



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)

[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 9, 2022

12:00 – 1:00 PM

In-person and Videoconference

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair; Hon. Kevin C. Brazile; Mr. David Fu; Ms. Rachel W. Hill; Mr. Shawn Landry; and Hon. Glenn Mondo

---

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. C. Todd Bottke; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; and Hon. Carol Corrigan

---

**Liaison Members Present:** Hon. Sheila Hanson

**Others Present:** Hon. Julie R. Culver; Mr. Juan Ambriz; Mr. Stephen Tow; 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 advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the December 13, 2021, Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

There were no public comments for this meeting.

---

### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–6)

---

#### Item 1

##### Chair Report

**Update:** Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, welcomed members to the first hybrid meeting with members participating both in-person and remotely. The Strategic Plan workstream is currently reviewing the plan for potential revisions and new technology needs. There will be a report on the Court Technology Modernization Funding program at the March Judicial Council meeting.

**Item 2**

**Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

**Update:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair of the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC), provided an update of ITAC's February 25 meeting. ITAC approved an amendment to the 2022 Annual Agenda that would implement a recommendation from the Branchwide Information Security workstream by establishing a separate information security governance body. ITAC members suggested the best option would be to have a joint standing subcommittee partnering with the Court Executive Advisory Committee (CEAC). An informal discussion with the CEAC Chair took place and the joint standing subcommittee is proposed for consideration at CEAC's next business meeting. Once both committees agree on the details, ITAC will ask the Technology Committee to approve the amended 2022 Annual Agenda. ITAC also approved the three Rules & Policy Subcommittee items on the agenda for this meeting which will be presented by Hon. Julie R. Culver, Chair of the Rules & Policy Subcommittee.

**Item 3**

**Jury Management System Grant Program for the Fiscal Year 2021-2022 (Action Required)**

**Update:** Mr. Juan Ambriz, Senior Business Systems Analyst in the Judicial Council Information Technology office, presented the proposed allocations for the FY 2021-22 jury grant requests and proposed grants. Detailed information is in the meeting materials (pages 6-10).

**Action:** Members approved the allocations as set forth in the report. Mr. Landry abstained as his court is participating in the grant program.

**Item 4**

**Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) Rules & Policy Subcommittee: Remove Requirement to Submit E-Filing Program Reports**

**Update:** Hon. Julie R. Culver, Chair, ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee, explained the proposal and that the Judicial Council currently uses other ways of collecting e-filing information from the trial courts. Removing the requirement in rule 2.253 will ease the burden on the courts.

**Action:** Members approved to circulate the proposed amendment for public comment.

**Item 5**

**ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee: Remote Access to Electronic Records**

**Update:** Hon. Julie R. Culver, Chair, ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee, presented amendments to rules 2.515, 2.521, and 2.523 to authorize remote access for administrators operating programs for appellate appointed counsel. The proposal would also amend rule 2.540 to

authorize remote access by the Courts of Appeal and the Habeas Corpus Resource Center.

**Action:** Members approved the proposed amendments to be circulated for public comment with additional questions being added to the Invitation to Comment.

#### Item 6

#### **ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee: Remote Access to Electronic Records by Private Criminal Defense Attorneys**

**Update:** Hon. Julie R. Culver, Chair, ITAC Rules & Policy Subcommittee, presented the proposed amendment of rule 2.519. The original request was to amend rule 2.540; however, the subcommittee suggests that rule 2.519 is more appropriate. They considered three alternatives, but felt the amendments fit the scope of request for parity between private criminal defense attorneys and public agency attorneys.

**Action:** Members approved the proposed amendment for public comment with additional questions regarding security standards to mitigate data mining of restricted records being added. ITAC will review the security issues and offer solutions to the Technology Committee at a future meeting. Ms. Rachel Hill abstained as a practicing criminal attorney.

---

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

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS  
APRIL 4, 2022

**Email Proposal**

The Judicial Council Technology Committee was asked to consider approving the five technology-related 2023-24 Budget Change Concepts.

Due to the limited availability of Technology Committee members and the body's other priorities, the Technology Committee 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 April 4, 2022, a notice was posted advising that the Technology Committee was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(B).

**Public Comment**

Because the email recommendation concerned a subject that otherwise must be discussed in an open meeting, the Technology Committee invited public comment on the proposed allocations under rule 10.75(o)(2). The public comment period began at 2 p.m. April 4, 2022, and ended at 9:00 a.m. April 6, 2022. No public comments were received.

**Action Taken**

After the public comment period ended, Technology Committee members were asked to submit their votes on the recommended Budget Change Concepts by 12:00 p.m. on April 7, 2022. Six members voted to recommend all of the proposals. One member voted to approve 4 proposals and voted no on one. Two members abstained from voting. The email recommendation was approved.

# Request: Placer Superior Court

- Request Technology Committee approve a new project 8 so court may spend balance of funding (\$22,000) of the already allocated \$109,535 in modernization funding.
- New Project 8: SIEM / SORE application (SPLUNK) – a tool that will assist in monitoring and responding to network threats and unusual activities. The Courts network has thousands of events and log file generated daily. This tool helps the trained IT Staff filter and review these event and log files in a way that allows an improved response time.