



# 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

August 27, 2018

10:00 AM - 3:00 PM

455 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, California 94102-3688

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice Chair; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Hon. Tara Desautels; Mr. Jason Galkin; Ms. Alexandra Grimwade; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Mr. Paras Gupta; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Hon. Jackson Lucky; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Mr. Snorri Ogata; Mr. Darrel Parker; Hon. Alan G. Perkins; Hon. Bruce Smith; Ms. Jeannette Vannoy; Mr. Don Willenburg; Mr. David H. Yamasaki

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Assemblymember Marc Berman; Hon. James Mize; Hon. Peter Siggins; Hon. Joseph Wiseman

**Others Present:** Justice Marsha Slough; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Mr. Rick Walery; Mr. John Yee; Mr. Michael Derr; Mr. Matt Nicholls; Mr. Rob Oyung; Mr. Mark Dusman; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Nicole Rosa; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Jackie Woods; and other JCC staff present

#### OPEN MEETING

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

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

##### Approval of Minutes and Public Comment

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the June 22, 2018, July 2, 2018, and the July 19, 2018 Action by Email, for the Information Technology Advisory Committee meetings. There were no public comments submitted for this meeting.

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-9)

##### Item 1

##### Chair's Report

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

**Update:** Judge Hanson welcomed and thanked everyone to the in-person ITAC meeting. She announced three new ITAC members whose terms start September 15. They are Judge

Donald Segerstrom from Tuolumne; Mr. Jake Chatters, the CEO at Placer, and Mr. Adam Creiglow, the Court Information Officer at Marin.

Judge Hanson also announced there are two ITAC departures. Judge Jackson Lucky, who concludes is service with ITAC in September after 3 years of service on ITAC and Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, who will retire from the Judicial Council next month after 20 years of service and 18 of those years with ITAC. She thanked both for their service a dedication.

## Item 2

### Judicial Council Technology Committee Update (JCTC)

Update on activities and news coming from this internal oversight committee.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair, JCTC

**Update:** Justice Slough provided an update on JCTC activities since the last ITAC meeting. Judge Gary Nadler participated in the New Judicial Council Orientation, explaining the roles, responsibilities, and relationship of the JCTC and ITAC to new members of the council. At the July 9 JCTC meeting, the committee received reports about four separate rules proposals related to technology that came from ITAC's work. All were approved either at the meeting or action by email. Finally, JCTC received updates on the Sustain Justice Edition and V3 case management system projects, the JCTC tracks these two projects funded through the Budget Change Proposals (BCPs).

Justice Slough gave a snapshot of the *Strategic Plan for Technology* that Judge Lucky will be presenting on later in ITAC's meeting. The plan has been distributed for a two-week branch comment period. After this feedback is incorporated, the plan will be out for a four-week public comment period. The goal is to present to the Judicial Council by year end.

## Item 3

### Branch Budget Update

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

Presenter: Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Budget Services

**Update:** Mr. Theodorovic provided ITAC with a branch budget update for FY 2018/2019. He indicated this is a successful budget year for the branch overall and that it included IT projects for self-represented litigants (SRL) e-Service web portal, online adjudication pilot program for traffic, and the ability to pay tool. Finance will submit unfunded technology BCPs to the DOF, due September 4, 2018. There are five IT BCPs: case management system; implementation of the Phoenix roadmap for HR & payroll; digitizing court records; business intelligence & data analytics; lastly the Futures Direction Directives. Every effort

is being made to work with the DOT and others to ensure they understand the IT needs of the courts and juridical branch.

#### Item 4

##### **Strategic Plan Update (Discussion)**

Provide progress on the Strategic Plan Workstream's update to the plan, including an overview of changes and invitation to provide input.

Presenter: Hon. Jackson Lucky, Member of the Strategic Plan Workstream

**Update:** Judge Lucky updated that the plan will go out for judicial branch comment for two weeks in late August and public comment will be in late September for four weeks. It will then be submitted to the JCTC for approval at their November 12, 2018 meeting and then to the Judicial Council at their late November 2018 meeting. They've refined the four plan goals: promote the digital court, innovate through IT community, dvance IT security and infrastructure and promote rule and legislative changes. The workstream also aligned the plan governance with the business goals. Slides are in the meeting materials.

#### Item 5

##### **Tactical Plan Update (Action Requested)**

Provide progress on the Tactical Plan Workstream efforts, including a discussion of and requested action on initiatives that may be continued or removed from the existing plan.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila Hanson, ITAC Chair; and Executive Sponsor for the Tactical Plan Workstream

**Action:** Judge Hanson indicated there are 10 courts representing various sizes and court expertise, as well as Judicial Council staff on this workstream. In addition they are working with workstream sponsors, project managers, and subject matter experts. The workstream has had two meetings. They are using the draft Strategic Plan as a guideline for drafting their two year plan. The initiative scope includes making sure the plan is at the right level, has branch-wide impact, and a financial or strategic advocacy. They discussed plan size, not wanting to place a specific limit on the number of initiatives allowing for flexibility. The workstream approach will evaluate and address: the existing plan, the work currently in progress that is not in existing plan, and new ideas and priorities. All initiatives and project timelines are listed in the meeting materials. ITAC reviewed and provide their input on initiatives changes, deletions, and additions. These are captured in the below motions.

**Motion to approve keeping initiative 3, Courthouse Video Connectivity in the Tactical Plan and dividing into two initiatives (a) Remote-Video and (b) Language-Access.**

**Motion to approve keeping and consolidating initiatives 6 and 7, Statewide E-Filing development and deployment in the upcoming Tactical Plan.**

**Motion to approve extending initiative 11, LAN/WAN in the next Tactical Plan.**

**Motion to approve keeping initiative 14, Identify New Policy, Rule changes in the next Tactical Plan.**

**Motion to approve removal of initiative 4, CCPOR from the Tactical Plan. (JCIT will manage going forward).**

**Motion to approve removal of initiative 8, identify and encourage projects that provide innovative services.**

**Motion to approve adding new initiatives on Futures Directive Workstreams (Intelligent Chat, Remote Video, and Voice-to-Text; Identity Management; and Data Analytics to the Tactical Plan.**

**All above motions are approved.**

#### **Item 6**

##### **Information Security Update (Action Requested)**

Review and consider whether to recommend acceptance of the proposed updates to the Judicial Branch Information Security Framework; and, receive an update on the establishment of an Information Security Outreach Program.

**Presenters:** Mr. Michael Derr, Principal Manager, Information Technology  
Mr. Matt Nicholls, Supervisor II, Information Technology

**Action:** Mr. Derr introduced Mr. Nicholls, formally with Yolo Superior Court. He then provided an update to ITAC on establishing an information security outreach program and updating the judicial branch information security framework. Mr. Derr is requesting ITAC approval to submit to the JCTC at their September 2018 meeting.

**Motion to approve the recommendation to submit the updated information Security Framework to the Judicial Council Technology Committee.**

**Motion approved.**

#### **Item 7**

**Futures Commission Directives (Progress Reports)**

Review and discuss final quarterly reports on the progress of the three directives from the Chief Justice:

**(a) Intelligent Chat for Self-Help Services**

*Includes update to extend estimated completion date to April 2019.*

Hon. Judge Groch, Executive Sponsor

Judge Groch advised there was a kickoff workstream meeting with two vendor demos on August 28, 2018. He invited the project lead, Mr. John Yee, to continue the update. Meeting topics included: the intelligent chat SharePoint site overview; discussion on goals/scope, proposed approach, and assignments; intelligent chat education; and next steps.

**(b) Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings**

Hon. Samantha Jessner, Executive Sponsor

Judge Jessner provided an update noting that she is working with Mr. Jake Chatters and Mr. Alan Crouse. They have assembled 8 courts of various sizes to participate in this workstream. At the kickoff meeting the split into four subcommittees each looking at one of these four topics: procedure, evidence, technical requirements and presentation. They are working to leverage existing resources, thinking about how it will work technically and procedurally. By using existing court proceedings that address the various challenges court users face in their research, they hope it will show what's most needed. Next steps include a proof of concept and then looking how this will actually work in the courts. It was suggested that this workstream reach out to the digital evidence workstream so not to duplicate efforts.

**(c) Voice-to-Text Language Services Outside the Courtroom**

*Includes update to amend key objectives within annual agenda and to extend estimated completion date to June 2019.*

Mr. Rick Walery, project manager provided an update on behalf of Judge Mize. The leadership team also includes Ms. Heather Pettit and Ms. Nicole Rosa from Judicial Council staff. Ms. Pettit is currently reaching out to courts for diverse operational and technical staff for workstream membership. Phase 1 will consist of a research and a feasibility study over the next 6-9 months as well as a technical lab either at the Judicial Council or a local court with different hardware and software options. Phase 2 will be more formalized with a standard used to measure success and definitions will be identified. Also they will find out how this aligns to the existing Judicial Council Language Access Taskforce and their partner the Stanford.

**Action:**

**Item 8**

**Comments and Questions Regarding Written Workstream and Subcommittee Reports**

**Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Workstream**

*Includes update to extend estimated completion date to March 2019.*

Hon. Samantha Jessner, Executive Sponsor

**E-Filing Strategy Workstream**

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Executive Sponsor

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

Hon. James M. Mize and Hon. Michael Groch, Executive Sponsors

**IT Community Development Workstream**

*Includes update to extend estimated completion date to March 2019.*

Hon. Alan Perkins and Ms. Jeannette Vannoy, Executive Sponsors

**Intelligent Forms Strategy Workstream**

*Workstream concluded at April ITAC meeting; JCIT tasked with operationalizing and identifying path forward.*

Hon. Jackson Lucky, Executive Sponsors

**Digital Evidence Workstream**

Hon. Kimberly Menninger, Executive Sponsor

**Disaster Recovery (DR) – Phase 2 Workstream**

Mr. Paras Gupta, Executive Sponsor

**Next Generation Hosting Strategy – Phase 2 Workstream**

Mr. Brian Cotta, Executive Sponsor

**Rules & Policy Subcommittee**

Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair

**Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Remote Access to Court Records**

Hon. Peter Siggins, Chair

**Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee**

Hon. Louis Mauro, Chair

**Comments and Questions Regarding Other Written Reports due to ITAC**

**Data Exchange Work Group Annual Report**

Mr. David Yamasaki, Executive Sponsor

Mr. Yamasaki added that the relationships formed with the justice partners have been invaluable as well as the support of the CIOs.

**Action:**

**Item 9**

**Liaison Reports**

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

Presenters:

**Member:**

**Liaison to/from:**

*Member appointed on behalf of ITAC to liaison committee:*

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 & Small Claims
Hon. Alan G. Perkins	Criminal Law
Hon. Julie R. Culver	Education (CJER)
Hon. Michael S. Groch	Traffic

*Liaison member appointed on behalf of partner committee:*

Mr. Jason Galkin	Education (CJER)
Hon. Daniel Buckley	Presiding Judges

**Updates:**

Judge Shelia F. Hanson attended a meeting TC Presiding Judges and Court Executives along with Mr. Robert Oyung and Mr. Jake Chatters regarding technology trends. At each of the two session, conducted and brainstorm about the upcoming IT Summit.

Justice Louis R, Mauro, have delayed working on uniform rules while the Supreme and Appellate courts went e-filing, but will add to the agenda for the next year of the Appellate Advisory Committee.

Judge Alan G. Perkins discussed the bail reform bill and if passed how it will impact the courts and various procedures, forms, etc. It may be helpful to have branch-wide methodology and procedures. Some courts have started bail reform, so it might be good to have someone collect processes from those courts to review for a branch-wide effort.

---

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

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.