



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

March 11, 2021

10:00 A.M. to 12:30 P.M.

Videoconference

Advisory Body Members Present:	Hon. Marsha G. Slough (Chair), Hon. Samuel K. Feng (Vice-chair), Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie, Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt, Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr., Mr. Patrick M. Kelly, Hon. Dalila C. Lyons, Hon. Ann C. Moorman, and Hon. David M. Rubin
Advisory Body Members Absent:	Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Advisory Body Leadership Present:	Hon. Abby Abinanti, Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Hon. Donald C. Byrd, Hon. Terry B. Friedman (Ret.), Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab, Hon. William F. Highberger, Hon. Brad R. Hill, Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo, Hon. Richard Vlavianos, and Hon. Brian L. McCabe
Staff Present	Ms. Karene Alvarado, Ms. Amber Barnett, Ms. Francine Byrne, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Ms. Charlene Depner, Mr. Edward Ellestad, Ms. Ann Gilmour, Ms. Lisa Gotch, Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Ms. Bonnie Rose Hough, Dr. Mary Ann Koory, Mr. Chris Magnusson, Ms. Catherine Ongiri, Ms. Claudia Ortega, Mr. Grant Parks, Ms. Laura Speed, Mr. Jagan Singh, Ms. Millicent Tidwell, Ms. Josely Yangco-Frona, and Ms. Carrie Zoller

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., and Ms. Yangco-Frona took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the following draft minutes:

- February 9, 2021, videoconference; and
- March 2, 2021, action by email.

Action: *The committee unanimously approved the minutes listed above.*

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM

2021 Advisory Body Annual Agendas (Action Required)

The committee reviewed the following draft annual agendas with advisory body chairs and staff in the order listed:

- Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability for the Judicial Branch
- Tribal Court-State Court Forum
- Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee
- Court Security Advisory Committee
- Court Facilities Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness
- Workload Assessment Advisory Committee
- Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee
- Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee
- Court Interpreters Advisory Panel

Action: The committee unanimously approved the 2021 advisory body annual agendas listed above.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:29 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on **enter date**.



Judicial Council of California

Meeting Agenda

Judicial Council

Please visit
courts website:
www.courts.ca.gov
to view live meeting on
May 21, 2021

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, May 21, 2021

Videoconference

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 – 9:45 a.m.

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

*A link to the live videostream of the meeting will be available in the Meeting Information Center
at least 15 minutes prior to the start of the open session.*

Open Session Begins: 9:45 a.m.

Call to Order

10 minutes

Public Comment

This meeting will be conducted via videoconference. Public comments will be accepted in writing only.

Submit written comments for this meeting by 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 20, 2021, to:

judicialcouncil@jud.ca.gov

Visit the link below and follow the instructions provided under the “Written Comments” section.

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

Comments received after the deadline will not be delivered to Judicial Council members.

Approval of Minutes

21-102 **Minutes of March 12, 2021, Judicial Council Meeting**

Chief Justice's Report

10 minutes

Administrative Director's Report

21-103 **Administrative Director's Report**

15 minutes

Judicial Council Internal Committee Reports

21-106 **Judicial Council Internal Committee Presentation**

15 minutes

21-104 **Judicial Council Internal Committee Written Reports**

CONSENT AGENDA

5 minutes

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.

[21-048](#)

Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts | Continued Distribution of Children's Waiting Room Funds During Temporary Closure (Action Required)

Summary:

The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve a request from the San Francisco Superior Court to continue receiving children's waiting room funds during the unforeseen temporary closure of its children's waiting rooms in response to the state of emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic. By continuing to receive funding, the court would have sufficient resources to provide safe and healthy children's waiting room settings for children when they can safely reopen.

[21-045](#)**Criminal Law | Judicial Council Appointment to Board of State and Community Corrections (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Executive and Planning Committee recommends that the Judicial Council appoint Judge Janet Gaard (Ret.) to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). The BSCC is an independent statutory agency that provides leadership to the adult and juvenile criminal justice systems, and expertise on public safety realignment issues. The BSCC is composed of 13 members, including a judge appointed by the Judicial Council.

[21-047](#)**Judicial Branch Administration | Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program (JBWCP) Advisory Committee recommends approval of the workers' compensation cost allocation fiscal year (FY) 2021-22 in the amount of \$ ___ for the trial courts and \$ ___ for the state judiciary, based on a 60 percent funding confidence level.

[21-093](#)**Judicial Council | Nonvoting Council Position (Action Required)****Summary:**

The chair of the Executive and Planning Committee recommends approving two advisory, nonvoting Judicial Council positions for a single three-year term with the 2021 Judicial Council appointments. The Judicial Council has the authority to add nonvoting positions under the California Constitution and rule 10.2 of the California Rules of Court. These advisory positions will allow for the reappointments of Associate Justice Carin T. Fujisaki and Presiding Judge Ann C. Moorman and enable the council to maintain continuity and leadership to address critical judicial branch policy issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the administration of justice.

[21-088](#)**Jury Instructions | Civil Jury Instructions (Release 39) (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions recommends approving for publication new and revised civil jury instructions prepared by the committee. These revisions bring the instructions up to date with developments in the law over the previous six months. On Judicial Council approval, the instructions will be published in the official supplement to the 2021 edition of the Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions (CACI).

[21-086](#)**Language Access Plan | Recommended Guidelines and Minimum Specifications for Video Remote Interpreting for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) and the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness recommend approving the *Recommended Guidelines and Minimum Specifications for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events*, updated under the direction of an ITAC working group following a revision process that included public

comment. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, courts have implemented remote video solutions to ensure access to justice and protect the health and safety of court staff, court users, and judicial officers. The VRI guidelines for spoken language have been updated to support VRI in both physical and virtual courtrooms and to provide guidance to courts and the public to ensure that remote interpreting allows limited English proficient court users to fully and meaningfully participate in court proceedings.

[21-075](#)**Report to the Legislature | Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20 (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Judicial Council's Language Access Services recommends approving the annual report on trial court interpreter expenditures for submission to the Legislature and the Department of Finance. This report is required by the Budget Act of 2019 (Stats. 2019, ch. 23).

[21-100](#)**Rules and Forms | Child Support: Revise Income Withholding for Support and Related Instructions (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve revisions to *Income Withholding for Support* (form FL-195) and *Income Withholding for Support-Instructions* (form FL-196) to comply with Family Code section 5208 and federal law.

[21-101](#)**Rules and Forms | Family Law: Technical Changes to Summary Dissolution Forms (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends technical revisions to two family law summary dissolution forms. The technical changes are mandated by Family Code section 2400 to reflect an increase in the cost of living based on changes to the California Consumer Price Index.

[21-092](#)**Rules and Forms | Miscellaneous Technical Changes (Action Required)****Summary:**

Various members of the judicial branch, members of the public, and Judicial Council staff have identified errors in the California Rules of Court and Judicial Council forms resulting from typographical errors and changes resulting from legislation, and previous rule amendments and form revisions. Judicial Council staff recommend making the necessary corrections to avoid causing confusion for court users, clerks, and judicial officers.

[21-095](#)**Rules and Forms | Rule of Court for the Center for Judicial Education and Research Advisory Committee (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Executive and Planning Committee recommends amending rule 10.50 of the California Rules of Court to conform to a recent change in procedures for filling vacancies on education curriculum committees, which shifted responsibility for making appointments from the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) Advisory Committee to the Chief Justice under the procedures in rule 10.32.

[21-090](#) **Rules and Forms | Technical Change to Gun Violence Emergency Protective Order (Action Required)**

Summary: Senate Bill 2617 (Stats. 2020; ch.286) amends the Penal Code to, among other things, further refine the time frame in which a law enforcement officer who requests a temporary emergency gun violence restraining order must file that order with the court. This proposal is to conform the language on the gun violence emergency protective order form with the amended language in the statute.

[21-105](#) **Rules and Forms | Unlawful Detainers: Forms to Implement Senate Bill 91 (Action Required)**

Summary: The Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommends revisions of three unlawful detainer forms to further implement Senate Bill 91 (Stats. 2021, ch. 2), urgency legislation that became effective on Friday, January 29, 2021. The council previously revised and adopted these forms (a mandatory form with supplemental allegations, the answer form, and a form with newly required verifications) on an expedited basis, prior to being circulated for public comment, to ensure the unlawful detainer forms conformed to the provisions of the new law as soon as possible. The committee is now recommending further revisions based on comments received, so that the forms will more fully and correctly reflect the provisions of SB 91.

[21-099](#) **Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act | Selection of Additional Pilot Project (Action Required)**

Summary: The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (Assem. Bill 590; Stats. 2009, ch. 457) provided that, beginning in fiscal year 2011-12, one or more pilot projects selected by the Judicial Council are to be funded to provide legal representation and improved court services to low-income parties on critical legal issues affecting basic human needs. On May 15, 2020, the Judicial Council approved the recommendation of the Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee, based on a competitive application process, to fund eleven pilot projects and defer another three applications for additional consideration. The Committee now recommends that one of the deferred pilot projects be funded.

DISCUSSION AGENDA[21-044](#)**Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts | Court Interpreters Program Funding and Allocation Methodology (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve its recommendations regarding unspent Court Interpreter Program (CIP) allocated funding for 2020-21, and a one-time CIP allocation methodology for 2021-22 while the Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee continues development of a workload-based methodology for consideration effective July 1, 2022.

Speakers:

Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Ms. Fran Mueller, Judicial Council Budget Services

15 minutes

[21-097](#)**Judicial Branch Administration | Judicial Branch Data and Information Governance Policy Concepts (Action Required)****Summary:**

The Information Technology Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council accept the attached report on Data and Information Governance Policy Concepts. This report is the final workproduct of the Data Analytics Workstream, which was charged with recommending a data analytics strategy for the branch that included developing branchwide data and information governance policy recommendations. Adopting these policy concepts will lay the foundation for future policy development and will help execute a new vision for data analytics in the judicial branch: *to analyze, use, and share data to inform decision-making in order to enhance and expand vital and accessible services for all the people of California.*

Speakers:

Hon. Tara Desautels and Mr. David Yamasaki, Executive Co-Sponsors,
Data Analytics Workstream, Information Technology Advisory Committee
Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Business Management Services

15 minutes

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)[21-011](#)**Court Facilities | Trial Court Facility Modifications Report for Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2020-21****Summary:**

This informational report to the Judicial Council outlines the allocations of facility modification funding made to improve trial court facilities in the third quarter (January through March) of fiscal year 2020-21. To determine allocations, the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee reviews and approves facility modification requests from across the state in accordance with the council's *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy*.

[21-098](#)**Equal Access Fund | Distribution of Funds from the National Mortgage Settlement Fund for Housing Issues****Summary:**

Assembly Bill 83 (Stats. 2020, ch. 15, Sec. 1), effective June 29, 2020, amended Government Code section 12531(d) to provide for a one-time \$31 million allocation to the judicial branch from the National Mortgage Settlement Fund to the Equal Access Fund to provide legal services in landlord-tenant matters. The statute provides that the Judicial Council allocate these funds to the State Bar, which distributes the funding to eligible legal services agencies. As directed by the Judicial Council at its September 25, 2020 meeting, the State Bar's Legal Services Trust Fund Commission reports on the distribution of the funds according to the formula specified in the Budget Act.

[21-089](#)**Judicial Branch Administration | Release of Demographic Data on California Justices and Judges****Summary:**

This informational report to the Judicial Council is of aggregate demographic information concerning the gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and veteran and disability status of California's justices and judges by specific jurisdiction, which council staff is required by statute to collect and release annually. In general, findings indicate that the California bench has become more diverse over time.

[21-087](#)**Report to the Legislature | Court Realignment Data (Calendar Year 2020)****Summary:**

Penal Code section 13155 requires Judicial Council staff, commencing January 1, 2013, to collect information from trial courts regarding the implementation of the 2011 Criminal Justice Realignment Legislation and make the data available annually to the California Department of Finance (DOF), Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), and Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) by September 1. This is the ninth annual court realignment data report. It will be distributed to the DOF, BSCC, and JLBC. The report, Court Realignment Data (Calendar Year 2020), is included as Attachment A to this report.

[21-096](#)**Report to the Legislature | Disposition of Criminal Cases According to Race and Ethnicity of Defendant****Summary:**

Penal Code section 1170.45 directs the Judicial Council to report annually on the statewide disposition of criminal cases according to defendants' race and ethnicity. In accordance with this requirement, Judicial Council staff will submit this annual report on May 20, 2021.

The data used in this report come from the Automated Criminal History System, which is a repository of data on dispositions maintained by the California Department of Justice. This report describes patterns seen in criminal case dispositions of adult felony arrests by race/ethnicity and tests whether any available legal or demographic information can account for the patterns seen.

[21-046](#)**Report to the Legislature | Trial Court Trust Fund Backfill Report, 2020-21, Third Quarter****Summary:**

Pursuant to the Budget Act of 2020, Item 0250-113-0001, Provision 3, the Judicial Council is required to submit quarterly reports to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on the estimated amount of General Fund required to backfill the Trial Court Trust Fund due to shortfalls in revenue to support trial court operations. This report is for the reporting period of January through March 2021. On or before April 30, 2021, the Judicial Council's Budget Services staff submitted the *2020-21 Trial Court Trust Fund Backfill Report, Quarter 3*.

[21-091](#)**Trial Courts | Public Notice by Courts of Closures or Reduced Clerks Office Hours****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 relay them to the Legislature. This is the 52nd report to date listing the latest court notices received by the council under this statutory requirement. Since the previous report, one superior court-the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo county-has issued a new notice.

Circulating Orders**Appointment Orders****Adjournment**



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

March 29, 2021

Action Requested

Approve Staff Recommendation

To

Members of the Executive and Planning
Committee

Deadline

April 15, 2021

From

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

Contact

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

Subject

Extend the Term of One Temporary
Subordinate Judicial Officer Position Serving
in Support of the Pretrial Pilot Program in the
Superior Court of Sonoma County

Executive Summary

Office of Court Research staff recommend that the Executive and Planning Committee review the request by the Superior Court of Sonoma County for authorization to extend the position of a Limited Term Subordinate Judicial Officer (SJO) working in support of the court's Pretrial Pilot Program. The extension of the position by 90 days is intended to support the court in its efforts to address an anticipated increase in workload appropriate for the SJO position to hear, over the course of the time period the extension would cover.

Recommendation

Office of Court Research staff recommend that the Executive and Planning Committee approve the Superior Court of Sonoma County's request for the authority to extend one Limited Term Subordinate Judicial Officer position serving in support of the court's Pretrial Pilot Program for 90 days beyond its current end date of June 30, 2021.

Relevant Previous Council Action

In 2007, the Judicial Council adopted a policy for the review and approval of requests from trial courts to change the number of SJO positions and delegate approval authority to its Executive and Planning Committee.¹ Government Code section 71622(a) grants authority to the council to determine the number and type of SJO positions in each trial court.

More specifically, the Judicial Council adopted a policy pertaining to changes in the number and status of SJO positions that, for the purposes of the current request, contained the following elements:

1. To establish a new SJO position, permanently eliminate an SJO position, or change the time base of an existing SJO position, a court must request and obtain approval from the Executive and Planning Committee. The requesting court must fund and bear all costs associated with an additional or augmented SJO position.
2. If an increase in the number of SJO positions is sought, the court must submit a request in writing to the appropriate Judicial Council regional administrative director.² A request must contain a certification by the presiding judge that the court has sufficient funds in its ongoing budget to cover the cost of any additional or augmented position. Judicial Council staff must provide the Executive and Planning Committee with (a) an estimation of the requesting court's ability to fund one-time and ongoing costs resulting from the establishment or augmentation of a new position, and (b) a confirmation of need, both SJO workload and overall judicial need, based on the most recent council-approved Judicial Needs Assessment.
3. The Executive and Planning Committee will authorize new or augmented SJO positions only if (a) the court can continuously fund the associated increased costs, and (b) the most recent council-approved Judicial Needs Assessment demonstrates that the requesting court's SJO workload justifies additional SJO positions and cannot be handled with existing judicial resources. The Executive and Planning Committee decision to change the number or type of SJO positions must be in writing and contain an analysis of the factors underlying the decision.
4. The Executive and Planning Committee will eliminate or decrease the time base of an SJO position on the request of a trial court.

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (Feb. 23, 2007), Items 9 and 10, *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Policy for Approval of Number of Subordinate Judicial Officers in the Trial Courts*, www.courts.ca.gov/documents/min0207.pdf.

² The position of regional administrative director was eliminated in 2012 as a result of the restructuring of the Administrative Office of the Courts (former name of Judicial Council staff).

Analysis/Rationale

Prior to the current request, the Superior Court of Sonoma County received a grant from the Judicial Council's Pretrial Pilot Program to hire two temporary SJOs to staff a research-action site in conjunction with the Arnold Ventures National Partnership for Pretrial Justice. These positions enabled the court to better serve the residents of Sonoma County as well as inform the council's understanding of the judicial workload that is associated with conducting pretrial assessments. Supplementary funding was necessary to support the hiring of the two SJO positions because workload of this kind is not ordinarily factored into models used to assess the workload need for subordinate judicial officers. The increase of 2.0 full-time equivalency (FTE) positions was intended to be limited term, with the salary and benefits fully funded by the grant through June 30, 2021.

While the court's participation in the Judicial Council Pretrial Pilot program is scheduled to end at the end of June 2021, the court has agreed to extend its participation in the program for an additional 90 days. The court has determined that it can undertake the work associated with the extended term with one Limited Term SJO without new grant funds. While the COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated changes in and placed limitations on the court's operations from March 2020 to the present, it anticipates a return to more normal operational conditions from April 2021 through September 2021. This should allow the court to provide pretrial assessments as well as gather information about pretrial programs, at a level that more closely approximates what the court originally envisioned.

Confirming the court's request in this matter is within the scope of the Judicial Council's responsibilities under Government Code section 71622(a),³ which delegated authority to the Executive and Planning Committee for review and approval of courts' requests to adjust the workload or number of SJOs serving in a court, as well as change the time base of an existing SJO position.⁴

Policy implications

Confirming the creation of temporary, grant-funded SJO positions for the purpose described above is consistent with well-established tenets of council policy on SJO positions.

³ "Each trial court may establish and may appoint any subordinate judicial officers that are deemed necessary for the performance of subordinate judicial duties, as authorized by law to be performed by subordinate judicial officers. However, the number and type of subordinate judicial officers in a trial court shall be subject to approval by the Judicial Council. Subordinate judicial officers shall serve at the pleasure of the trial court." (Gov. Code, § 71622(a).)

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (Feb. 23, 2007), Item 10, *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Policy for Approval of Number of Subordinate Judicial Officers in the Trial Courts*, www.courts.ca.gov/documents/min0207.pdf.

Comments

This proposal, which is consistent with council policy on the status and funding of SJO positions, did not circulate for comment.

Alternatives considered

The proposed extension in the temporary SJO service period is consistent with council policy. On that basis, no alternatives were considered.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The court indicates that it has performed the necessary budget analysis to confirm that it has sufficient funds to pay for the costs associated with this request. Implementing the recommendation would generate no fiscal or operational costs beyond the grant awarded to the branch as a whole.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Letter from the Presiding Judge Bradford J. DeMeo, Superior Court of Sonoma County, to Justice Marsha G. Slough, Executive and Planning Committee Chair (Jan. 27, 2021)

Superior Court
State of California

COUNTY OF SONOMA
HALL OF JUSTICE
600 ADMINISTRATION DRIVE
SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA 95403



BRADFORD J. DeMEO
JUDGE

January 27, 2021

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair
Executive & Planning Committee
Judicial Council of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Modification of Subordinate Judicial Officer Positions

Dear Justice Slough and members of Executive & Planning Committee

The Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma, hereby requests approval to modify the 2.0 Limited Term Subordinate Judicial Officer Positions which are scheduled to terminate June 30, 2021. We are asking for authority to extend one Limited Term Subordinate Officer position for 90 days from June, 30, 2021, through and including September 30, 2021.

Our Court's participation in the Judicial Council Pretrial Pilot Program is scheduled to end on June 30, 2021. However, we have agreed to extend our participation 90 days to end on September 30, 2021. We have determined that we can complete the extended term of 90 days with just one Limited Term Subordinate Judicial Officer even though there are no new grant funds for the extension. COVID-19 has undoubtedly skewed our data due to changes and limitations in our court operations from March 16, 2020, to the present. However, we anticipate increasing operations to the extent we can gather data that resembles normal operations from April 2021 through September 2021.

I have enclosed our original letter of request to increase the number of Subordinate Judicial Officer Positions from 3.0 to 5.0 dated January 16, 2020, for your reference.

Feel free to contact our Court Executive Officer, Arlene D. Junior at (707) 521-6855 or ajunior@sonomacourt.org, should you or any member have any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Bradford DeMeo".

Bradford DeMeo
Presiding Judge
Sonoma County Superior Court

January 16, 2020

Hon. Douglas P. Miller, Chair
Executive & Planning Committee
Judicial Council of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Increase in Subordinate Judicial Officer Positions

Dear Justice Miller and members of Executive & Planning Committee

The Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma, hereby requests approval to increase the Subordinate Judicial Officer Positions from 3.0 FTE to 5.0 FTE temporarily through June 30, 2021, with the designation of "2.0 FTE Limited Term" to apply to the two new Subordinate Judicial Officers. The increase is the result of being awarded a Judicial Council Pretrial Pilot Program grant as a research-action site in conjunction with the Arnold Ventures National Partnership for Pretrial Justice. The grant application and award contemplated the hiring of two Subordinate Judicial Officers full-time limited term for the duration of the pilot project. The two new full time temporary commissioners will be assigned to the pilot project and will have alternating day/night duties 24 hours, seven days per week. The increase of 2.0 FTE Limited Term in the SJO positions, including salary and benefits, will be funded through this grant entirely.

Feel free to contact our Court Executive Officer, Arlene D. Junior at (707) 521-6855 or ajunior@sonomacourt.org, should you or any member have any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bradford DeMeo
Presiding Judge
Sonoma County Superior Court