



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 17, 2017

10:00 AM

Teleconference

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice Chair; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. Jackson Lucky; Mr. Terry McNally;; Ms. Allison Merrilees in for Hon. Mark Stone; Hon. James Mize; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Mr. Don Willenburg; Hon. Joseph Wiseman; Mr. David H. Yamasaki

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Hon. Peter J. Siggins

**Others Present:** Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Ms. Jackie Woods; Mr. Mark Gelade; Mr. Brett Howard

#### OPEN MEETING

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

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

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the December 2, 2016, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

There were no written comments for this meeting.

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-7)

##### Item 1

##### Opening Remarks and Chair Report

**Update:** Hon. Shelia F. Hanson welcomed Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, CIO of the Superior Court of Napa County. Ms. Vannoy previously was a member of the Judicial Branch Technology Planning Task Force, developing the *Strategic Plan for Technology*; and recently participated as a member of the ITAC Tactical Plan workstream. She is also certified faculty for the National Center for State Courts' (NCSC) Institute for Court Management (ICM) program. In addition, she has served as speaker at various national conferences.

Judge Robert Freedman is retiring as of March 31, but was unable to attend today's meeting. The chair expressed her appreciation for his dedication to ITAC, as a member and a vice-chair.

There will be a staff change as well. Ms. Jamel Jones has served ITAC since 2012 as lead staff and recently accepted a position as the JCIT PMO supervisor. This position is part of Mr. Rob Oyung's organization transformation of the council's IT office. In her new role, she will continue having committee oversight and will work with ITAC, but delegate her day-to-day duties to additional staff. Judge Hanson thanked her for her dedication and contributions.

Both Judge Hanson and Justice Louis R Mauro attended the NCSC's eCourts conference this past December in Las Vegas. They found it very valuable to meet with technology members from across the state. The conference included some very interesting presentations. Ms. Jones circulated a link from NCSC that includes some of the videos from the conference and she encouraged members to view those presentations.

Lastly, Judge Hanson discussed how ITAC is growing as seen by the increasing amount of workstream meetings and work. As a result, ITAC is outgrowing its' quarterly meeting schedule. Meetings and updates are being limited when there is a need to grow meetings. Today's meeting has limited workstream and subcommittee reports to questions and answers only based on the written reports in your materials. In addition, Judge Hanson and Justice Mauro are looking at scheduling additional teleconference meetings and possibly another in-person meeting. Please reach out to the chair if you have comments or concerns with this model.

## Item 2

### **Case Management System Data Exchange Operations Plan (Action Requested)**

Information Technology (JCIT) office. Decide whether to accept the operations plan and recommend that it—along with the DX Workstream Governance Plan (shared with ITAC at its December meeting)—be approved by the JCTC.

**Presenters:** Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer/Director  
Ms. Nicole Rosa, Staff, DX Workstream

**Action:** Mr. Robert Oyung and Ms. Nicole Rosa shared the progress on the next steps for the governance plan. Ms. Nicole Rosa provided an overview of the governance plan. Detailed slides are included with the meeting materials.

Mr. Oyung described the role of JCIT operationalization moving forward as outlined in his slide presentation. Mr. David Yamasaki wanted to make sure that the effort continues to move forward and not to lose momentum. Decisions to consider are Committee Structure: use of a working group on an ad hoc basis and staffing requirements: year one JCIT can provide the BSA to start program and year two look to the courts to provide staffing. This will allow more time for JCIT to handle backend project. However, if courts cannot provide as much staff time, JCIT will staff with a full time BSA. Mr. Oyung wants

ITAC to recognize there will be a need to put a plan together to staff project if JCIT needs to staff. He believes it would be better to have courts involved, as they understand the use and operational processes and business needs of the exchanges and will consider options to keep the court involved while using JCIT staff in a backup role. Mr. Oyung suggested that once the project is going, it could transition to JCIT staff instead of courts, only involving courts for new exchanges as they implement. He will then work with courts after the first year regarding their commitment and then confirm with courts if they can continue to commit for year two. If not, then JCIT will see if another court can take over or assign to JCIT staff.

**Motion to accept the JCIT exchange plan and recommendation; to forward to JCTC for their approval; and conclude the data exchange workstream.**

**Approved.**

### Item 3

#### **Annual Agenda and Tactical Planning Alignment (Action Requested)**

Discuss the alignment of the ITAC Annual Agenda and *Tactical Plan for Technology* development processes intended to improve and streamline planning. Decide whether to accept and recommend updates to the process.

Presenter: Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer/Director

**Action:** Mr. Oyung outlined his slide presentation, also in meeting materials, and offered a proposal that better aligns with ITAC planning cycles. Should ITAC change the timing of the annual agenda? Additionally, should it align with the RUPRO schedule or with the fiscal year rather than the calendar year as it does now? The other concern is the BCP process. It would be good to have it be the natural flow of the agenda. Members agreed that aligning to the *Tactical Plan for Technology* would be an appropriate change.

**Motion to approve modifying the annual planning process to align with this recommendation.**

**Approved.**

### Item 4

#### **Comments and Questions Regarding Written Workstream and Committee Reports**

##### **Update:**

##### **Tactical Plan Workstream**

There were no comments or questions.

##### **Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream**

There were no comments or questions.

##### **Disaster Recovery Framework Workstream**

Proposing BCPs to draft requirements as soon as possible for 2018 queue. If a court obtains an innovation grant for this work, that is a great way to link these and provide a proof of concept.

#### **E-Filing Workstream**

The RFP is posting today, March 17.

#### **Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Workstream**

Opportunities here for proposals to align with the DR workstream. The next JC meeting will vote at next meeting for the innovation grants. There are shared goals with the Intelligent Forms workstream focus on technology and the SRL portal intended to provide framework and infrastructure that would include electronic forms.

#### **Video Remote Interpreting Workstream (VRI)**

Project is in pilot.

#### **Intelligent Forms Workstream**

Judge Jackson Lucky is now the executive sponsor. Solicitation is underway for workstream membership.

#### **Rules & Policies and Projects Subcommittee**

There were no comments or questions.

#### **Joint Appellate Subcommittee**

There were no comments or questions.

### **Item 5**

#### **Judicial Council Technology Committee Update**

Update on activities and news coming from this oversight committee.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, JCTC

**Update:** Justice Marsha Slough provided an update on JCTC activities since last December. JCTC held an in-person meeting on December 16, with three teleconference meetings, and two actions by email that went to the council. She offered congratulations to the Tactical Plan workstream team on their efforts and project completion. JCTC upcoming work includes the strategic plan update; hosting a small court technology summit held in late spring to ensure they capture small court needs before the statewide technology summit in August. This statewide summit is in conjunction with Presiding Judges and invitees will include all branch technology areas and is summit is tentatively August 23-24. The LOA would like more background information and work on the CMS funding

request the next phase replacements, LOA wants more background work. Justice Slough thanked ITAC members and staff for their hard work.

## Item 6

### Branch Update

Update on the status of the branch and its budget, along with any technology-related discussions with the Department of Finance and/or with Legislators.

Presenter: Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Director, Finance  
Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer/Director

**Update:** Ms. Fogarty provided a branch budget update that outlines a three-year cycle. This includes FY16/17, discussing FY 17/18 and planning for FY 18/19 (potential BCPs). Fiscal year 17/18 includes \$5 million for Sustain and \$300K for VRI. Legislature feedback has taken a position and asked for money only for fit gap analysis for CMS. VRI uses existing funding for pilot. However, JCC hasn't received anything from legislature to take action, only feedback at this point. Mr. Oyung updated on FY 18/19. Initial Funding Requests (IFR) has five funding concepts submitted to discuss with courts to begin drafting the BCPs. They include: CMS upgrades next round placeholder; Integration grants to digitizing paper case files (one time cost is fiscally inhibitive); CCPOR is currently funded from IMF and fund is shrinking and not appropriate to fund ongoing for CCPOR; SRL workstream for portal infrastructure funding; and Deploying an identity management solution to back up if the e-filing program doesn't go through. These will go through due diligence and a decision made if the IFRs move to BCPs.

The budget revise for FY 17/18 comes out early May.

## Item 7

### Liaison Reports

Reports from members appointed as liaisons to/from other advisory bodies.

Presenters: Hon. James M. Mize, Superior Court of Sacramento County

**Update:** Judge Mize reported the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee held an all-day meeting on February 28. Their presentation *Using Animation to Simplify Legal Stuff* was a great presentation that suggests using visuals to explain items instead of just words. Ms. Jamel will reach out to the council staff that presented in hopes to share with ITAC.

**Final info.** Members appreciated seeing the new slide format used at this meeting.

Of note, June 9 is the next meeting, not June 17. There may be an additional meeting in April or May. Justice Mauro added that there would only be meetings if necessary.

He noted that ITAC is very active and there may be a need for more meetings including one more in person meeting.

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:46 AM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**2017 ITAC ASSIGNMENTS**  
**Subcommittee Members, Liaisons &**  
**Workstream Executive Sponsors**

**Projects Subcommittee**

*ITAC Members*

*Vacant, Chair*

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Hon. Samantha P. Jessner

Hon. James M. Mize

Hon. Alan G. Perkins

Mr. Brian Cotta

Mr. David Yamasaki

*Judicial Council Staff*

Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian,  
Information Technology

Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Legal Services

**Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee**

*ITAC Members*

Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Chair

Hon. Peter J. Siggins

Hon. Alan G. Perkins

Mr. Don Willenburg

*AAC Members*

Mr. Kevin Green

Mr. Joseph Lane

Mr. Jorge Navarette

Ms. Kimberly Stewart

*Judicial Council Staff*

Ms. Julie Bagoye, Information Technology  
TBD, Legal Services

**Rules & Policy Subcommittee**

*ITAC Members*

Hon. Peter J. Siggins, Chair

Hon. Julie R. Culver

Hon. Jackson Lucky

Hon. Louis R. Mauro

Mr. Darrel Parker

Mr. Don Willenburg

*Vacant*

*Judicial Council Staff*

Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian, Information  
Technology

Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Legal Services

Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Legal Services

Ms. Camilla Kieliger, Legal Services

Ms. Jane Whang, Legal Services



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## 2017 ITAC ASSIGNMENTS Subcommittee Members, Liaisons & Workstream Executive Sponsors

### Liaison Appointments

#### *ITAC Members*

#### *Liaison to:*

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson	TC Presiding Judges
Mr. David Yamasaki	Court Executives
Hon. Louis R. Mauro	Appellate
Hon. James M. Mize	Access
Hon. Samantha P. Jessner	Civil Jury Instructions
<i>Vacant</i>	Civil & Small Claims
Hon. Alan G. Perkins	Criminal Law
Hon. Julie R. Culver	Education (CJER)
Hon. Michael S. Groch	Traffic

### Workstreams and Executive Sponsors

#### Disaster Recovery Framework and Pilot Workstream

Hon. Alan G. Perkins, Mr. Brian Cotta

#### E-Filing Strategy Workstream

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

#### Intelligent Forms Workstream

Hon. Jackson Lucky

#### Next Generation Hosting Strategy Workstream

Hon. Jackson Lucky, Mr. Brian Cotta

#### Self- Represented Litigants (SRL) E-Services Portal Workstream

Hon. James M. Mize

#### Tactical Plan Update Workstream (completed)

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

#### Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Workstream

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers



## Technology Innovations Grants by Category

#	Court	Program Name	Category	Amount
49	Orange Superior Court	<b>Improving Court Management Through the Use of Analytics</b> Establish an interactive, real-time data dashboard with relevant case information from a variety of data systems.	Analytics/Dashboard	\$938,851.34
32	Santa Barbara Superior Court	<b>Instant Family Law Orders</b> Enhance the way a copy of the court's orders after a hearing are produced by integrating a Microsoft Surface Pro tablet with the court's case management system to produce an order after the hearing within minutes of the conclusion of the court's proceedings.	Automate manual process	\$312,926.00
39	5th District Court of Appeal	<b>Modernize the Transcript Assembly Program</b> Enhance the current Transcript Assembly Program software being utilized in the majority of trial courts within the 5th District Court of Appeal to automate the manual staff process.	Automate manual process	\$793,000.00
21	Los Angeles Superior Court	<b>Self-help Traffic Avatar (Gina) Expansion</b> Establish a self-help traffic avatar in both Monterey and Merced Superior Courts to assist customers with paying tickets, scheduling court dates, and registering for traffic school.	Avatar	\$59,373.00
27	Riverside Superior Court	<b>Traffic Avatar</b> Establish an interactive virtual avatar that will assist online customers with traffic related inquiries.	Avatar	\$67,124.93
38	Yolo Superior Court	<b>Online Interactive Multilingual Tool</b> Establish an online interactive multilingual tool (avatar) for Small Claims, Unlawful Detainer and Traffic cases.	Avatar	\$91,500.00

## Technology Innovations Grants by Category

#	Court	Program Name	Category	Amount
9	Sacramento Superior Court	<b>Monitor and Measure the Achievement of Program Goals</b> Enhance the existing collaborative courts by increasing its capacity to monitor and measure the achievement of program goals and effectiveness by inputting data into a case management system designed specifically for collaborative courts, developing data collection tools and protocols, and developing and issuing dashboard reports.	Collaborative Courts Analytics/Dashboard	\$311,849.00
1	Alameda Superior Court	<b>Collaborative Court Management Information System</b> Enhance the existing management information system for use across collaborative court programs to better promote collaborative justice principles through more effective program analysis and evaluation.	Collaborative Courts CMS	\$114,223.00
15	Sonoma Superior Court	<b>Veterans Court Enhancements</b> Enhance the existing Veterans Court by increasing the current caseload, creating of program materials, expanding treatment services, creating a greater website presence, improving overall case management and coordination, and developing a participant tracking system.	Collaborative Courts CMS	\$56,476.00
46	Orange Superior Court	<b>Automating the Courtroom Check-in</b> Establish an application to automate the courtroom check-in process and the payment of trial court fees utilizing a Customer Relationship Management platform to save and track customer information and incorporate mobile technology with functionality to send text reminders to litigants and attorneys.	CRM & Mobile App	\$246,190.00
45	Monterey Superior Court	<b>Cloud Based Disaster Recovery Solution</b> Establish a cost-effective and resilient solution for a timely recovery of vital network and computer systems necessary for business continuity and restoring essential court functions and services to the public.	Disaster Recovery	\$209,361.00

## Technology Innovations Grants by Category

#	Court	Program Name	Category	Amount
42	Los Angeles Superior Court	<b>E-filing Technical Capabilities</b> Establish Identity Management which ensures secure and consistent access to digital services across providers, and affordable financial gateways to lower the overall costs of digital commerce that all Electronic Filing Managers and Electronic Filing Service Providers will need to leverage to ensure e-filers have a consistent and cost-effective e-filing experience.	Identify Management /Payment Gateway	\$114,760.00
22	Monterey Superior Court	<b>California Court Access App</b> Establish and deploy a mobile application for smartphones and devices, advanced online access, and a cloud-hosted solution to serve as a remote Clerk's Office available to court users around the clock.	Mobile App	\$789,940.00
25	Riverside Superior Court	<b>Attorney and Litigant Electronic Courtroom Self Check-in</b> Establish a wireless proximity sensor technology outside each courtroom to enable attorneys and litigants to electronically "touch and check-in to" the courtroom and receive a "check-in alert," all by using their smartphone.	Mobile App	\$179,250.67
53	Santa Cruz Superior Court	<b>SMS Notifications</b> Establish a solution that interfaces with the court jury system and the case management system to provide SMS notifications to court users and jurors in Santa Cruz County.	Mobile App	\$35,760.00
52	San Mateo Superior Court	<b>Automated Line Queuing System</b> Establish an automated queuing management system to triage requests for services at the court clerk windows, plan and assign staffing to meet that demand, and to relieve congestion in the clerk offices.	Queuing	\$125,000.00
34	Sonoma Superior Court	<b>Queuing/Appointment/Calendar System</b> Establish a new queuing system to include appointments, remote check-in, and email and/or text message (SMS) notifications.	Queuing/Mobile App	\$56,586.00

## Technology Innovations Grants by Category

#	Court	Program Name	Category	Amount
17	5th District Court of Appeal	<b>Self-help and Learning Center Website</b> Establish a self-help and learning center website that would include Judicial Council approved fillable forms, virtual assistance and interviews to assist with forms and document completion, interactive learning, and you-tube instructional videos for self-represented litigants or attorneys unfamiliar with the appellate process.	Self Help Portal	\$317,916
19	Contra Costa Superior Court	<b>California's Virtual Self-help Site</b> Enhance the current California Virtual Self Help Site by adding animated or virtual help/assistance in four languages, incorporating a "My Case Tracker" portal into the site, Self-Represented Litigant assisted electronic filing and education, and case management system integration.	Self Help Portal	\$970,365
23	Orange Superior Court	<b>Enhance Self-help Portal</b> Enhance the current Self-help Portal by installing self-check-in kiosks, build and implement a mobile application for cell phones and tablets, integrate the Self-help Portal with the Court's case management system, and purchase hardware to help court users navigate through the court facilities.	Self Help Portal	\$326,800.00
26	Riverside Superior Court	<b>Intelligent Self-help Kiosk</b> Establish intelligent kiosk systems at all courthouses that will give customers information and direct them to court offices to eliminate the need to wait in line for that same information.	Self Help Portal	\$629,292.70
28	San Bernardino Superior Court	<b>Customer Relationship Management Portal</b> Establish a Customer Relationship Management Portal to help self-represented litigants access general legal and procedural information about their case type and available options, complete and submit forms for review prior to filing, communicate with self-help staff, register for workshops, and track the status of their active case(s).	Self Help Portal	\$430,755.51

## Technology Innovations Grants by Category

#	Court	Program Name	Category	Amount
30	San Diego Superior Court	<b>Access to Information Made Simple</b> Establish a video appointment system and electronic message board to assist litigants with understanding procedures, completing paperwork, and generally navigating the family court process in a simple and convenient manner.	Self Help Portal	\$276,320.00
31	San Mateo Superior Court	<b>Develop and Provide Expanded Online Self-help</b> Enhance the court's self-help services by adding on-site and countywide kiosks/workstations, online "live-chat" and "inquiry chat" technology, and updated web-based video and written content for Family Law, Domestic Violence, Guardianships, Conservatorships, and Small Claims.	Self Help Portal	\$336,000.00
43	Los Angeles Superior Court	<b>Justice System Partner and Litigant Portal</b> Establish a court case access portal that will enable access to certain case data and documents through queries for justice partners and litigants in seven counties (Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Monterey, Orange, San Diego, Santa Clara, and Orange).	Self Help Portal	\$637,500.00
47	Orange Superior Court	<b>Conservatorship Accountability Portal</b> Enhance the conservatorship accounting process, improve the court's ability to protect assets, and to allow a simplified accounting report process for conservators, guardians, and fiduciaries.	Self Help Portal	\$212,972.00
48	Orange Superior Court	<b>Court User Portal</b> Establish a new website to serve as a court user portal to allow the public to register for phone/text reminders, submit electronic correspondence to the court, make payments, and view case information.	Self Help Portal	\$511,200.00
18	Butte Superior Court	<b>Remote Video Conferencing Technology</b> Establish the use of remote video conferencing technology to 13 rural courts (Butte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Imperial, Lake, Modoc, Nevada, Placer, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity) and ensure each court has adequate bandwidth and technological infrastructure to support a self-help program	Video Conferencing	\$576,140.00

## Technology Innovations Grants by Category

#	Court	Program Name	Category	Amount
		that can be used collaboratively by sharing self-help resources between participating courts.		
29	San Bernardino Superior Court	<b>Video Conferencing Child Custody Recommending Counseling</b> Establish Video Conferencing Child Custody Recommending Counseling at three courthouses (San Bernardino, Victorville, and Joshua Tree) to enable all parties to see one another and communicate more effectively through verbal and body language interactions.	Video Conferencing	\$35,537.60
36	Ventura Superior Court	<b>Internet Based Self-help Workshops</b> Enhance self-help services by offering live, interactive video workshops with groups of up to 25 self-represented litigants on the topics of Dissolution/Legal Separation/Nullities and Request for Orders in Family Law matters, as well as Civil Harassment Restraining Orders, Guardianships and Unlawful Detainers.	Video Conferencing	\$932,404.00
8/24 <sup>1</sup>	Placer Superior Court	<b>Video Appearances</b> Develop a central solution for video appearances across functional areas in the court by installing video conferencing hardware and software in 14 courtrooms and two administrative locations.	Video Hearings	\$560,000.00
41	Humboldt Superior Court	<b>Interactive Video Conferencing System</b> Establish an interactive video conferencing system to conduct hearings required by the Lanterman-Petris-Short Act in order to reduce undue stress on patients, as well as reduce public safety risks associated with patient transport.	Video Hearings	\$170,919.87

## Technology Innovations Grants by Category

#	Court	Program Name	Category	Amount
44	Merced Superior Court	<b>Video Conference Hearings Project</b> Establish video conferencing equipment in four courtrooms to help streamline the justice process for both criminal defendants and civil respondents by implementing video hearings for preliminary hearings and civil cases with the judge hearing cases located at the Merced Courthouse and the defendant or respondent located in a courtroom at the Los Banos Courthouse.	Video Hearings	\$194,540.00
50	Sacramento Superior Court	<b>Video Conferencing of Mental Health Hearings</b> Establish video conferencing to conduct mental health hearings, including petitions for writs of habeas corpus, for Riese medication capacity determination, and for time extensions.	Video Hearings	\$52,860.00
51	San Bernardino Superior Court	<b>Remote Video Proceedings</b> Establish video hearings within the city of Big Bear Lake for traffic infraction arraignments and misdemeanor probation modification matters from the Big Bear jurisdiction.	Video Hearings	\$244,698.58

<sup>1</sup> Split funding between Collaborative Courts and Self-help, Family and Juvenile Courts