	<i>R. Feldstein</i>
	<i>Vice-Chair</i>	<i>San Diego</i>	<i>Mr. Michael M. Roddy</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>9/18</i>			<i>K. Flener</i>	<i>J. Chatters</i>
1	Court Executive Officer	Sacramento	Hon. Lloyd G. Connelly, Ret.		Indefinite			T. Ainsworth (Interim)	
2	Court Executive Officer	Lassen	Mr. Christopher Vose		Indefinite			A. Barone	
3	Court Executive Officer	Humboldt	Ms. Kim Bartleson		Indefinite			M. Tozzi	
4	Court Executive Officer	Mariposa	Ms. Cynthia J. Busse		Indefinite				
5	Court Executive Officer	Santa Cruz	Mr. Alex Calvo		Indefinite				
6	Court Executive Officer	Calaveras	Ms. Karen Camper		Indefinite				
7	Court Executive Officer	Los Angeles	Ms. Sherri R. Carter		Indefinite				
8	Court Executive Officer	San Mateo	Ms. Rodina Catalano		Indefinite				
9	Court Executive Officer	Placer	Mr. Jake Chatters		Indefinite				
10	Court Executive Officer	Tulare	Ms. Stephanie Cameron		Indefinite			L. Cleek	
11	Court Executive Officer	Tehama	Ms. Caryn A. Downing		Indefinite				
12	Court Executive Officer	San Bernardino	Ms. Nancy Eberhardt		Indefinite			C. M. Volkers	
13	Court Executive Officer	Napa	Mr. Richard D. Feldstein		Indefinite				
14	Court Executive Officer	Alameda	Mr. Chad Finke		Indefinite				
15	Court Executive Officer	Santa Clara	Ms. Rebecca Fleming		Indefinite			D. Yamasaki	
16	Court Executive Officer	Butte	Ms. Kimberly Flener		Indefinite				
17	Court Executive Officer	Inyo	Ms. Pamela Foster		Indefinite				
18	Court Executive Officer	Shasta	Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley		Indefinite				
19	Court Executive Officer	Colusa	Mr. Jason Galkin		Indefinite			K. Harrigan	
20	Court Executive Officer	Mono	Mr. Hector Gonzalez		Indefinite				
21	Court Executive Officer	Imperial	Ms. Maria Rhinehart (Interim)		Indefinite			T. Grimm	
22	Court Executive Officer	Sonoma	Ms. Arlene Junior		Indefinite			J. Guillén	
23	Court Executive Officer	Monterey	Mr. Chris Ruhl		Indefinite			P. Gupta (Interim)	T. Risi
24	Court Executive Officer	Modoc	Ms. Ronda Gysin		Indefinite				
25	Court Executive Officer	Riverside	Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr.		Indefinite				
26	Court Executive Officer	Sutter	Ms. Stephanie M. Hansel		Indefinite			M. B. Todd	
27	Court Executive Officer	Glenn	Mr. Kevin Harrigan		Indefinite			H. K. Swift	
28	Court Executive Officer	Trinity	Ms. Staci Holliday		Indefinite			C. V. Schooten	
29	Court Executive Officer	San Joaquin	Ms. Rosa Junqueiro		Indefinite				
30	Court Executive Officer	Marin	Mr. James Kim		Indefinite				
31	Court Executive Officer	Sierra	Mr. Lee Kirby		Indefinite				
32	Court Executive Officer	Amador	Mr. Rob Klotz		Indefinite			B. Cockerham	
33	Court Executive Officer	Yolo	Mr. Shawn C. Landry		Indefinite				
34	Court Executive Officer	Lake	Ms. Krista LeVier		Indefinite				
35	Court Executive Officer	Kings	Mr. Jeffrey E. Lewis		Indefinite				
36	Court Executive Officer	Del Norte	Ms. Sandra Linderman		Indefinite				
37	Court Executive Officer	Alpine	Ms. Annie Long		Indefinite				
38	Court Executive Officer	Siskiyou	Ms. Renee McCanna Crane		Indefinite			M. F. McHugh	
39	Court Executive Officer	Kern	Mr. Terry McNally		Indefinite				
40	Court Executive Officer	Nevada	Mr. G. Sean Metroka		Indefinite				
41	Court Executive Officer	Fresno	Ms. Sheran L. Morton		Indefinite				
42	Court Executive Officer	Contra Costa	Mr. Stephen H. Nash		Indefinite				
43	Court Executive Officer	Plumas	Ms. Deborah Norrie		Indefinite				
44	Court Executive Officer	Santa Barbara	Mr. Darrel E. Parker		Indefinite				
45	Court Executive Officer	Ventura	Mr. Michael D. Planet		Indefinite				
46	Court Executive Officer	San Luis Obispo	Mr. Michael Powell		Indefinite			S. E. Matherly	
47	Court Executive Officer	San Diego	Mr. Michael M. Roddy		Indefinite				
48	Court Executive Officer	Mendocino	Ms. Kim Turner		Indefinite			C. Ruhl	
49	Court Executive Officer	Yuba	Ms. Bonnie Sloan		Indefinite			S. Konishi	
50	Court Executive Officer	Merced	Ms. Linda Romero Soles		Indefinite				
51	Court Executive Officer	San Benito	Mr. Gil Solorio		Indefinite				
52	Court Executive Officer	Stanislaus	Mr. Hugh K. Swift		Indefinite			R. Uliana	R. Fleming
53	Court Executive Officer	Solano	Mr. Brian Taylor		Indefinite				
54	Court Executive Officer	Madera	Ms. Bonnie Thomas		Indefinite				
55	Court Executive Officer	Tuolumne	Ms. Jeanine D. Tucker		Indefinite				
56	Court Executive Officer	El Dorado	Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco		Indefinite				
57	Court Executive Officer	Orange	Mr. David H. Yamasaki		Indefinite			A. Carlson	
58	Court Executive Officer	San Francisco	Mr. T. Michael Yuen		Indefinite				

	Position	County	Member Name	1st Term Start	1st Term End	Current Term Start	Current Term End	Replaced	Previous
	<i>Chair</i>	<i>Butte</i>	<i>Ms. Kimberly Flener</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>9/18</i>			<i>J. Chatters</i>	<i>R. D. Feldstein</i>
	<i>Vice-Chair</i>	<i>San Diego</i>	<i>Mr. Michael M. Roddy</i>	<i>9/17</i>	<i>9/18</i>			<i>K. Flener</i>	<i>J. Chatters</i>
1	Executive Officer--48+	Sacramento	Hon. Lloyd Connelly (Ret.)	3/17	Indefinite			T. Ainsworth	C.M. Volkers
2	Executive Officer--48+	Orange	Mr. David H. Yamasaki	12/16	Indefinite			A. Carlson	S. Slater
3	Executive Officer--48+	Los Angeles	Ms. Sherri R. Carter	9/4/13	Indefinite			W. Mitchell	J. A. Clarke
4	Executive Officer--6-15	Merced	Ms. Linda Romero Soles	9/17	9/20			J. Chatters	K. Turner
5	Executive Officer--6-15	Butte	Ms. Kimberly Flener	9/17	9/20			R. D. Feldstein	S. E. Matherly
6	Executive Officer--48+	Alameda	Mr. Chad Finke	10/2/15	Indefinite			L. T. Wilson	P. Sweeten
7	Executive Officer--16-47	San Mateo	Ms. Rodina Catalano	2/15/17	9/14/18			R. Fleming	B. Taylor
8	Executive Officer--48+	Riverside	W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr	1/2/14	Indefinite			L. Whaley	S. R. Carter
9	Executive Officer--2-5	Glenn	Mr. Kevin Harrigan	9/15/16	9/14/19			D. W. Norrie	T. L. Grimm
10	Executive Officer--16-47	San Joaquin	Ms. Rosa Junqueiro	9/17	9/20			D. E. Parker	R. Junqueiro
11	Executive Officer--16-47	Ventura	Mr. Michael D. Planet	6/02	05	9/17	9/20	S. Gonzalez	
12	Executive Officer--16-47	Solano	Mr. Brian Taylor	9/17	9/18			T. A. Risi	J. O. Guillén
13	Executive Officer--48+	San Diego	Mr. Michael M. Roddy	2/06	Indefinite			R. Sorensen	S. Love
14	Executive Officer--2-5	Tuolumne	Ms. Jeanine D. Tucker	11/15	9/14/18			M. B. Todd	T. Burkhart
15	Executive Officer--48+	San Bernardino	Ms. Nancy Eberhardt	10/16	Indefinite			C. M. Volkers	S. H. Nash
16	Executive Officer--48+	Santa Clara	Ms. Rebecca Fleming	12/16	Indefinite			D. Yamasaki	K. Torri
17	Executive Officer--48+	San Francisco	Mr. T. Michael Yuen		Indefinite			C. Williams	G. Park-Li
18	At-Large Member	Placer	Mr. Jake Chatters	9/18/17	9/30/18			K. Flener	S. C. Landry

Appointed for 3-year terms staggered so that 1/3 of the committee will change each year.

Membership (Rule 10.48) Effective February 20, 2014, rule 10.48 has been amended and the committee shall consist of the following 18 members:

2 Executive Officers from courts with 2-5 judges

2 Executive Officers from courts with 6-15 judges

4 Executive Officers from courts with 16-47 judges

9 Executive Officers (all) from courts with 48+ judges

1 At-large Member (appointed by committee chair to one-year term)

Chair and Vice-Chair will be appointed by the Chief Justice for one-year terms.

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2018
Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Superior Court of Fresno County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Budget Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services
Committee's Charge/Membership: <p>Rule 10.64(a) of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, which is to make recommendations to the council on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for trial courts and provides input to the council on policy issues affecting trial court funding. Rule 10.64(b) sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>Rule 10.64(c) sets forth the membership position categories of the committee.* The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee currently has 26 members.** The attached term of services chart provides the composition of the committee.</p> <p><i>*Lead staff and Judicial Council Budget Services leadership would like to propose a change to California Rules of Court, rule 10.64(c)(1) to define “presiding judge” as a current presiding judge or a past presiding judge within the last 10 years (i.e., not “an immediate past presiding judge”) for new appointments. Existing members are eligible to be reappointed regardless of the time since they were a presiding judge or past presiding judge. This proposal will be presented to Rules and Projects Committee for consideration.</i></p> <p><i>**The chair, lead staff, and Judicial Council Budget Services leadership would like to propose decreasing the membership size from 26 to 24 and will present this discussion during the 2018 nominations cycle.</i></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.

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

1. AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee (with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the Department of Child Support Services)
2. Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed-Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Joint Subcommittee (with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee)
3. Fiscal Planning Subcommittee
4. Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee
5. Funding Methodology Subcommittee (*Amend*) – *Current charge is to continue to focus on the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology approved by the council in April 2013. Propose to amend charge to include the subcommittee adopt the charge of the Interpreter Funding Working Group (below), and consider funding allocation methodologies for other non-discretionary dollars as necessary.*
6. Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee (*Dissolve*) – *Current charge is to focus on a funding methodology and allocations relating to criminal justice realignment, specifically Proposition 47 workload. Considering no new money in the 2017-18 Governor’s Budget, May Revise, or Budget Act, this subcommittee did not convene for all of the 2017 calendar year. Propose to dissolve this subcommittee and shift responsibility of the charge to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee to review the allocation methodology as needed.*
7. Interpreter Funding Working Group (*Dissolve*) – *Current charge is to focus on developing a methodology for allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund Court Interpreter Program (0150037) in the event of a funding shortfall, and review existing methodologies. Propose to dissolve this working group and shift responsibility of the charge to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee.*

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 Projects ³	
1.	Project Title Not applicable.	Priority #⁴
	Project Summary⁵: Status/Timeline: Fiscal Impact/Resources: Internal/External Stakeholders: AC Collaboration:	

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 ³	
1.	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Allocations	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of structural shortfalls identified in the IMF and TCTF. The Trial Court Budget and Advisory Committee Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee will review 2018-19 allocations from the IMF and TCTF to ensure consistency with Judicial Council goals and objectives and propose solutions to address any structural shortfall in either fund. The expected outcome is to assist the council in ensuring solvency of the IMF and TCTF.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing (allocations for 2018–19 will be approved by July 2018)</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services staff as well as multiple other Judicial Council office staff that have programs funded from the IMF and/or TCTF.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Various Judicial Council offices with programs funded from the IMF and/or TCTF, and external stakeholders include trial courts and service providers.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: In addition, various advisory bodies that have programs in these funds provide recommendations regarding funding and program priorities.</p>		
2.	Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)	Priority 2⁴
<p>Project Summary: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. In April 2013, the Judicial Council approved the WAFM for use in allocating the annual state trial court operations funds with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be evaluated and submitted to the Judicial Council for approval. The current phase of the project in making allocation recommendations for year 6 (2018–19) and beyond of WAFM is part of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee’s annual work plan approved on June 8, 2017, with a goal of making recommendations to the Judicial Council in January 2018. Amendments to the annual work plan going into 2019–20 to be presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on December 4, 2017. Expected outcome is an improvement to the WAFM to more accurately capture WAFM-related funding needs of the trial courts.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services staff including Budget Management and Court Research.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include trial courts.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee oversees the Resource Assessment Study model which feeds into WAFM.	
3.	<i>Proposition 47 Funding</i>	<i>Priority 2⁴</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. Proposition 47 became effective on November 5, 2014. The Budget Act of 2015 included \$26.9 million from the General Fund to address increased trial court workload associated with Proposition 47. The Budget Act of 2016 included \$21.4 million, and no money was provided in the Budget Act of 2017. The expected outcome is to appropriately allocate funds based on workload; however, there is a recommendation included that the Funding Methodology Subcommittee obtain responsibility for the continued review and refinement of the allocation methodology based on updated statistical data and provision of additional funding in future fiscal years.</p>		
<p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing</p>		
<p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Budget Services staff including Budget Management and Court Research, and Criminal Justice Services staff.</p>		
<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Internal stakeholders include Criminal Justice Services and external stakeholders include trial courts.</p>		
<p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>		
4.	<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding</i>	<i>Priority 2⁴</i>
<p><i>Project Summary:</i> Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from a Judicial Council meeting in April 2015 as a recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and evolved in May 2017 as a result of a fiscal year 2017–18 and 2018–19 recommendation to the council by the Small Court Dependency Workload Working Group (established in October 2016) with input from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee. Members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, in collaboration with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, make up the Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed-Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Joint Subcommittee, which is charged with reviewing the workload model for court-appointed dependency counsel. The expected outcome is to appropriately allocate funds based on workload with consideration for smaller courts.</p>		
<p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Targeted completion date of December 2018 for 2019–20 implementation.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities³	
	<p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services and Center for Families, Children & the Courts staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Internal stakeholders include Center for Families, Children & the Courts, and external stakeholders include trial courts and service providers.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>	
5.	Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator (AB 1058) Funding	Priority 2⁴
	<p>Project Summary: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from a Judicial Council meeting in April 2015 as a recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, with an original targeted completion date of December 2017 for 2018–19 implementation (which has since been pushed out another year to 2019–20 implementation). In collaboration with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee will work on the development of a workload-based funding methodology for the AB 1058 program originally developed in 1997. The expected outcome is to appropriately allocate funds based on workload per a Judicial Council December 2016 report.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Targeted completion date of December 2018 for 2019–20 implementation.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services and Center for Families, Children & the Courts staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Internal stakeholders include Center for Families, Children & the Courts, and external stakeholders include trial courts and DCSS.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee.</p>	
6.	Interpreter Funding Methodology	Priority 2⁴
	<p>Project Summary: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated due to the declining fund balance in the TCTF Court Interpreter Program (0150037), and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Interpreter Funding Working Group was established to develop a methodology for allocations from the Court Interpreter Program in the event of a funding shortfall and to review existing methodologies. The expected outcome is to appropriately allocate funds in the event of a shortfall; however, there is a</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³
	<p>recommendation included that the Funding Methodology Subcommittee obtain responsibility for the continued review and development of an allocation methodology.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Targeted completion date of December 2018 for reimbursements in 2018–19.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services Staff and Court Operations Services staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>

DRAFT

LIST OF 2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)</p> <p>The Funding Methodology finalized its WAFM allocation recommendation for 2018–19 on November 14, 2017, which is scheduled to go to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on December 4, 2017 and to the Judicial Council in January 2018. Project continues into the 2018 agenda.</p>
2.	<p>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding</p> <p>The Small Court Dependency Workload Working Group made a recommendation to the Judicial Council in May 2017 as it relates to a Bureau of Labor Statistics adjustment for two years (2017–18 and 2018–19). The working group sunsetted on May 19, 2017. Project continues into the 2018 agenda.</p>
3.	<p>Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator (AB 1058) Funding</p> <p>The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee heard a report on potential funding models by a consultant, Maximus. Project continues into the 2018 agenda.</p>
4.	<p>State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Allocations</p> <p>The Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee made 2017–8 IMF and TCTF allocation recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Council in May and July of 2017. Project continues into the 2018 agenda.</p>
5.	<p>V3 Case Management System Funding</p> <p>Project continues into the 2018 agenda; however, included in the IMF and TCTF Allocations ongoing project as funding allocation recommendations for this particular project are under the purview of the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee.</p>

Trial Court Budget

	Position	County	Member Name	1st Term Start	1st Term End	Current Term Start	Current Term End	Replaced	Previous
	Chair	Fresno	Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin	9/15	9/16	9/17	9/18	L. M. Earl	
1	Presiding Judge	San Diego	Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton	9/17	9/20			G. Sanders	M. Slough
2	Presiding Judge	Lake	Hon. Andrew S. Blum	9/16	9/19			Goode	
3	Presiding Judge	Los Angeles	Hon. Daniel J. Buckley	9/17	9/18			K. C. Brazile	C. B. Kuhl
4	Presiding Judge	Fresno	Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin	1/15	9/16	9/16	9/19	R. A. Chouteau	
5	Presiding Judge	Riverside	Hon. Mark A. Cope	7/13	10/14	9/17	9/20		
6	Presiding Judge	Santa Barbara	Hon. James E. Herman	9/15	9/18			D. A. Harman	L. J. Masunaga
7	Presiding Judge	Humboldt	Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs	9/14	9/18			T. DeSantos	
8	Presiding Judge	Trinity	Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson	9/16	9/19			L. D. Holland	L. M. Begen
9	Presiding Judge		Vacant	9/15	(9/18)			I. R. Kaufman	E. W. Johnson
10	Presiding Judge	Santa Clara	Hon. Patricia M. Lucas*	9/17	9/18			J. B. Barton	G. S. Gaul
11	Presiding Judge	Orange	Hon. Charles Margines	9/17	9/20			L. M. Earl	
12	Presiding Judge	Santa Cruz	Hon. Paul M. Marigonda	1/15	9/15	9/15	9/18	L. L. Hicks	
13	Presiding Judge	Merced	Hon. Brian L. McCabe	9/15	9/16	9/16	9/19	B. Goode	
14	Court Executive Officer	Los Angeles	Ms. Sherri R. Carter	7/13	10/14	9/17	9/20		
15	Court Executive Officer	San Bernardino	Ms. Nancy Eberhardt	9/17	9/20			W. S. Hamrick	J. Chatters
16	Court Executive Officer	Alameda	Mr. Chad Finke	9/17	9/20			T. L. Grimm	D. Norrie
17	Court Executive Officer	Santa Clara	Ms. Rebecca Fleming	7/13	10/14	9/16	9/19		
18	Court Executive Officer	Butte	Ms. Kimberly Flener*	9/17	9/18			J. Chatters	
19	Court Executive Officer	Colusa	Mr. Kevin Harrigan	9/15	9/18			S. C. Landry	
20	Court Executive Officer	Kings	Mr. Jeffrey E. Lewis	9/15	9/18			A. Carlson	M. D. Planet
21	Court Executive Officer	Ventura	Mr. Michael D. Planet	9/15	9/18			S. H. Nash	B. Taylor
22	Court Executive Officer	San Diego	Mr. Michael M. Roddy	7/13	10/14	9/17	9/20		
23	Court Executive Officer	Solano	Mr. Brian Taylor	9/15	9/18			D. H. Yamasaki	
24	Court Executive Officer	Merced	Ms. Linda Romero Soles	3/1/2016	9/18			M. B. Todd	
25	Court Executive Officer	El Dorado	Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco	9/15	9/16	9/15/16	9/19	K. Turner	T. Ugrin-Capobianco
26	Court Executive Officer	Orange	Mr. David H. Yamasaki	9/16	9/17	9/17	9/20	C. Volkers	
27	Advisor	Sacramento	Mr. Robert Oyung					M. Tidwell	
28	Advisor	Sacramento	Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic	7/13	10/14	1/15	9/17		
29	Advisor	Sacramento	Ms. Millicent Tidwell					J. Patel	
30	Advisor	Sacramento	Mr. John Wordlaw						

Membership (Rule 10.64): The committee consists of members from the following categories:

The advisory committee consists of an equal number of trial court presiding judges and court executive officers reflecting diverse aspects of state trial courts, including urban, suburban, and rural locales; the size and adequacy of budgets; and the number of authorized judgeships. For purposes of this rule, "presiding judge" means a current presiding judge or an immediate past presiding judge;

No more than two members may be from the same court;

*The chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee serve as ex officio voting members;

Notwithstanding rule 10.31(e), a presiding judge is qualified to complete his or her term on the advisory committee even if his or her term as presiding judge of a trial court ends;

The Judicial Council's chief of staff, chief administrative officer, chief operating officer, and director of Finance serve as non-voting members