



# 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

November 18, 2025

12:00 p.m.

Videoconference

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair; Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Vice-Chair; Mr. Jordan Aiken; Mr. Mike Baniel; Hon. Kathy Ciuffini; Mr. Brian Cotta; Hon. Julie R. Culver; Hon. Tara M. Desautels; Mr. Timothy Fox; Mr. Jason Galkin; Ms. Katy Grant; Hon. Michael Groch; Mr. AJ Guzman; Ms. Carrie Holmes; Mr. Brett Howard; Hon. Kimberly Menninger; Hon. Richard Miadich; Hon. Ioana Petrou; Ms. Jeannette Vannoy

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Damon Connolly; Ms. Rebecca Fleming; Hon. Michael Mau

**Others Present:** Hon. Maria Hernandez; Mr. John Yee; Judicial Council staff

---

#### OPEN MEETING

---

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order. Staff took roll call and made opening announcements.

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 21, 2025, Information Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

---

#### DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM (ITEMS 1 – 3)

---

##### Item 1

###### Chair Report

The committee received an update on activities and news from the Information Technology Advisory Committee chair, Hon. Sheila F. Hanson.

##### Item 2

###### Judicial Council Technology Committee Chair Report

The committee received an update on activities and news from the Judicial Council Technology Committee chair, Hon. Maria D. Hernandez.

##### Item 3

###### 2026 Annual Agenda (Action Requested)

The committee discussed the proposed 2026 Annual Agenda which included seven workstreams and two subcommittees, from the Information Technology Advisory Committee chair, Hon.

Shelia F. Hanson. Ultimately, the committee discussed deferring some workstreams for potential reconsideration midway through the agenda cycle and resource permitting.

***Action: The committee voted to defer two proposed workstreams—(1) Enhanced Collaboration Tools and (2) Framework and Develop Strategies to Improve the Digital Experience on Court Websites.***

***Action: The committee voted to recommend the 2026 Annual Agenda based on available resources, for submission to the Judicial Council Technology Committee for consideration.***

---

## ADJOURNMENT

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved by the advisory body on {ENTER DATE}.



# Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
[courts.ca.gov](https://courts.ca.gov)

---

## REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*Item No.:*

For business meeting on April 24, 2026

---

**Title**

Judicial Branch Technology: AB 716  
Implementation Outcomes on Remote Public  
Access

**Report Type**

Information

**Date of Report**

January 12, 2026

**Submitted by**

Judicial Council Technology Committee  
Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Chair  
David Slayton, Vice-Chair

**Contact**

John Yee, 415-865-4601  
[john.yee@jud.ca.gov](mailto:john.yee@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

This report summarizes the significant progress the trial courts have made in implementing Assembly Bill 716 (AB 716), which requires courts to provide public audio access to courtroom proceedings when courthouses are physically closed. It presents information the Judicial Council collected from trial courts on the use of one-time funding of \$66.4 million provided through the Budget Act of 2022 to upgrade courtroom audio and video systems. Through a two-year effort, 1,171 courtrooms have been modernized, and projects are underway in another 210 courtrooms. This report highlights key outcomes and direct feedback from participating courts, including improved accessibility, reduced disruption, as well as cost savings and operational efficiencies.

### Relevant Previous Reporting or Action

At its meeting on March 24, 2023, the council approved an allocation of approximately \$32 million to 28 trial courts for fiscal year (FY) 2022–23 funding for courtroom audio upgrades that satisfy the statutory mandate of Assembly Bill 716.<sup>1</sup> At its meeting on January 19, 2024, the council approved an allocation of approximately \$25 million to 17 trial courts for FY 2023–24 to

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Judicial Branch Technology: Allocation of Funds for AB 716 Legislative Mandate, Fiscal Years 2022–23 and 2023–24* (Mar. 2, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11694259&GUID=CFF3EBC4-494B-4F85-B6AD-D26675A1DB1E>

support audio upgrades in courts that were either not fully funded or did not request funding for FY 2022–23.<sup>2</sup>

## **Analysis/Rationale**

To support the ongoing courtroom modernization initiative mandated by AB 716 (Stats. 2021, ch. 526),<sup>3</sup> the Judicial Council implemented a multiyear funding strategy to ensure remote public access to courtroom proceedings when courthouses are physically closed. This access is provided through public audio streaming or telephonic listening options, as required by statute.

The Budget Act of 2022 allocated \$33.2 million from the General Fund for FY 2022–23 and \$33.2 million for FY 2023–24, along with four dedicated positions and \$1.632 million in ongoing funding to implement and sustain this access statewide. Of the total allocation, approximately \$57 million was designated for direct distribution to trial courts to upgrade audio equipment in courtrooms constructed prior to 2000.

To determine funding distribution, Judicial Council staff conducted a statewide survey of trial courts to assess audio and video equipment needs. Forty-nine courts responded, and their submissions were analyzed and prioritized based on courthouse age (20 years or older), case type usage, and prior funding status. Courts that had initiated but not completed upgrades using earlier Information Technology Modernization Funding were eligible for supplemental support.

The average cost of an audio equipment upgrade was estimated at \$50,000 per courtroom. All upgrades were required to align with technical specifications developed by the Information Technology Advisory Committee’s Hybrid Courtroom Workstream.

As a result of the two-year funding cycle, 31 courts received funding for upgrades to courthouses built before 2000 and 1,381 courtrooms were funded for upgrades. All eligible courts that submitted funding requests received full or substantial funding, and courts not funded in the initial cycle were given the opportunity to apply in the second year. One court applied for funds in Year 1 but chose not to participate and did not receive any funding.

This strategic investment has significantly advanced the state’s goal of equitable, remote public access to judicial proceedings, particularly in civil matters, and has modernized courtroom infrastructure in alignment with legislative intent. Additionally, approximately 1,639 courtrooms statewide—representing approximately 75 percent of all courtrooms—were compliant with AB 716 as of December 31, 2025, leaving approximately 461 courtrooms remaining that will still require remote public access technology upgrades.

---

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Judicial Branch Technology: Allocation of Funds for AB 716 Legislative Mandate, Fiscal Year 2023–24* (Dec. 29, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12563621&GUID=59FA2B84-134A-428C-B4E1-D45287C3A704>.

<sup>3</sup> Assembly Bill 716, [leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202120220AB716](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB716).

## **Implementation Progress**

As of December 31, 2025, and across the two-year funding cycle, 27 courts completed 35 upgrade projects,<sup>4</sup> modernizing a total of 1,171 courtrooms statewide. Six courts still have eight projects in progress, impacting an additional 210 courtrooms. Five of these courts are among the 27 that have completed projects. A list of participating courts and courtrooms upgraded is provided in Attachment A. These included 9 large, 10 medium, and 12 small courts.

Project status by fiscal year as of December 31, 2025:

- FY 2022–23 (Year 1):
  - Twenty-four courts completed upgrade projects.
  - Three courts have Year 1 projects in progress:<sup>6</sup>
    - Los Angeles
    - Mono
    - Orange
- FY 2023–24 (Year 2):
  - Eleven courts completed upgrade projects.<sup>5</sup>
  - Five courts have Year 2 projects in progress:<sup>6</sup>
    - Los Angeles
    - Orange
    - Sacramento
    - Santa Clara
    - Solano
  - San Francisco had a project in Year 1 and planned a second project in Year 2. However, the court was unable to encumber its funds for the Year 2 project in time, so the Year 2 project was cancelled.

This progression reflects strong statewide engagement and momentum toward full AB 716 compliance.

## **Implementation Highlights**

- Superior Court of Butte County transformed 16 courtrooms across two courthouses with an \$800,000 investment, successfully eliminating persistent issues like muffled audio and unreliable wireless microphones—dramatically improving the courtroom experience for all participants.
- Superior Court of San Diego County, one of the largest in the state with 90 courtrooms across five courthouses, reported that the newly installed audio systems were “well

---

<sup>4</sup> Eight courts completed two projects.

<sup>5</sup> Some courts completed projects both years.

<sup>6</sup> Los Angeles, Santa Clara, Solano, Mono, Sacramento, and Monterey will be completed by June 30, 2026. Orange will be completed by June 30, 2027.

received by judges,” signaling a strong endorsement from the bench and a meaningful upgrade to courtroom functionality.

- Superior Court of Inyo County, with just one courtroom, maximized its \$50,000 allocation to complete critical design and repair work. The improvements earned positive feedback from court leadership, underscoring the value of even modest investments in audio infrastructure.

These improvements have increased public access, supported courtroom efficiency, and helped ensure compliance with AB 716 while modernizing critical audio infrastructure.

## **Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications**

The two-year AB 716 funding initiative has delivered substantial fiscal and operational benefits to California’s trial courts while advancing the state’s commitment to public access and courtroom modernization. The \$66.4 million in General Fund allocations across FY 2022–23 and FY 2023–24 enabled courts to implement critical audio infrastructure upgrades that directly support compliance with AB 716’s remote access requirements.

### **Fiscal Impact**

- **One-time investments** in courtroom audio systems have yielded long-term value by improving reliability, clarity, and accessibility.
- **Cost savings** were achieved through centralized Judicial Council support in vendor negotiations, design reviews, and procurement coordination. For example:
  - Superior Court of San Francisco County saved approximately \$165,825, which represents approximately 12 percent of its grant, through Judicial Council–assisted vendor negotiations.
  - Superior Court of Inyo County benefited from Judicial Council–led design corrections and vendor proposal reviews, resulting in a more functional and cost-effective solution.
- Courts reported that the funding significantly reduced their financial burden, especially in jurisdictions where total project costs exceeded available local resources.

### **Operational Impact**

- Upgraded systems have enhanced both in-person and remote courtroom experiences by:
  - Improving audio clarity for all courtroom participants, including judges, jurors, attorneys, litigants/parties, and public observers;
  - Increasing reliability, with fewer microphone dropouts and stronger wireless coverage; and

- Providing more consistent functionality for in-person and remote participants supporting transparency and continuity of operations.

These improvements have directly supported courtroom efficiency, reduced technical disruptions, and increased public trust in the judicial process.

**Policy Implications**

The initiative underscores the value of centralized technical support and funding coordination in achieving statewide policy goals. It highlights the importance of modernizing legacy infrastructure to meet evolving public access expectations and legislative mandates. The program's success may inform future policy decisions regarding technology standards, funding models, and statewide implementation strategies for courtroom modernization.

**Attachments and Links**

Attachment A: AB 716 Upgrade Status as of December 31, 2025

<b>AB 716 Upgrade Status as of December 31, 2025</b>		
<b>Superior Court</b>	<b>Courtrooms Completed</b>	<b>Courtrooms In Progress</b>
<b>Small Courts</b>		
Butte	16	-
El Dorado	1	-
Humboldt	8	-
Inyo	1	-
Mariposa	1	-
Merced	6	-
Modoc	1	-
Mono	-	1
Nevada	7	-
San Luis Obispo	15	-
Santa Cruz	8	-
Yuba	6	-
<b>Medium Courts</b>		
Contra Costa	21	-
Kern	40	-
Monterey	21	-
San Joaquin	19	-
San Mateo	25	-
Santa Barbara	26	-
Solano	14	5
Stanislaus	12	-
Tulare	17	-
Ventura	11	-
<b>Large Courts</b>		
Alameda	69	-
Los Angeles	392	160
Orange	127	22
Riverside	52	-
Sacramento	9	19
San Bernardino	12	-
San Diego	101	-
San Francisco	67	-
Santa Clara	66	3
<b>Total Courtrooms</b>	<b>1,171</b>	<b>210</b>

## Notes:

Court size is based on number of judges: large (48+), medium (16–47), small (15 or fewer).

Court size totals = 9 large, 10 medium, 12 small.



**Information Technology Advisory Committee**  
**Advisory Committee/Task Force/Working Group**  
**Liaison Report**

Meeting Date:  
January 21, 2026

- I. Reporting Member: Ioana Petrou, Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three
- II. Name of Advisory Committee: Appellate Advisory Committee (AAC)
- III. Relevant Updates
  - **Increasing the File-size Limit for E-filing in the Court of Appeal:** AAC staff is in the process of submitting a technical report to amend rule 8.74 to increase the file-size limit for e-filing in the Court of Appeal from 25 megabytes to 100 megabytes effective July 1, 2026. Staff has confirmed with the Appellate Court Clerk Executive Officers that the requisite budget increase is in place and confirmed with the Judicial Council Office of Information Technology that the vendor (i3Verticals) will increase the e-filing file size limit on July 1, 2026 to 100 megabytes.
  - **Electronic Exhibits in the Court of Appeal:** Following the finalization of the electronic exhibit platform in the Court of Appeal, AAC will consider what action is necessary to clarify requirements for use of an electronic exhibits platform and increase the efficiency of the transmission of exhibits in the Court of Appeal.
- IV. Other Information of Potential Interest
  - **Appellate Caseflow Workgroup Recommendations Regarding Record Preparation:** AAC is working on rule and form proposals to implement recommendations made by the Appellate Caseflow Workgroup effective January 1, 2027. These include: (1) streamlining or reducing the number of tasks required by superior court clerks in preparing the record on appeal; and (2) simplify the record designation process to make it clearer and more efficient.

## **Report to the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

**From:** Judge Michael Groch

**Role:** ITAC Liaison to the Center for Judicial Education and Resources Advisory Committee (CJERAC)

**Meeting Date:** January 21

## **Center for Judicial Education and Resources Advisory Committee (CJERAC) Update**

---

### **Overview**

This report provides an update on activities of the Center for Judicial Education and Resources Advisory Committee (CJERAC). The committee oversees statewide judicial education policy, delivery methods, and long-term education planning, with particular emphasis on access, consistency, cost-effectiveness, and appropriate use of technology in judicial education.

### **Education Planning and Delivery**

CJERAC approved the 2026–2028 Education Plan, following review of curriculum committee recommendations and associated cost-benefit analyses. The plan largely continues existing programming while normalizing the number of New Judge Orientation sessions and Judicial College offerings after prior expansion. The committee reaffirmed its approach of reserving in-person education primarily for new judges and new assignments, while favoring remote delivery for education aimed at experienced judicial officers.

### **Use of Remote Technology in Judicial Education**

The committee continues to refine its use of remote and hybrid delivery models to balance educational effectiveness, cost containment, and statewide access. CJERAC approved converting courses designed for experienced judges to remote delivery, including the Qualifying Ethics core course, while allowing courts to request in-person offerings when resources permit. This approach reflects sustained reliance on technology-supported education platforms.

### **Rule and Policy Considerations**

CJERAC approved adding to its 2026 Annual Agenda a project to consider potential amendments to California Rules of Court, rule 10.465, related to judicial education requirements on bias and fairness. No rule change has been adopted. Any proposal would proceed through the standard multi-year rulemaking process and include evaluation of delivery methods, costs, and operational impacts.

## **Federal Immigration Enforcement Education**

In response to increased immigration enforcement activity in and around California courthouses, and at the direction of the Chief Justice, CJERAC has directed staff to develop and deploy judicial education addressing federal immigration enforcement issues. This work is being treated as time-sensitive and is proceeding outside the normal two-year education plan cycle.

The education will address the current state of the law, distinctions between judicial warrants and administrative immigration warrants, appropriate judicial responses, and use of the California Attorney General's model policies on immigration issues. Initial offerings will be delivered via live remote courses to ensure rapid statewide access, with materials also posted on CJER Online. While the immediate focus is judicial education, the committee has recognized that court staff training may also be necessary given that immigration enforcement interactions frequently occur outside the courtroom.

## **Current Status and Forward Look**

CJERAC is implementing the approved 2026–2028 Education Plan, advancing responsive education initiatives such as immigration enforcement training, and continuing to evaluate delivery methods in light of budget constraints and technology capabilities.

## **Summary for ITAC**

At this time, there are no action items requiring ITAC intervention, but continued coordination is advisable as education delivery and technology reliance continue to expand. Judicial education increasingly depends on reliable, scalable technology platforms for delivery, access, and resource management.

## **Report to the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

**From:** Judge Michael Groch

**Role:** ITAC Liaison to the Traffic Advisory Committee

**Meeting Date:** January 21

### **Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) Update**

---

#### **Overview**

This report provides an update on recent activities of the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC). The committee's work remains focused on its core statutory and advisory responsibilities, including annual updates to the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedules (UBPS), review of traffic-related legislation for operational impacts on the courts, and coordination where traffic policy intersects with court technology initiatives.

#### **Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedules**

The committee completed review and approval of technical corrections to the 2025 Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedules, addressing identified errors in conviction assessments and related formatting issues. In October 2025, TAC approved the 2026 UBPS for circulation for public comment. This action supports the Judicial Council's statutory obligation to adopt updated schedules effective January 1 each year and reflects the compressed timeline between the close of the legislative session and council adoption.

#### **Legislative Review and Monitoring**

During the first half of 2025, the committee reviewed multiple traffic-related bills, including AB 289, AB 435, AB 981, and AB 983. Review focused on procedural, operational, and workload impacts on trial courts. The committee did not take formal positions on these measures but provided feedback to Judicial Council staff, particularly where proposals could shift enforcement models, expand administrative processes, or create unintended impacts on court operations. Legislative monitoring remains ongoing.

#### **Traffic Violator School and MyCitations Coordination**

At its June 2025 meeting, the committee received a presentation addressing traffic violator school processes as they relate to MyCitations. Discussion focused on alignment between existing rules, forms, and the evolving online adjudication environment. No immediate action was required, but this remains an area of continued coordination as MyCitations and related tools continue to develop.

### **Current Status and Forward Look**

The committee is supporting the public comment and adoption process for the 2026 Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedules and continues to monitor traffic-related legislation with potential operational or technology impacts. Coordination with court technology initiatives remains active, particularly where traffic policy intersects with online adjudication, payment, and compliance systems.

### **Summary for ITAC**

There are no immediate issues requiring ITAC action at this time. The Traffic Advisory Committee's work remains on schedule and focused. Core statutory responsibilities are being met, legislative proposals are being reviewed through an operational lens.