



INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

July 17, 2024

12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Videoconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Vice- Chair; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Tara Desautels; Mr. A.J. Guzman; Mr. Jake Pison; Mr. Mike Baliel; Hon. Julie Culver; Mr. Neal Taniguchi; Mr. Brett Howard; Ms. Carrie Holmes; Hon. Kimberly Menninger.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Chief Judge Wiseman; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Mr. Adam Creiglow; Hon. Truc Do Ms. Rebecca Fleming; Mr. Jason Galkin; Hon. Michael S. Groch; Hon. Amy Guerra; Hon. Ioana Petrou; Hon. Bruce Smith.

Others Present: Mr. John Yee; Mr. Douglas G. Denten; and Judicial Council staff

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The following Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting minutes were approved:

- May 15, 2024

There were no written comments from members of the public received for this meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

Chair's Report

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson welcomed the committee members and provided updates on the following:

- **State Budget:** Governor Gavin Newsom signed the 2024 State Budget Act on June 29. Due to a projected budget shortfall of over \$46 million, the committee will suspend in-person meetings until further notice. Meetings will be held monthly via videoconference. The Judicial Branch Technology Summit will be postponed. The committee will receive updates on how the new state budget impacts ITAC.
- **Tactical Plan for Technology:** This workstream has held five successful meetings and meets biweekly. They are reviewing feedback on each initiative

and plan to share a draft of the 2025–2026 Tactical Plan for Technology with the branch for public comment in October.

- **California Trial Court Facility Standards:** The updated draft of the Facilities Standards will be presented to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee for approval on August 9 and is scheduled to be presented to the Judicial Council in September for consideration.

Item 2

Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program (Action Requested)

Update: Mr. Douglas G. Denton, Principal Manager, Language Access Services Program, Judicial Council, presented the proposed awards for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grants Program, Cycle 6, Fiscal Year 2024-25. He informed the committee that the signed 2024 State Budget Act allocated \$2.55 million to the program for language access and technology projects requested by the courts. The maximum funding for qualifying signage projects is \$200,000, and \$270,000 for technology projects. The grant program received 18 requests for the maximum amounts for this cycle. The program has approved funding for all 18 requests, with \$603,811.54 allocated to the signage projects and \$1,746,188.46 to technology projects. After ITAC approval, these proposed awards will be reviewed by the Technology Committee and then submitted to the Judicial Council for final approval.

Action: The committee unanimously approved the proposed awards for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grants Program, Cycle 6, Fiscal Year 2024-25.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No. 24-033

For business meeting on November 15, 2024

Title

Language Access Plan: Allocations for Signage and Technology Grant Program, Cycle 6, Fiscal Year 2024–25

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

November 15, 2024

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

September 23, 2024

Recommended by

Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness

Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair

Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Cochair

Language Access Subcommittee

Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Chair

Information Technology Advisory Committee

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Vice-Chair

Contact

Douglas G. Denton, Principal Manager

Language Access Services Program

415-865-7870

douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov

Irene Balajadia, Senior Analyst

Language Access Implementation Unit

415-865-8833

irene.balajadia@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend approving proposed grant awards for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program of \$2.16 million to expand language access for court users. For Cycle 6 (fiscal year 2024–25), 18 courts applied for and will be awarded grants for signage and technology projects.

Recommendation

The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective November 15, 2024:

1. Approve the proposed allocations of \$555,808.52 for signage and \$1,607,366.48 for technology, totaling \$2.16 million for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program for fiscal year (FY) 2024–25, which includes a 7.95% reduction due to the current state budget reductions;
2. If the grants are subsequently deemed exempt from the 7.95% reduction, then the awarded courts will receive an additional allocation to reflect the full grant amount; and
3. Direct staff to work with Branch Accounting and Procurement to draft and execute intra-branch agreements with each awarded court.

The proposed allocations and summary of the requests for funding are included as Attachment A.

Relevant Previous Council Action

In January 2015, the Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*. The plan provides recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access for all of California’s approximately 6.4 million limited-English-proficient (LEP) residents and potential court users.

The Budget Act of 2018 (Stats. 2018, ch. 29) included \$2.55 million in ongoing funding for language access signage and technology (S&T) infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council. On September 24, 2019, the Judicial Council adopted a process to annually disburse these language access signage and technology grants to the trial courts and directed Language Access Services staff to solicit and review grant applications and develop recommendations for review and approval by the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, the Information Technology Advisory Committee, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council.¹

Under the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program, courts may be eligible to receive up to \$200,000 for signage projects and up to \$270,000 for technology projects. If total requests are under the annual allocation for each category then larger amounts may be requested and approved by the council for grants to expend funding.² This is the sixth year of the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program (Cycle 6). In September 2023 the council approved grants to all 13 trial courts that applied for S&T grants and 4 additional courts that

¹ See Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Language Access Plan: Signage and Technology Grants* (Sept. 9, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7675626&GUID=F2CCA714-356A-41B7-82B5-05C058CE0D6E>.

² See Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Language Access Plan: Signage and Technology Grant Program, Fiscal Year 2021-22: Requests and Proposed Allocations* (Sept. 30, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9942092&GUID=5220FB28-A269-47DA-BAAD-4D8A89638903>.

applied for grants under different but related grant opportunities.³ All funding from Cycle 5 under the \$2.35 million annual allocation was distributed to courts.

Analysis/Rationale

To support judicial branch language access expansion efforts, the Budget Act of 2018 included ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.55 million per year for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs. Of the \$1.55 million for technology, \$200,000 is dedicated to the Judicial Council for upgrades to the online Language Access Toolkit and other council language access infrastructure support (such as translation costs for statewide forms, web content, and other multilingual resources for LEP court users). The amount available to trial courts for technology is, therefore, \$1.35 million each year. With the signage funding, the total grant amount available to trial courts each year is \$2.35 million.

Following are the goals of the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help LEP court users navigate the courthouse.
- Assist courts that may need equipment or software that will facilitate communication with LEP court users and the courts.
- Allocate funds to as many trial courts as possible within the given budget to support language access signage and technology initiatives.
- Fund enhancements that provide LEP court users with greater access to the courts and to information in the languages needed to serve court users.
- Encourage courts to establish an ongoing plan that coordinates with other facilities planning and/or with planned or ongoing technology initiatives that support language access as a core service of the court.

On March 15, 2024, a memorandum was released by Judicial Council Information Technology to courts on how to request funding for various technology grant opportunities via a single application process. The deadline for courts to apply was April 2, 2024.

Judicial Council staff coordinated the review of Cycle 6 Language Access Signage and Technology Grant requests with the other technology funding requests (i.e., Information Technology Modernization Funding (ITMF) Program and Jury Management Systems Grant) to ensure that no court would receive duplicate funding for the same project.

For Cycle 6, 18 courts applied for signage and technology needs. Of the 18 courts that applied, 7 courts also applied for grants with the ITMF Program. The projects from all 18 courts can be funded, with adjustment for one court to stay within allowable signage project limits. The total

³ See Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Language Access Plan: Proposed Allocations for Signage and Technology Grant Program, Cycle 5, Fiscal Year 2023–24* (Aug. 23, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12246027&GUID=DD2336E8-D1E6-4D2C-B3D8-D8CF7AA38921>.

recommended signage allocation is \$603,811.54, leaving \$396,188.46 unallocated in the signage category. The remaining funding from the signage category is allowed to go toward related technology category projects as long as the projects benefit LEP court users. The recommendations apply this \$396,188.46 in unallocated signage funds to the technology category.

For the technology category, two courts requested more than the maximum and were capped at \$270,000, but also applied for funds from the ITMF program, which could potentially provide additional funding. One court applied for a very large project and was allocated the maximum of \$270,000. Please see Attachment A for details.

The proposed allocations were reviewed and approved by the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness on September 26 via action by email, the Information Technology Advisory Committee on September 25, and the Technology Committee on TBD via action by email.⁴ The grant awards reflect an overall 7.95% reduction to the state-level judiciary with the recommendation to allocate additional funds if they are later made available.

Proposed Allocations: Signage and Technology Grant Program, Cycle 6 (FY 2024–25), in Dollars

County of Trial Court	Signage Award	Technology Award	Total Proposed Award	Award Reduced by 7.95%
Alameda	35,000.00	—	35,000.00	32,217.50
Contra Costa	—	22,500.00	22,500.00	20,711.25
Kings	6,953.54	19,870.00	26,823.54	24,691.07
Los Angeles	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00	432,635.00
Monterey	—	15,000.00	15,000.00	13,807.50
Orange	—	55,000.00	55,000.00	50,627.50
Riverside	—	75,000.00	75,000.00	69,037.50
San Benito	24,358.00	12,418.00	36,776.00	33,852.31
San Diego	—	35,000.00	35,000.00	32,217.50
San Francisco	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00	432,635.00
San Mateo	2,500.00	14,000.00	16,500.00	15,188.25
Santa Barbara	85,000.00	—	85,000.00	78,242.50
Solano	—	175,063.29	175,063.29	161,145.76
Sonoma	—	270,000.00	270,000.00	248,535.00
Tulare	50,000.00	—	50,000.00	46,025.00
Ventura	—	232,551.76	232,551.76	214,063.89
Yolo	—	270,300.00	270,300.00	248,811.15

⁴ The seven courts that also applied for grants under the ITMF Program are Kings, Riverside, San Benito, Solano, Sonoma, Ventura, and Yolo. These courts can be fully funded by S&T grants, with the exception of Solano and Sonoma. For these two courts, the remainder of their grant request is subject to the ITMF approval process.

Yuba	—	9,485.41	9,485.41	8,731.32
	\$603,811.54	\$1,746,188.46	\$2,350,000.00	\$2,163,175.00

The table below summarizes the number of project requests by signage grant priority.

Signage Grant Projects

Priority #	Signage Grant Project	Total # of Projects
1	Translation of Signage	0
2	Court Websites & Wayfinding Translations	4
3	Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	5
4	Automated Queue-Management System	1
5	Multilingual Non-electronic Signage	0
	Total Signage Grant Projects	10

The table below summarizes the number of project requests by technology grant priority.

Technology Grant Projects

Priority #	Technology Grant Project	Total # of Projects
1	Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions to Support Language Access	5
2	Interpreter Equipment	5
3	Scheduling or Other Software	1
4	Multilingual Videos	0
5	Audiovisual Systems Upgrade	6
6	Multilingual Kiosks	2
	Total Technology Grant Projects	19

The above two tables summarize the total number of projects requested; some courts requested multiple projects. As a result, the total number of projects exceeds the total number of courts that applied this cycle. For a detailed explanation of all the grant projects, see Attachment A.

Policy implications

Under the grant program, courts can apply for funding for audio or video remote solutions to support language access, including video remote interpreting (VRI), if permitted by their memorandums of understanding and any other agreements between court administration and court employees or independent contractors. All courts, including courts that participate in the

grant program and request funding for VRI equipment, will be asked to follow the council’s VRI guidelines for spoken language-interpreted events.⁵

Comments

Public comments were not solicited for this proposal because the recommendations are within the Judicial Council’s purview to approve without circulation.

Alternatives considered

No alternatives were considered because the recommended allocations were calculated using the funding methodology approved by the Judicial Council.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

Funding assists courts with language access signage and technology initiatives. Because funding is ongoing for the trial courts, individual courts are encouraged to establish an ongoing grant funding plan that coordinates with other facilities or technology initiatives planned or underway in their court to support language access. Courts may use grant funding for facilities modification costs that directly relate to the purpose of the grant—for signage or technology—as long as the anticipated facility modification costs are built into the total grant amount.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2024–25: Proposed Allocations

⁵ See Judicial Council of Cal., *Recommended Guidelines and Minimum Specifications for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (May 21, 2021), <https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/partners/default/2023-07/vri-guidelines.pdf>.

**Attachment A: Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2024-25: Proposed Allocations
(Signage)**

#	Trial Court Name	SIGNAGE Project Description(s):	TOTAL SIGNAGE Requested	PROPOSED SIGNAGE Awards	AWARD REDUCED BY 7.95%
1	Alameda	Document Translation - Signage Priority 2: Court Websites Wayfinding Translations	25,000.00	25,000.00	23,012.50
		How to File Video Modification - Signage Priority 3: Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	10,000.00	10,000.00	9,205.00
2	Kings	Qmatic Upgrade for Self Help and Family Court Services - Signage Priority 4: Automated Queue Management System	6,953.54	6,953.54	6,400.73
3	Los Angeles	CourtWays Digital Signage and Wayfinding Implementation - Signage Priority 2: Court Websites Wayfinding Translations	200,000.00	200,000.00	184,100.00
4	San Benito	CourtBoard External Hearing Display - Signage Priority 3: Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	24,358.00	24,358.00	22,421.54
5	San Francisco	ACCESS Center PARTWAYS Virtual Wayfinder Project - Signage Priority 3: Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	200,000.00	200,000.00	184,100.00
		Court's Update Signage System & Display - Signage Priority 3: Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	219,023.75	-	-
6	San Mateo	Multilingual Online Wayfinding - Signage Priority 2: Court Websites Wayfinding Translations	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,301.25
7	Santa Barbara	Digital Content Refresh & Translation - Signage Priority 2: Court Websites Wayfinding Translations	85,000.00	85,000.00	78,242.50
8	Tulare	Signage Modernization - Signage Priority 3: Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	50,000.00	50,000.00	46,025.00
			\$822,835.29	\$603,811.54	\$555,808.52

Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2024-25: Proposed Allocations (Technology)

#	Trial Court Name	TECHNOLOGY Project Description(s):	TOTAL TECHNOLOGY Requested	PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY Awards	AWARD REDUCED BY 7.95%
1	Contra Costa	Courtroom Interpreter Equipment Devices - Technology Priority 2: Interpreter Equipment	22,500.00	22,500.00	20,711.25
2	Kings	Multilingual Kiosks - Lobby - Technology Priority 6: Multilingual kiosks	14,500.00	14,500.00	13,347.25
		Video Remote Interpreting - Technology Priority 1: Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	5,370.00	5,370.00	4,943.09
3	Los Angeles	CourtWays Digital Signage and Wayfinding Implementation - Technology Priority 6: Multilingual Kiosks	13,150,508.95	270,000.00	248,535.00
4	Monterey	Self-Help Bookings - Technology Priority 3: Scheduling or Other Software	15,000.00	15,000.00	13,807.50
5	Orange	Video Remote Interpreting Equipment - Technology Priority 1: Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	55,000.00	55,000.00	50,627.50
6	Riverside	Interpreter Equipment - Technology Priority 2: Interpreter Equipment	75,000.00	75,000.00	69,037.50
7	San Benito	Wireless Microphones for Courtrooms - Technology Priority 2: Interpreter Equipment	12,418.00	12,418.00	11,430.77
8	San Diego	Interpreter Equipment Upgrades - Technology Priority 5: Audio-Visual Systems Upgrade	15,000.00	15,000.00	13,807.50
		Interpreter Video Equipment Upgrades - Technology Priority 5: Audio-Visual Systems Upgrade	20,000.00	20,000.00	18,410
9	San Francisco	ACCESS Center PARTWAYS Virtual Wayfinder Project - Technology Priority 1: Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	270,000.00	270,000.00	248,535.00
10	San Mateo	Interpreter Equipment and Coordination Enhancement - Technology Priority 2: Interpreter Equipment	14,000.00	14,000.00	12,887.00
11	Solano	Wireless Interpreting Equipment - Technology Priority 2: Interpreter Equipment	13,000.00	13,000.00	11,966.50
		Criminal Courtroom A/V Upgrades - Technology Priority 5: Audio-Visual Systems Upgrade	226,000.00	162,063.29	149,179.26
12	Sonoma	Audio-Visual Systems Upgrade - Technology Priority 5: Audio-Visual Systems Upgrade	267,750.14	260,514.11	\$239,803.24
		Interpreter Equipment Upgrade - Technology Priority 5: Audio-Visual Systems Upgrade	9,485.89	9,485.89	8,731.76
13	Ventura	Courtroom Video Upgrades Remote Proceedings - Technology Priority 1: Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	232,551.76	232,551.76	214,063.89

Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2024-25: Proposed Allocations (Technology)

14	Yolo	Workshops/Training Rooms AV Upgrade - Technology Priority 5: Audio-Visual Systems Upgrade	270,300.00	270,300.00	248,811.15
15	Yuba	Speakerphones for Telephonic Interpretation - Technology Priority 1: Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	9,485.41	9,485.41	8,731.32
			\$14,697,870.15	\$1,746,188.46	\$1,607,366.48

Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2024–25: Proposed Allocations (Summary)

#	Trial Court Name	Funded in FY 2019-2020	Funded in FY 2021-2022	Funded in FY 2022-2023	Funded in FY 2023-2024	Funded in FY 2024-2025	SIGNAGE AWARD	TECHNOLOGY AWARD	TOTAL PROPOSED AWARDS	AWARD REDUCED BY 7.95%
1	Alameda	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	35,000.00	-	35,000.00	32,217.50
2	Contra Costa	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	-	22,500.00	22,500.00	20,711.25
3	Kings	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	6,953.54	19,870.00	26,823.54	24,691.07
4	Los Angeles	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00	432,635.00
5	Monterey	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	15,000.00	15,000.00	13,807.50
6	Orange	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	55,000.00	55,000.00	50,627.50
7	Riverside	No	No	No	No	Yes	-	75,000.00	75,000.00	69,037.50
8	San Benito	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	24,358.00	12,418.00	36,776.00	33,852.31
9	San Diego	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	35,000.00	35,000.00	32,217.50
10	San Francisco	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00	432,635.00
11	San Mateo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2,500.00	14,000.00	16,500.00	15,188.25
12	Santa Barbara	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	85,000.00	-	85,000.00	78,242.50
13	Solano	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-	175,063.29	175,063.29	161,145.76
14	Sonoma	No	No	No	No	Yes	-	270,000.00	270,000.00	248,535.00
15	Tulare	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	50,000.00	-	50,000.00	46,025.00
16	Ventura	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	232,551.76	232,551.76	214,063.89
17	Yolo	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	270,300.00	270,300.00	248,811.15
18	Yuba	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-	9,485.41	9,485.41	8,731.32
							\$603,811.54	\$1,746,188.46	\$2,350,000.00	\$2,163,175.00



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm

INVITATION TO COMMENT

W24-XX

Title

Judicial Branch Technology: Rules for Adoption of Technological and Data Security Standards

Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes

Adopt Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.405;
amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.172

Proposed by

Court Executives Advisory Committee
Darrel Parker, Chair
Information Technology Advisory
Committee
Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Action Requested

Review and submit comments by January 6, 2025

Proposed Effective Date

July 1, 2025

Contact

Jenny Grantz, 415-865-4394
jenny.grantz@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary and Origin

The Court Executives Advisory Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee propose amending one rule and adopting one rule to allow the Judicial Council to adopt standards for technological and data security for the courts and the council.

Background

In 2023, the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) formed the Joint Information Security Governance Subcommittee (JISGS). JISGS develops cybersecurity and data protection initiatives on behalf of the judicial branch and reviews and makes recommendations on branchwide incident management, security training, and security policies. JISGS's goal is to give the Judicial Council confidence that information security policies have been adequately vetted and have branchwide support.

As a result of its work over the past year, JISGS believes that it would be beneficial for the Judicial Council to adopt standards for technological and data security that would apply to the courts and the council. These standards would help to ensure a minimum level of information

This proposal has not been approved by the Judicial Council and is not intended to represent the views of the council, its Rules Committee, or its Legislation Committee. It is circulated for comment purposes only.

security across the branch and would also enable the branch to apply information security best practices more effectively.

The Proposal

To allow the Judicial Council to adopt technological and data security standards for the courts and the council, the committees propose amending one rule and adopting one rule.

Rule 10.172

Existing rule 10.172 requires each superior court to develop a court security plan that addresses numerous subject areas. The committees propose moving the computer and data security subject area to new rule 10.405. To do so, the committees propose:

- Revising subdivision (a) to refer to a “court security plan that applies to each court facility in the county” instead of a “countywide court security plan” to clarify that rule 10.172 addresses security in court facilities;
- Revising subdivision (b)(1) to remove subpart (V), “computer and data security,” because that topic will be covered by new rule 10.405; and
- Adding a second sentence to the Advisory Committee Comment to inform readers that computer and data security are now covered by rule 10.405 instead of rule 10.172.

Rule 10.405

The committees propose adopting new rule 10.405 to create the process for developing, adopting, and revising technological and data security standards for the courts and the Judicial Council.

Subdivision (a) describes the development and approval process for the standards. The committees decided to make ITAC responsible for developing the standards and making recommendations to the Judicial Council because ITAC’s membership includes judicial officers, court executives, court technologists, and other subject matter experts, and ITAC has extensive experience developing proposals to address technological issues affecting the courts.

Subdivision (b) creates a 30-day comment period during which the courts can comment on proposed substantive amendments to any standard adopted under rule 10.405. The committees’ goal is to ensure that all courts are given sufficient notice and opportunity to provide input on the standards. The language in subdivision (b)(1) was modeled on rule 10.804(b)(1), which contains a similar comment process.¹

¹ Rule 10.804(b)(1) reads: “Before making any substantive amendments to the *Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual*, the Judicial Council must make the amendments available to the superior courts, the California Department of Finance, and the State Controller's Office for 30 days for comment.”

Subdivision (b) also gives the Technology Committee the authority to approve nonsubstantive technical changes or corrections without Judicial Council approval and without the 30-day comment period. This provision is similar to provisions in other rules that allow for technical changes and corrections without council approval.²

Subdivision (c) clarifies that any standards adopted under rule 10.405 apply to the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal, the superior courts, and the Judicial Council.

Subdivision (d) clarifies that for security reasons, any standards adopted under rule 10.405 are exempt from public disclosure under rule 10.500.³

Alternatives Considered

The committees considered taking no action but ultimately determined that the proposal was warranted because creating technological and data security standards could provide tremendous benefits to the courts and the Judicial Council.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The standards adopted under proposed rule 10.405 might require courts to implement or change their policies or procedures, which might require training for judicial officers and court staff. Courts might also need to procure equipment or services to meet the standards adopted under rule 10.405.

² For example, rule 10.804(b)(2) allows the Administrative Director to make technical changes and corrections to the *Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual*. Similarly, rule 10.22(d)(2) allows the Rules Committee to recommend “nonsubstantive technical change[s] or correction[s]” to the California Rules of Court and Judicial Council forms without circulating the proposed changes for public comment.

³ Rule 10.500(f)(6) exempts from disclosure any “[r]ecords whose disclosure would compromise the security of a judicial branch entity or the safety of judicial branch personnel, including but not limited to, court security plans, and security surveys, investigations, procedures, and assessments.”

Request for Specific Comments

In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committees are interested in comments on the following:

- Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?

The advisory committees also seek comments from *courts* on the following cost and implementation matters:

- Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify.
- What would the implementation requirements be for courts—for example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems?
- Would three months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation?
- How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes?
- Does the proposal appropriately address the different characteristics of the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal, the superior courts, and the Judicial Council?

Attachments

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rules 10.172 and 10.405, at pages 5–9

Rule 10.172 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2025, to read:

1 **Title 10. Judicial Administration Rules**

2
3 **Division 2. Administration of the Judicial Branch**

4
5 **Chapter 2. Court Security**

6
7
8 **Rule 10.172. Court security plans**

9
10 **(a) Responsibility**

11 The presiding judge and the sheriff or marshal are responsible for developing an
12 annual or multiyear comprehensive, ~~countywide~~ court security plan that applies to
13 each court facility in the county.
14

15
16 **(b) Scope of security plan**

17 (1) Each court security plan must, at a minimum, address the following general
18 security subject areas:

19 (A) Composition and role of court security committees;

20 (B) Composition and role of executive team;

21 (C) Incident command system;

22 (D) Self-assessments and audits of court security;

23 (E) Mail handling security;

24 (F) Identification cards and access control;

25 (G) Courthouse landscaping security plan;

26 (H) Parking plan security;

27 (I) Interior and exterior lighting plan security;

28 (J) Intrusion and panic alarm systems;

29 (K) Fire detection and equipment;

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Rule 10.172 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2025, to read:

- 1 (L) Emergency and auxiliary power;
- 2
- 3 (M) Use of private security contractors;
- 4
- 5 (N) Use of court attendants and employees;
- 6
- 7 (O) Administrative/clerk's office security;
- 8
- 9 (P) Jury personnel and jury room security;
- 10
- 11 (Q) Security for public demonstrations;
- 12
- 13 (R) Vital records storage security;
- 14
- 15 (S) Evacuation planning;
- 16
- 17 (T) Security for after-hours operations;
- 18
- 19 (U) Custodial services;
- 20
- 21 ~~(V) Computer and data security;~~
- 22
- 23 (VW) Workplace violence prevention; and
- 24
- 25 (WX) Public access to court proceedings.
- 26
- 27 (2) Each court security plan must, at a minimum, address the following law
- 28 enforcement subject areas:
- 29
- 30 (A) Security personnel and staffing;
- 31
- 32 (B) Perimeter and entry screening;
- 33
- 34 (C) Prisoner and inmate transport;
- 35
- 36 (D) Holding cells;
- 37
- 38 (E) Interior and public waiting area security;
- 39
- 40 (F) Courtroom security;
- 41
- 42 (G) Jury trial procedures;

Rule 10.172 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2025, to read:

1
2 (H) High-profile and high-risk trial security;

3
4 (I) Judicial protection;

5
6 (J) Incident reporting and recording;

7
8 (K) Security personnel training;

9
10 (L) Courthouse security communication;

11
12 (M) Hostage, escape, lockdown, and active shooter procedures;

13
14 (N) Firearms policies and procedures; and

15
16 (O) Restraint of defendants.

17
18 (3) Each court security plan should address additional security issues as needed.

19
20 **(c) Court security assessment and assessment report**

21
22 At least once every two years, the presiding judge and the sheriff or marshal are
23 responsible for conducting an assessment of security with respect to all court
24 operations. The assessment must include a comprehensive review of the court's
25 physical security profile and security protocols and procedures. The assessment
26 should identify security weaknesses, resource deficiencies, compliance with the
27 court security plan, and any need for changes to the court security plan. The
28 assessment must be summarized in a written assessment report.

29
30 **(d) Submission of court a plan to the Judicial Council**

31
32 On or before November 1, 2009, each superior court must submit a court security
33 plan to the Judicial Council. On or before February 1, 2011, and each succeeding
34 February 1, each superior court must give notice to the Judicial Council whether it
35 has made any changes to the court security plan and, if so, identify each change
36 made and provide copies of the current court security plan and current assessment
37 report. In preparing any submission, a court may request technical assistance from
38 Judicial Council staff.

39
40
41

Rule 10.172 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective July 1, 2025, to read:

1 **(e) Plan review process**

2
3 Judicial Council staff will evaluate for completeness submissions identified in (d).
4 Annually, the submissions and evaluations will be provided to the Court Security
5 Advisory Committee. Any submissions determined by the advisory committee to
6 be incomplete or deficient must be returned to the submitting court for correction
7 and completion.
8

9 **(f) Delegation**

10
11 The presiding judge may delegate any of the specific duties listed in this rule to
12 another judge or, if the duty does not require the exercise of judicial authority, to
13 the court executive officer or other court employee. The presiding judge remains
14 responsible for all duties listed in this rule even if he or she has delegated particular
15 tasks to someone else.
16

17 **Advisory Committee Comment**

18
19 This rule is adopted to comply with the mandate in Government Code section 69925, which
20 requires the Judicial Council to provide for the areas to be addressed in a court security plan and
21 to establish a process for the review of such plans.
22

23 Former subdivision (b)(1)(V), on computer and data security, is now addressed in rule 10.405, on
24 judicial branch technology and data security standards.

Rule 10.405 of the California Rules of Court would be adopted, effective July 1, 2025, to read:

1 **Title 10. Judicial Administration Rules**

2
3 **Division 2. Administration of the Judicial Branch**

4
5 **Chapter 6. Court Technology, Information, and Automation**

6
7
8 **Rule 10.405. Judicial branch technology and data security standards**

9
10 **(a) Adoption and maintenance of standards**

11
12 The Judicial Council may adopt and maintain judicial branch standards for
13 technological and data security. The Information Technology Advisory Committee
14 will be responsible for developing the standards, making any revisions, and
15 making recommendations to the Judicial Council.

16
17 **(b) Revisions to the standards**

18
19 (1) Before making any substantive amendments to the standards, the Information
20 Technology Advisory Committee must make the amendments available to the
21 entities listed in subdivision (c) for 30 days for comment.

22
23 (2) Upon the recommendation of the Information Technology Advisory
24 Committee, the Technology Committee may approve nonsubstantive
25 technical changes or corrections without the comment period required in
26 subdivision (b)(1) and without approval by the Judicial Council.

27
28 **(c) Application of standards**

29
30 The standards apply to the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal, the superior
31 courts, and the Judicial Council.

32
33 **(d) Disclosure of standards**

34
35 The standards are exempt from public disclosure consistent with the provisions of
36 rule 10.500 that exempt records whose disclosure would compromise the security
37 of a judicial branch entity.