



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE
THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: February 10, 2020
Time: 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes for the following Judicial Council Technology Committee meetings:

- November 22, 2019 Action by Email
- January 16, 2020 Open Meeting

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by February 7, 2020, 12:00 p.m. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Rita Alderucci. Only written comments received by February 7, 2020, 12:00 p.m. will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1– 5)

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of/or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

An update and report on ITAC will be provided; this will include the activities of the workstreams.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program (Action Required)

Consider whether to approve the proposed awards for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program for FY 2019-20.

Presenters: Hon. Victor Rodriguez, Chair, Language Access Subcommittee
Mr. Douglas Denton, Principal Manager, Language Access Services Program

Item 4

Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to the California Rules of Court (Action Required)

Consider whether to recommend circulating proposed amendments to the California Rules of Court to indicate that an electronic filing service provider must allow the party to proceed with an electronic filing even if the party does not consent to receive electronic service.

Presenters: Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Chair, Appellate Advisory Committee, Vice-Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee, and Chair Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee
Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney II, Legal Services

Item 5

Technology Micro-Grant Program (Information Only)

Discuss the possibility of offering small technology grants to courts in Fiscal Year 19-20 for support with one-time purchases of technology goods and/or services.

Presenter: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS
NOVEMBER 22, 2019

Email Proposal

The Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) was asked to consider approving the report on the feasibility, rule, regulation and statutory requirements, to support implementation of remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for most noncriminal court proceedings for acceptance and submission of the report on the Future Commissions Directive: Remote Video Appearances for Most Non-Criminal Hearings to the Judicial Council.

Due to the limited availability of JCTC members and the body's other priorities, the JCTC did not have time to consider this request at a meeting in a timely manner. Accordingly, the Chair concluded that prompt action by email was necessary.

Notice

On November 20, 2019 a notice was posted advising that the JCTC was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(B).

Public Comment

Because the email proposal concerned a subject that otherwise must be discussed in an open meeting, the JCTC invited public comment on the proposal under rule 10.75(o)(2). The public comment period began at 10:00 a.m., November 20, 2019 and ended at 9:00 a.m. November 22, 2019. No comments were received.

Action Taken

After the public comment period ended, JCTC members were asked to submit their votes on the proposed prioritization by 10:00 a.m. on November 25, 2019. Seven members voted to approve the proposal with one member abstaining. The email proposal was approved.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

January 16, 2020

1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

In Person

American Room, Judicial Council Conference Center
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95833

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair; Hon. C. Todd Bottke, Vice-Chair; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Ms. Nancy Eberhardt; Ms. Rachel W. Hill; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Others Present: Ms. Heather L. Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Mr. David Koon; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Nicole Rosa; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the November 15, 2019.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Judge Brodie reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Item 2

Review of Information Technology Advisory Committee 2020 Annual Agenda (Action Required)

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair of ITAC, provided a review of the 2020 Annual Agenda.

Action: The committee discussed the activities of ITAC and its workstreams, reviewed the new “scope” categories, asked and answered questions. The committee unanimously approved the Annual Agenda.

Item 3

Technology Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) (Action Required)

Update: Ms. Heather Pettit provided a report on the technology-related concepts for BCP funding beginning FY 21/22.

Actions: The committee asked questions and discussed the concepts presented. The committee then took the following actions, voting unanimously on each:

- A. Removed two concepts – Online Dispute Resolution and Digital Evidence in the Court – Pilots – from consideration. The committee believed it was too early in the process for their submission.
- B. Combined three concepts – Judicial Virtual Customer Service Center, Trial Court Digital Services: Improving Public Access and Customer Service, and Branchwide Automated Email and Text Reminders – into a single proposal entitled: Digital Navigator Services.
- C. Determined the remaining four proposals would be of great benefit to the branch and ranked them in the following order:
 1. **Branchwide Security Operations Center and Identity Management Solution** for Trial Courts, Appellate Courts, Supreme Court, and Judicial Council
 2. **Judicial Branch Data Governance**
 3. **Digital Navigator Services** (consolidating Judicial Virtual Customer Service Center, Trial Court Digital Services: Improving Public Access and Customer Service, and Branchwide Automated Email and Text Reminders concepts)
 4. **California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) Modernization**
- D. Directed Judicial Council Information Technology staff to forward the completed BCP concepts to the Judicial Council Budget Services staff; and
- E. Directed staff to provide the JCTC ranking of the technology related BCP concepts to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) for their consideration. (The JBBC would be ranking all judicial branch BCPs at a future meeting.)

- F. Heather Pettit informed the committee that she is anticipating an additional Appellate IT Modernization BCP concept to be presented through the appellate advisory committee process; and will share an update at a future JCTC meeting.

Action: The committee received the report, agreed on the prioritization, and unanimously approved to submit the concepts to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee.

A D J O U R N M E N T

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.: 20-082

For business meeting on March 23-24, 2020

Title

Language Access Plan: Signage and
Technology Grant Program, FY 2019-20:
Requests and Proposed Allocations

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

March 24, 2020

Recommended by

Advisory Committee on Providing Access
and Fairness

Date of Report

January 17, 2020

Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair
Hon. Luis A. Lavin, Cochair
Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Chair, Language
Access Subcommittee

Contact

Douglas G. Denton, Principal Manager
415-865-7870, douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov

Information Technology Advisory
Committee

Danielle M. McCurry, Senior Analyst
415-865-7677, danielle.mccurry@jud.ca.gov

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair
Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice-Chair

Executive Summary

The 2018 Budget Act included \$2.55 million ongoing funding for language access signage and technology infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council. In September 2019, the Judicial Council approved a grant program to disburse this funding to the trial courts on an annual basis (up to \$1 million per year for language access signage grants, and up to \$1.35 million per year for language access technology grants). Courts were able to apply for both signage and technology needs. The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF) and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommend approving the proposed grant award recommendations and directing Language Access Services (LAS) staff of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts to draft and execute Intra-Branch Agreements (IBAs) with awarded courts for fiscal year 2019–20.

Recommendation

The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective March 24, 2020:

1. Approve the proposed *Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2019-20: Requests and Proposed Allocations Memorandum*
2. Direct LAS staff to work with Branch Accounting and Procurement to draft and execute Intra-Branch Agreements with each awarded court.

The proposed recommendations 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* (Language Access Plan, or LAP). The LAP provides recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access for all of California's approximately 7 million limited-English-proficient (LEP) residents and potential court users.

On September 24, 2019, the Judicial Council adopted a process for Language Access Signage and Technology Grants and directed LAS staff to solicit and review grant applications and develop recommendations for review and approval by PAF, ITAC, and the Judicial Council.¹

Analysis/Rationale

Effective March 2019, PAF's Language Access Subcommittee has worked to ensure the continuation of efforts to achieve and maintain access to justice for California's LEP court users. PAF and the subcommittee partner with ITAC, as appropriate, on technology issues.

To support judicial branch language access expansion efforts, the 2018 Budget Act 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 \$1,550,000 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, \$1,350,000 each year.

The goals of the Signage and Technology Grant program follow:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help LEP court

¹ See Judicial Council report for the September 24, 2019 business meeting at <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7675626&GUID=F2CCA714-356A-41B7-82B5-05C058CE0D6E>

users to 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 their language.
- Encourage courts to establish for grant funding 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.

Following approval by the council, the grant program was launched by LAS staff in October 2019, with applications due from interested courts by November 2019. The deadline to apply was extended to December 3, 2019 in order to give courts additional time to finalize project ideas and requests for funding.

Once applications were received, potential grantees were determined by Judicial Council staff, who worked closely with the Executive Office and followed the priorities established for the first year in the grant process overview approved by the council. Recommendations for grantees were formed by staff working with the Executive Office prior to advisory body approval.

A total of 29 trial courts requested funding and submitted project request forms (see Attachment A). Nineteen (19) of the 29 courts requested funding in both signage and technology categories. Five (5) courts requested funding in the signage category only, and five (5) courts requested funding in the technology category only. Of the 29 courts that applied for grant funding, there was representation from the northern, southern and central regions of the state (Attachment A).

Under the grant program, no more than \$100,000 is allocated to any one court for signage, and no more than \$135,000 is allocated to any one court for technology, unless total requests are lower than the annual allocation. This required minor reductions for signage, as noted below.

Signage requests under \$50,000: Each of these requests was fully funded, except for Del Norte County Superior Court. After the application deadline, the court subsequently lowered the amount of their request after receiving a quote from the vendor.

Signage requests \$50,000 and over: Courts were awarded up to 90% of the amounts for these requests to stay near the \$1,000,000 allocation for signage. Further reductions were made for courts where the 90% award exceeded the typical costs for consultation evaluations and/or static signage.

Technology requests: Technology projects were limited to no more than \$135,000 for each court under the grant guidelines. For technology, four (4) courts received the maximum amount allowed, and all other courts were able to be funded at the full amounts requested under \$135,000. The total allowable requests were under the \$1,350,000 allocation for technology,

which resulted in remaining funding of \$37,773.05. This funding will be set aside as a contingency fund to be used in case of need, for example, to help offset unforeseen cost increases for individual technology projects. LAS staff will work closely with the awarded courts to help track progress, identify any additional funding needs that can be covered by the contingency fund, and support completion of individual projects.

Staff's recommendation is to allocate a total of \$1,000,000.00 for signage grants and a total of \$1,312,266.95 for technology grants to the courts and hold the remaining \$37,773.05 as a contingency fund to help offset unforeseen cost increases for individual technology projects. The proposed allocation will provide grant funding to all 29 courts who applied in the grant program's first year. A table showing the detail by court is attached to this report.

Policy implications

Under the grant program, courts will be able to apply for funding for audio or video remote solutions, 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.² Doing so will help to ensure proper use of VRI solutions in the courts, because VRI is still an emerging technology and must be carefully implemented by individual courts to ensure due process for LEP court users.

Comments

The proposed allocations were reviewed and approved by PAF in January 2020, and by ITAC and the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) in February 2020 (TBD).

Alternatives considered

A variety of disbursement methodologies exist for ongoing funding; however, a determination was made to disburse the funding as a grant program to help the council identify and fund local needs, establish priorities, encourage courts to develop plans for ongoing funding, assist courts with uniform practices, and establish a mechanism to highlight progress and best practices each year.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

Funding will assist courts with language access signage and technology initiatives. Because funding is ongoing for the trial courts, individual courts will be encouraged to establish an ongoing plan for grant funding that coordinates with other facilities or technology initiatives

² See Judicial Council of Cal., *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (Mar. 15, 2019), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf.

planned or underway in their court to support language access. For Fiscal Year 2020-21, LAS staff will start the next grant application cycle this summer, to allow courts more time to apply.

All courts that submitted Signage and Technology Grant requests for FY 2019-20 will be notified as to whether they will receive funding. Intra-Branch Agreements (IBAs) for the signage and technology grant requests which are funded are expected to be delivered to the Court Executive Officers for signatory approval and returned to the Judicial Council prior to April 30, 2020. Funds must be encumbered by the court in the current fiscal year, and the court must inform the Judicial Council that funding for the project has been encumbered by June 30, 2020. If the reimbursement request and invoices to support the requested reimbursement amount are not received by December 31, 2020, grant funding for the cost of the project will be unavailable for reimbursement to the court.

LAS staff works regularly with court language access representatives to identify best practices and innovations taking place in language access, including in the areas of signage and technology. A report will be prepared at the completion of each grant year to identify successful signage and technology projects, which will allow the branch to share best practices and innovations with courts statewide and with the public.

Attachment

1. Attachment A: *Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2019-20: Requests and Proposed Allocations Memorandum*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
 Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date

January 13, 2020

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair
 Hon. Luis A. Lavin, Cochair
 Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Chair, Language
 Access Subcommittee
 Advisory Committee on Providing Access
 and Fairness

Deadline

N/A

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair
 Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice-Chair
 Information Technology Advisory Committee

Contact

Douglas G. Denton
 Principal Manager, Language Access
 Services
 415-865-7870
douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov

From

Douglas G. Denton
 Principal Manager, Language Access Services
 Center for Families, Children and the Courts

Danielle M. McCurry
 Senior Analyst, Language Access
 Services
 415-865-7677
danielle.mccurry@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY
 2019-20: Requests and Proposed Allocations

Background

The 2018 Budget Act included ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.35 million per year for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts. In September 2019, the Judicial Council approved a grant program to disburse this funding on an annual basis. Trial courts were able to apply for grant

funding for both signage and technology needs. On October 15, 2019, for Fiscal Year 2019-20, Language Access Services (LAS) staff released a grant program packet, which included a memorandum to courts on how to request funding and a project request form. The deadline for courts to submit completed project request forms for signage or technology grants was December 3, 2019.

Objectives of Grant Program

The goals of the Signage and Technology Grant Program are to:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help limited English proficient (LEP) court users to 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 their language.
- Encourage courts to establish for grant funding 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.

Application Timing and Process

- Applications were due close of business Tuesday, December 3, 2019.
- Recommendations on the allocation will be considered by the Judicial Council at its March 2020 meeting.
- All courts that submit Signage and Technology Grant requests will be notified as to whether they will receive funding.
- Intra-Branch Agreements for the signage and technology grant requests which are funded are expected to be delivered to the Court Executive Officers for signatory approval and returned to the Judicial Council prior to April 30, 2020.

Prioritization Categories

Signage Grants

Priority	Project
1	Plain language editing and professional translation of signage language that is unavailable in the <i>Glossary of Signage Terms and Icons</i> (at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lap-toolkit-Glossary_of_Signage_Terms_and_Icons.xlsx)
2	Development of multilingual wayfinding strategies, including electronic displays with automated maps, orientation guides with multilingual interface, and/or other types of multilingual electronic signage
3	Investment in multilingual non-electronic signage (paper, plaques, etc.)
4	Equipment and startup costs for an automated queue-management system that will contain multilingual information

Technology Grants

Priority	Project
1	Interpreter equipment, including upgraded headsets and other communication equipment for interpreters (for example, wireless transmitters and receivers, charging stations, and carrying cases)
2	Telephonic/video remote solutions equipment for LEP assistance both inside and outside the courtroom (for example, speakerphones and equipment for video remote appearances, video remote interpreting, counter assistance, or other self-help remote assistance, including tablets, computer equipment, and monitors) ¹
3	Scheduling software for language access services, multilingual avatars for LEP court users, or other software that allows for accurate multilingual communication between the LEP court user and the court
4	Multilingual videos for LEP court users, including translation costs
5	Audio-visual systems upgrades, broadband service, and/or other infrastructure enhancements (must directly relate to services provided to LEP court users)
6	Multilingual kiosks

¹ Courts that participate in the grant program and request funding for video remote interpreting equipment will be asked to agree to follow the council’s *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (Mar. 15, 2019), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf.

Number of Requests and Prioritization Metrics

A total of 29 trial courts requested funding and submitted project request forms (see attached). Nineteen (19) of the 29 courts requested funding in both signage and technology categories. Five (5) courts requested funding in the signage category only, and five (5) courts requested funding in the technology category only. A summary of the funding requests by prioritization category is outlined below, along with an indication on whether the project can be funded.

Signage Grants

Priority #1: Plain language editing and professional translation of signage language that is unavailable in the *Glossary of Signage Terms and Icons*: 9 requested projects (9 can be funded).

Priority #2: Development of multilingual wayfinding strategies: 14 requested projects (14 can be funded).

Priority #3: Investment in multilingual nonelectronic signage: 6 requested projects (6 can be funded).

Priority #4: Equipment and startup costs for an automated queue-management system that will contain multilingual information: 1 requested project (1 can be funded).

Technology Grants

Priority #1: Interpreter equipment: 18 requested projects (18 can be funded).

Priority #2: Telephonic/video remote solutions for inside and outside the courtroom: 8 requested projects (8 can be funded).

Priority #3: Scheduling or other software; multilingual avatars: 6 requested projects (6 can be funded).

Priority #4: Multilingual videos: 1 requested project (1 can be funded).

Priority #5: Audio-visual systems upgrades, broadband service, and/or other infrastructure enhancements: 1 requested project (1 can be funded).

Priority #6: Multilingual kiosks: 4 requested projects (4 can be funded).

Statewide Representation

Of the 29 courts that applied for grant funding, there was representation from the northern, southern and central regions of the state. Court sizes varied with six (6) small, nine (9) small/medium, eight (8) medium, and six (6) large courts applying for funding.

Court Size*	Number of Courts that Applied	Number that Applied for Signage	Number that Applied for Technology
Small	6	5	3
Small/Medium	9	7	9
Medium	8	6	6
Large	6	6	6
Total	29	24	24

*Court size based on small (2–5 judges), small–medium (6–15 judges), medium (16–47 judges), large (48 judges or more).

Supplemental Questions

Courts were also asked two supplemental questions on the project request form to determine interest in: (1) exploring voice-to-text translation software as part of a statewide pilot; and (2) becoming part of a video remote interpreting program as a provider and/or receiver court.

Thirty-one (31) courts responded to the supplemental questions. Seventeen (17) courts expressed interest in joining a statewide pilot program to explore voice-to-text translation software. Fifteen (15) courts expressed interest in potentially becoming part of a video remote interpreting program (1 as a provider court, 4 as receiver courts, and 10 as provider/receiver courts).

Staff Recommendation

Staff's recommendation is to allocate a total of \$1,000,000.00 for signage grants and a total of \$1,312,266.95 for technology grants to the courts. The proposed allocation will provide grant funding to all 29 courts who applied in the grant program's first year. A table showing the detail by court is attached to this memorandum.

Methodology for Reductions

Under the grant program, no more than \$100,000 is allocated to any one court for signage, and no more than \$135,000 is allocated to any one court for technology, unless total requests are lower than the annual allocation. This required minor reductions for signage as noted below.

Signage Requests:

Under \$50,000: Each of these requests were fully funded, except for Del Norte Superior Court. After the application deadline, the court subsequently lowered the amount of their request after receiving a quote from the vendor.

\$50,000 and up: Courts were awarded up to 90% of the amounts for these requests to stay near the \$1,000,000 allocation for signage. Further reductions were made for courts where the 90% award exceeded the typical costs for consultation evaluations and/or static signage.

Technology Requests:

Technology projects were limited to no more than \$135,000 for each court under the grant guidelines. For technology, four (4) courts received the maximum amount allowed, and all other courts were able to be funded at the full amounts requested under \$135,000. The total allowable requests were under the \$1,350,000 allocation for technology, which resulted in extra funding of \$37,773.05. This additional funding will be set aside as a contingency fund to be used in case of need, for example, to help offset unforeseen cost increases for individual technology projects. LAS staff will work closely with the awarded courts to help track progress, identify any additional funding needs that can be covered by the contingency fund, and support completion of individual projects.

A more formalized rubric was not required for the current grant applications but may be required in future years to score applications based on prioritization.

Next Steps

Following approval by the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, Information Technology Advisory Committee, and Judicial Council Technology Committee, LAS staff will present the proposed allocations to the Judicial Council for its review and approval in March 2020. Upon approval by the Judicial Council, LAS staff will notify courts of the approved allocations and will post the awards to the Language Access webpage. LAS staff will also work with Branch Accounting and Procurement staff to draft and execute Intra-Branch Agreements (IBAs) with each court for their projects.

Attachment:

1. FY 2019-20 Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Requests and Proposed Awards

cc:

Robert Oyung, Chief Operating Officer, Judicial Council
Heather Pettit, Director and Chief Information Officer, Information Technology
Charlene Depner, Director, Center for Families, Children and the Courts
Don Will, Assistant Director, Center for Families, Children and the Courts

SIGNAGE GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Signage Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
1	ALAMEDA	600 new or upgraded wayfinding and regulatory signs throughout all courthouses. <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 90,000.00
2	AMADOR	Consultant to develop LEP signage and wayfinding strategies.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
3	BUTTE	Update existing signage. Adding new signage in Spanish (static). <i>Note: Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 57,023.47
4	DEL NORTE	New static signage in Spanish and Hmong. <i>Note: Court reduced their request to \$2000 after initial submission based on quote from vendor.</i>	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
5	FRESNO	Digital wayfinding system throughout main courthouse location.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 44,622.44	\$ 44,622.44
6	IMPERIAL	Electronic wayfinding system in English and Spanish.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00
7	INYO	Informational and wayfinding signage (static).	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
8	KERN	Updating/replacing improperly translated signage.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 1,973.09	\$ 1,973.09
9	KINGS	#1: Enhancing existing static wayfinding signage in English and Spanish.	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 1,965.00	\$ 1,965.00
		#2: Install multilingual electronic wayfinding signage.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 29,965.00	\$ 29,965.00
		#3: Improve current customer queuing system with multilingual options.	Priority 4 (Software)	\$ 20,933.00	\$ 20,933.00
10	LASSEN	Multilingual court information and services signage for courthouse.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
11	LOS ANGELES	Consultant to evaluate wayfinding and signage system for six (6) of 38 facilities. <i>Note: Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 85,000.00
12	MADERA	Multilingual digital signage displays for wayfinding & general information.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 43,833.49	\$ 43,833.49
13	MERCED	#1: Consultant to evaluate signage needs for LEP users. <i>Note: Court requested \$100K for all 3 projects. Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 75,000.00
		#2: Replace/update notices with electronic signage in English and Spanish (includes electronic signs, monitors and software).	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)		
		#3 Add multilingual signage for Self-Help Center (static).	Priority 3 (Non-electronic Signage)		

SIGNAGE GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Signage Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
14	ORANGE	#1: Multilingual electronic wayfinding displays in five courthouses (20 displays). <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 84,200.00	\$ 75,780.00
		#2: Convert 546 temporary/paper signs into permanent signs (i.e. mounted plastic signs).	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 13,650.00	\$ 13,650.00
15	SACRAMENTO	#1: Provide signage to assist LEP court users in the process of securing an interpreter.	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 7,700.00	\$ 7,700.00
		#2: Update the posted Advisement of Rights signage.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 1,700.00	\$ 1,700.00
		#3: Update the content of the check in kiosk system for interpreter services.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 4,300.00
16	SAN FRANCISCO	Consultant to evaluate and develop signage strategy. Install digital, multilingual wayfinding kiosks. <i>Note: LAS staff has identified this as two projects; however court did not separate on request form. Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 85,000.00
17	SAN JOAQUIN	Extend digital courtroom calendar to include multilingual wayfinding and general court information displays. <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 63,730.00	\$ 57,357.00
18	SANTA BARBARA	Implement digital, multilingual wayfinding system. <i>Note: After the deadline, the CEO requested to amend to \$100K for signage, resulting in a 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 90,000.00
19	SANTA CLARA	#1: Multilingual digital signage for docket display and wayfinding solutions (Vendor: CourtWays). <i>Note: Court requested \$100K for both projects. 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 90,000.00
		#2: Multilingual rotating signage for digital displays and case docket listings that include hearing listings.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)		
20	SANTA CRUZ	Replacement of all legacy signage with modern multilingual signage. <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 57,023.47
21	SOLANO	Update multilingual static signage for non courtroom offices.	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 19,817.93	\$ 19,817.93
22	STANISLAUS	Replace approximately 76 existing signs. Currently available only in English.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 6,184.00	\$ 6,184.00
23	YUBA	Replace English-only signs with English & Spanish.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 4,072.11	\$ 4,072.11
TOTALS:				\$ 1,158,746.06	\$ 1,000,000.00
				\$ (158,746.06)	\$ -

TECHNOLOGY GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Technology Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
1	ALAMEDA	#1: Modify the physical court infrastructure to accommodate telephonic interpretation for all court locations.	Priority 5 (Infrastructure Enhancements)	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 6,500.00
		#2: Purchase of wireless equipment for simultaneous interpretation and extension equipment for telephonic interpretation services.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 6,200.00	\$ 6,200.00
		#3: Create a multilingual smartphone application to assist LEP Court Users with wayfinding.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 38,848.00	\$ 38,848.00
		#4: Integrate the interpreter management system (Shiftboard) and the traffic case management system (TCMS) to assign interpreters in traffic cases.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 29,000.00	\$ 29,000.00
2	AMADOR	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment for courtroom.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 4,094.00	\$ 4,094.00
		#2: Self-help multilingual kiosk for court lobby.	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
3	BUTTE	Add interactive screen for multi-use Language Access Wayfinding solutions.	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
4	COLUSA	Interpreter headsets and wireless assistive listening transmitters, receivers, lanyards, and carrying cases.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 2,300.00
5	IMPERIAL	Purchase four (4) sets of portable remote video conferencing equipment and two additional wireless transmitters and receiver sets.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 5,500.00
6	KERN	Purchase interpreter headsets for all courtrooms.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 30,704.24	\$ 30,704.24
7	KINGS	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment and upgrade headsets in all courtrooms.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 12,337.42	\$ 12,337.42
		#2: Multilingual Arraignment video translation.	Priority 4 (Multilingual Videos)	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00
8	LASSEN	Purchase interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
9	LOS ANGELES	Purchasing and implementing video remote interpreting technology for three (3) facilities.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
10	MADERA	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment (4 sets).	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 7,468.58	\$ 7,468.58
		#2: Tablets for internal communications between interpreters and staff (to include accessories).	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 8,935.12	\$ 8,935.12
11	MARIN	Replacement of interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 23,080.00	\$ 23,080.00

TECHNOLOGY GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Technology Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
12	MERCED	#1: Upgrade interpreter equipment/transmitters. <i>Note: Court requested \$135K for both projects.</i>	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
		#2: Upgrade phone tree to offer Spanish language options.	Priority 3 (Software)		
13	ORANGE	Purchase 100 tablets, 10 laptops and software to be used by interpreters for internal communications.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
14	PLACER	#1: Purchase new VRI Hardware.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 20,700.00	\$ 20,700.00
		#2: Convert existing kiosk to a multilingual kiosk.	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 15,640.00	\$ 15,640.00
15	SACRAMENTO	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 13,300.00	\$ 13,300.00
		#2: Purchase automated scheduling software for language access services.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
16	SAN FRANCISCO	#1: Replace interpreter equipment. 63 devices.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 70,000.00	\$ 70,000.00
		#2: Purchase five (5) tablets for real-time tablet language assistance at the public counters. <i>Note: Amount requested includes Language Line Interpreter On Wheels and tablets. Also includes \$30k to modify the public counters to accommodate the tablets.</i>	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
17	SAN MATEO	#1: Replace outdated interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 56,250.00	\$ 56,250.00
		#2: Purchase interpreter scheduling and invoicing solution.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
18	SANTA BARBARA	The signage project is delivered on a technological platform. <i>Note: Court requested over the maximum. Proposed award is maximum award available through the grant.</i>	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 175,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
19	SANTA CLARA	#1: Purchase upgraded interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 20,679.48	\$ 20,679.48
		#2: Digital signage/wayfinding kiosk. Software development, hardware, displays (with project management and installation)	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 97,097.50	\$ 97,097.50
20	SANTA CRUZ	Replace interpreter equipment for all court locations.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 45,746.00	\$ 45,746.00

TECHNOLOGY GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Technology Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
21	SHASTA	#1: Purchase updated interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 18,469.11	\$ 18,469.11
		#2: Purchase tablets for different points of contact outside of the courtroom to provide assistance (e.g. communicate and inform LEPs of services available).	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 15,787.50	\$ 15,787.50
22	SOLANO	Purchase interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
23	STANISLAUS	#1: Purchase additional interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 3,369.00	\$ 3,369.00
		#2: Purchase seven (7) tablets and tablet mounts for online translation services.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 3,126.00	\$ 3,126.00
24	TULARE	Upgrade interpreter equipment to Infrared Assistive Listening System.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 53,635.00	\$ 53,635.00
TOTALS:				\$ 1,352,266.95	\$ 1,312,266.95

\$ (2,266.95)	\$ 37,733.05
----------------------	---------------------

DRAFT

FY 2019/2020 SIGNAGE TECHNOLOGY GRANT
TOTAL AWARDS BY COURT

COUNTY	SIGNAGE AWARD	TECHNOLOGY AWARD	Total Award	Total Request
1. ALAMEDA	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 80,548.00	\$ 170,548.00	\$ 180,548.00
2. AMADOR	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 29,094.00	\$ 49,094.00	\$ 49,094.00
3. BUTTE	\$ 57,023.47	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 67,023.47	\$ 110,000.00
4. COLUSA	N/A	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 2,300.00
5. DEL NORTE	\$ 2,000.00	N/A	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
6. FRESNO	\$ 44,622.44	N/A	\$ 44,622.44	\$ 44,622.44
7. IMPERIAL	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 9,600.00	\$ 9,600.00
8. INYO	\$ 10,000.00	N/A	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
9. KERN	\$ 1,973.09	\$ 30,704.24	\$ 32,677.33	\$ 32,677.33
10. KINGS	\$ 52,863.00	\$ 14,837.42	\$ 67,700.42	\$ 67,700.42
11. LASSEN	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 7,000.00
12. LOS ANGELES	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 220,000.00	\$ 235,000.00
13. MADERA	\$ 43,833.49	\$ 16,403.70	\$ 60,237.19	\$ 60,237.19
14. MARIN	N/A	\$ 23,080.00	\$ 23,080.00	\$ 23,080.00
15. MERCED	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 210,000.00	\$ 235,000.00
16. ORANGE	\$ 89,430.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 224,430.00	\$ 232,850.00
17. PLACER	N/A	\$ 36,340.00	\$ 36,340.00	\$ 36,340.00
18. SACRAMENTO	\$ 13,700.00	\$ 43,300.00	\$ 57,000.00	\$ 57,000.00
19. SAN FRANCISCO	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 205,000.00	\$ 220,000.00
20. SAN JOAQUIN	\$ 57,357.00	N/A	\$ 57,357.00	\$ 63,730.00
21. SAN MATEO	N/A	\$ 81,250.00	\$ 81,250.00	\$ 81,250.00
22. SANTA BARBARA	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 225,000.00	\$ 275,000.00
23. SANTA CLARA	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 117,776.98	\$ 207,776.98	\$ 217,776.98
24. SANTA CRUZ	\$ 57,023.47	\$ 45,746.00	\$ 102,769.47	\$ 110,746.00
25. SHASTA	N/A	\$ 34,256.61	\$ 34,256.61	\$ 34,256.61
26. SOLANO	\$ 19,817.93	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 34,817.93	\$ 34,817.93
27. STANISLAUS	\$ 6,184.00	\$ 6,495.00	\$ 12,679.00	\$ 12,679.00
28. TULARE	N/A	\$ 53,635.00	\$ 53,635.00	\$ 53,635.00
29. YUBA	\$ 4,072.11	N/A	\$ 4,072.11	\$ 4,072.11
	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,312,266.95	\$ 2,312,266.95	\$ 2,511,013.01

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

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

INVITATION TO COMMENT

[ITC prefix as assigned]-__

Title

Electronic Filing and Service: Electronic Filer May Proceed with Electronic Filing Even if the Electronic Filer Does Not Consent to Electronic Service

Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes

Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.255

Proposed by

Information Technology Advisory Committee
Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Action Requested

Review and submit comments by June 9, 2020

Proposed Effective Date

January 1, 2021

Contact

Andrea L. Jaramillo, 916-263-0991
andrea.jaramillo@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary and Origin

The Information Technology Advisory Committee recommends the Judicial Council amend rule 2.255 of the California Rules of Court. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to require an electronic filing service provider to allow an electronic filer to proceed with an electronic filing even if the electronic filer does not consent to receive electronic service. The proposal originated with comments received from the Superior Court of Orange County and the Joint Rules Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees.

Background

Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 (section 1010.6) provides statutory authority for electronic filing and service. Courts may (1) permit electronic service by local rule, or (2) require electronic service by local rule or court order. (§ 1010.6(b)-(d).)

In 2017, the Legislature amended section 1010.6 to state that for cases filed on or after January 1, 2019, electronic service was “not authorized unless a party or other person has expressly consented to receive electronic service in that specific action” unless electronic service was required by local rule or court order. Rule 2.251(b) of the California Rules of Court¹ had previously allowed the act of electronic filing alone to be evidence of consent to receive

¹ All further references to rules are to the California Rules of Court.

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

electronic service for represented persons, but the amendments to section 1010.6 eliminated this option. Section 1010.6 does, however, allow a person to provide express consent electronically by “manifesting affirmative consent through electronic means with the court or the court’s electronic filing service provider, and concurrently providing the party’s electronic address with that consent for the purpose of receiving electronic service.” (§ 1010.6(a)(2)(A)(ii).)

The Legislature did not provide for what it meant to “manifest affirmative consent through electronic means.” To fill this gap, the Judicial Council amended rule 2.251(b) to allow an electronic filer to consent by either filing a form or agreeing to a term with an electronic filing service provider (EFSP) that “clearly states that agreement constitutes consent” to receive electronic service. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.251(b)(1)(B)(i).) The rules allow, but do not require, an EFSP to include such a term.

The Proposal

The proposed rule would require an EFSP that includes a term for the electronic filer’s consent to electronic service to allow an electronic filer to proceed with an electronic filing even if the electronic filer does not agree to that term. For example, if an EFSP had a checkbox that an electronic filer could click to agree to electronic service, the proposed rule would require the EFSP to allow the electronic filer to proceed with the electronic filing even if the electronic filer did not click on the checkbox. The proposal may improve access to electronic filing by ensuring that filers are able to file electronically even if they choose not to receive electronic service.

The proposed rule would apply only to electronic service by express consent. Accordingly, it would not apply to electronic service *required* by local rule or court order.

Alternatives Considered

The committee considered the alternative of making no change, but found the proposal preferable as it may reduce barriers to electronic filing by ensuring electronic filers are able to opt-out of electronic service when electronic service is not otherwise required by the court.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

It is not expected that the proposal will have significant impact on the courts different from any impacts that may exist as a result of the statutory requirement for persons to provide express consent to electronic service. It is expected that the proposal will ensure litigants always have the option to electronically file at courts where electronic filing is permitted. EFSPs will be impacted, but that impact may be minimal because they are not required to include a term allowing electronic filers to consent to electronic service through the EFSP.

Request for Specific Comments

This box is mandatory. In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committee is interested in comments on the following:

- Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?
- Should electronic filers be able to opt out of electronic service? Why or why not?
- For EFSPs, is the proposal feasible?

The advisory committee also seeks comments from *courts* on the following cost and implementation matters:

- Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify.
- Would there be implementation requirements for courts? If so, what would they be— for example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), or modifying case management systems?

Attachments and Links

1. Cal. Rules of Court, proposed amendment to rule 2.255, at page 4.
2. Link A: Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.251,
https://www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=two&linkid=rule2_251.
3. Link B: Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.255,
https://www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=two&linkid=rule2_255.

Rule 2.255 of the California Rules of Court would be amended, effective January 1, 2020, to read:

1 **Rule 2.255. Contracts with and responsibilities of electronic filing service providers**
2 **and electronic filing managers**

3
4 **(a)-(f) * * ***

5
6 **(g) Electronic filer not required to consent to electronic service**

7
8 (1) An electronic filing service provider must allow an electronic filer to proceed
9 with an electronic filing even if the electronic filer does not consent to
10 receive electronic service.

11
12 (2) This provision applies only to electronic service by express consent under
13 rule 2.251(b).
14
15



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date

January 27, 2020

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair
Hon. C. Todd Bottke, Vice-Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee

Deadline

N/A

From

Kathleen Fink, Manager,
Judicial Council Information Technology

Contact

Kathleen Fink, Manager
415-865-4094
kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Civil Case Management System (V3)
Replacement Projects: January 2, 2020 –
January 27, 2020

Project: Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

Status: The Monthly Project Status meeting was held on January 27, 2020.

The next Monthly Project Status meeting is scheduled for February 24, 2020.

Judicial Council Information Technology is working with Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura to coordinate “lights on” planning and court funding for V3 support after June 2020.

Intra Branch Agreements (IBAs):

The final disbursement for Sacramento’s 2016-17 IBA is in progress.

Amendments are in progress to the FY 2017-18 IBAs for Orange, Sacramento, and San Diego Superior Courts to enable them to expend the funds through June 2021.

Ventura Superior Court (Journal Technologies - eCourt):

Civil requirements-gathering and documentation sessions are continuing, with a planned completion in March 2020. The court is working closely with the vendor, particularly on Appeals and Probate requirements, to ensure their feasibility.

The current target for go live for Civil, Probate, and Appeals is June 2021, however, the court is engaging in contingency planning should the vendor request further delays.

Journal Technologies has started development on completed Civil requirements.

San Diego Superior Court (Tyler Odyssey):

Small Claims Requirements Phase 100% complete. Design Phase 95% complete. Build 10% complete.

Probate and Civil Requirements 30% and 20% complete, respectively.

For areas where development is not required, good progress has been made, with 90% of known code table configurations complete. 100% of small claims and appeals forms are built, as well as 80% of Probate forms and 70% of Civil forms.

San Diego is also implementing a solution to improve the resiliency and disaster recovery of the application. The solution is from the vendor Zerto.

The Tyler Executive team has notified the court that they will be requesting an extension to the current project plan. Small Claims go live is moved from September 2020 to May 2021, and Probate and Civil to May 2022.

Sacramento Superior Court (Thomson Reuters C-Track):

Completed consolidation and review of MSA requirements and translating of requirements into corresponding business functions in each division. The court is working with Thomson Reuters to confirm functionality that is in-scope vs. out of scope for Civil and Probate.

The court's Operations and IT teams participated in design sessions conducted by the vendor. The sessions provided further clarification on functionality gaps that were identified during the discovery phase.

Worked with vendor to finalize the Risk Management, Change Management, and Support Plans. The plans have been approved by the court.

The court is reviewing and revising the project schedule with Thomson Reuters due to vendor delays. Current projections are for first quarter 2022, however, delays are expected.

Orange Superior Court (Update CMS V3 for supportability and reliability):

Orange is on schedule in deploying their builds of CMS V3.

User acceptance testing as started for the modernized Spring framework and is ahead of schedule. The project checkpoint with Operations was positive. Go live is planned for May 2020.

The court is beginning planning to remove SiteMinder security software and integrate directly with Microsoft Azure Active Directory for consistency with their other applications. Orange is on track to complete their conversion by June 2020.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date

February 3, 2020

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair
Hon. C. Todd Bottke, Vice-Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee

Deadline

N/A

From

David Koon, Manager,
Judicial Council Information Technology

Contact

David Koon, Manager
415-865-4618
david.koon@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement
Projects: Status January 1 – January 31, 2020

As requested, this communication provides a written update regarding the progress of the nine courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system which collectively received \$4.1 million in funding for FY 17/18 and \$896,000 in FY 18/19 as a result of submitting a BCP to replace the SJE case management system with a modern CMS platform.

Project: Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement project for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

Status: Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts met on January 22, 2020 for their monthly status meeting. At these meetings, the SJE courts review the status of the deployments of the new case management system. Currently, there are four courts (Humboldt, Madera, Plumas and Sierra) which have gone live on their new case management system. The focus of the project activity is preparing for the next wave of court deployments which will begin in the first quarter of 2020.

February 3, 2020

Page 2

Next Steps: Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts will continue to meet monthly to review progress and upcoming milestones.