



Judicial Council of California  
Technology Committee

[courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

January 12, 2026

12 p.m.

Videoconference

---

**Advisory Body** Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Chair; Mr. David Slayton, Vice-Chair;  
**Members Present:** Mr. Charles Johnson; Hon. Ricardo R. Ocampo; Mr. Craig Peters;  
Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Liaison, Information Technology Advisory Committee

**Advisory Body** Ms. Kate Bieker; Hon. Carol Corrigan; Hon. Joan K. Irion; Hon. Jeffrey C.  
**Members Absent:** Kauffman

**Others Present:** Mr. John Yee and Judicial Council staff

---

#### OPEN MEETING

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m. and took roll call.

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the December 22, 2025, Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

---

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

---

##### Item 1

##### Chair Report (No Action – Information Only)

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

##### Item 2

##### Information Technology Advisory Committee: Update and Report (No Action – Information Only)

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

##### Item 3

##### Budget Change Proposal Concepts submitted by Judicial Council Information Technology for Fiscal Year (FY) 2027–28 (Action Required)

Mr. John Yee, Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council, presented technology-related Budget Change Proposal concepts from Judicial Council Information Technology for FY 2027–28.

**Action:** The committee reviewed and discussed the technology-related Budget Change Proposal concepts from Judicial Council Information Technology for FY 2027–28.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved by the advisory body on [enter date].

# Judicial Branch

## 2027–28 Budget Change Proposal Concept

(4 Page Maximum Length)

<b>Requesting Entity</b>	Judicial Council Technology Committee
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Trial Courts Technology Ongoing Support
<b>Proposal Summary</b> The council is requesting \$42.5 million in ongoing general funds starting from FY2027-28. The purpose of the request is to provide augmented funding to provide financial relief to the increased cost of technology at the trial courts.	
Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Proposed fund source: General Funds	

### Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) \*

Fiscal Year	2027–28 (BY)	2028–29 (BY+1)	2029–30 (BY+2)	2030–31 (BY+3)	2031–32 (BY+4)
<b>Positions</b>					
<b>Personal Services</b>					
<b>Operating Expenses &amp; Equipment</b>					
<b>Local Assistance</b>	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000
<b>Total</b>	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000
One-time					
Ongoing	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000

\*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

### **Problem or Issue**

California's trial courts have become more and more reliant on technology to deliver access to justice. Through the use of modern case management systems, electronic filing, public document access portals, and many more, litigants and the public rely on the courts' technology solutions to interact with the courts. However, technology operational costs have risen dramatically in the last five years. During and post-pandemic, the cost of equipment, software licenses, cloud storage and services, and information security services have dramatically increased. Supply chain challenges and vendors moving to subscription-based pricing models have contributed to the elevated cost in technology. Existing court funds are insufficient to ensure the upkeep of the equipment, software, and services needed to support the court operations.

### **Background/History of Problem**

Historically, the trial courts developed technology solutions on a mainframe that had limited data stored in the system, and records were maintained in paper. Litigants, the public, judicial officers, and staff were forced to rely upon paper records. Data analysis to improve court operations was limited due to limits in stored data. To improve court operations and ensure better public access, trial courts have migrated to modern case management systems that store tremendous amounts of case data (including historical data), documents are now primarily digitized for better access, and public portals have been created to allow remote electronic filing and access to case information. More recently, to ensure that systems are stable and readily available, many technology systems have been transitioned to cloud services. While all of these changes have resulted in improved services to the public and more efficient use by judicial officers and staff, each of these migrations has resulted in increased costs that have not been covered by other judicial branch funding. The need to continue providing these services, and advancing further, has placed significant budgetary burdens on trial court budgets.

### **Impact of Denial of Proposal**

If this funding is denied, the trial courts may have to reduce or defer critical technology services, reducing public trust and confidence and limiting access to justice in the trial courts. Courts will need to extend their software and equipment service life which may create security risk and may impact court operations due to equipment failure.

---

### **Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal**

Tracking  
Number:

Ensures court equipment and software are up to date and secure.

#### **Required Review/Approval**

Choose from drop down, advisory body(ies) who should review this proposal

Choose from drop down, advisory body(ies) who should review this proposal

Choose from drop down, advisory body(ies) who should review this proposal.

#### **Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations**

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion

Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch

Please use this space to add any additional considerations.

#### **Approval**

*I certify that I have reviewed this concept, and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.*

**Director Signature:** Type your name to enter signature.

**Contact Name:** Name of person who will respond to questions on concept information.

# Judicial Branch

## 2027–28 Budget Change Proposal Concept

(4 Page Maximum Length)

<b>Requesting Entity</b>	Judicial Council Technology Committee
--------------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Proposal Title</b>	Appellate Court Technology Modernization and Ongoing Cost Adjustment
-----------------------	--

### Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council requests 6 new ongoing positions at \$1.62 million in new ongoing general funds, \$2.55 million in ongoing general funds beginning in FY 2027–28 (\$12.75 million over the next five years), and \$1.5 million in one-time general funds beginning in FY 2027-28, (\$300,000 annually for the next five years).

This funding will provide the application maintenance, enhancement and support of the Appellate Courts Case Management System (ACCMS). In addition, the funding will cover the increased operational, software and hosting cost of the ACCMS application. Funding for local assistance is needed for the Courts of Appeals to ensure the courts' equipment and software are maintained, secured, and kept up to date. By providing these positions and funding, the Judicial Council will be able to ensure the ACCMS application remains secure, reliable, and capable of meeting the evolving needs of California's Courts of Appeal.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Proposed fund source: General Fund

### Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) \*

Fiscal Year	2027–28 (BY)	2028–29 (BY+1)	2029–30 (BY+2)	2030–31 (BY+3)	2031–32 (BY+4)
<b>Positions</b>	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Personal Services</b>	1,620,000	1,620,000	1,620,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
<b>Operating Expenses &amp; Equipment</b>	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
<b>Local Assistance</b>	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,850,000</b>	<b>2,850,000</b>	<b>2,850,000</b>	<b>2,850,000</b>	<b>2,850,000</b>
One-time	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Ongoing	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000

\*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

### **Problem or Issue**

The funding request addresses deficiencies in providing support for the Appellate Case Management System (ACCMS) and the Courts of Appeals. For instance, due to current funding levels, there is a backlog in application development needs that cannot be processed efficiently. Current funding levels do not provide the staffing and resources needed to modernize or enhance the application to meet the needs of the appellate courts. Existing funding only allows for maintenance of the application.

Modernization of the ACCMS is needed to ensure the application is viable for the future to support the courts. Aging technology and a shortage of skilled personnel are leading to increased downtime and higher maintenance costs, creating significant risks and uncertainty. Modernizing a sustainable platform with adequate support skills is essential. Modernizing the ACCMS will enhance system reliability, reduce maintenance costs, and improve user experience for court staff.

Local assistance funding for the Courts of Appeals is needed to ensure the courts' local equipment and software are kept up to date and secure. The cost of essential equipment to keep the Courts of Appeal operational has greatly increased over the last five years. This includes updated network systems, secure communication tools, and updated operational software. Without this crucial funding, the efficiency and security of our judicial system may be compromised, affecting the delivery of justice.

### **Background/History of Problem**

The Appellate Courts Case Management Systems (ACCMS) was developed almost 15 years ago. The application has been updated through the years to meet the legislative changes and requirements of the courts. However, operational costs have steadily increased, and the current allocation no longer adequately covers these expenses. Appellate court operations prioritize the utilization of technology to secure and modernize applications; ensure fair and equitable access to justice; and align with branchwide strategic goals of fairness, equity, and inclusion. Appellate court operations currently require a baseline budget of \$2 million to deliver the highest quality of justice and service to the public; however, budget allocations have not kept pace with operational demands.

In the last five years, network and security equipment costs have drastically increased due to the demand to support remote and hybrid work environments during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. This has made it challenging to ensure that court equipment is secure and up to date.

The existing funds are insufficient to modernize and maintain critical equipment essential to the operations of the Courts of Appeals. In 2007, the Judicial Council requested \$1.5 million in annual funding, but only \$660,000 was approved. This amount supported the network refresh for the California Supreme Court and the Appellate courts; however, current funding levels are inadequate for proper upkeep and maintenance of equipment necessary for the security of the Courts of Appeals' operations.

### **Impact of Denial of Proposal**

Without additional funding to the personnel and ongoing support costs, the ACCMS application will remain in maintenance support status. This means it will only receive essential updates and fixes. As a result, any modernization and enhancement to meet the needs of the courts will be limited. A delay in funding this request will increase the technical debt and risk because outdated technology requires more resources to maintain and is more vulnerable to security threats. As the technology platform ages, the cost of maintaining it will increase. Additionally, the security of the platform will be at higher risk and finding skilled personnel to support it will become more difficult and costly.

Without the additional local assistance funding, the appellate courts face difficulties in keeping their equipment and software up to date and secure. Equipment may need to be extended for extra service years, raising the risk of security vulnerabilities and equipment failure -- causing operational disruption.

### **Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal**

Modernization of the ACCMS Application to ensure the application is flexible and supportable to meet the needs of the Courts of Appeals.

Local assistance funding to ensure the courts' equipment are secure and kept up to date to support the operational needs of the courts.

Tracking  
Number:

---

### Required Review/Approval

Information Technology Advisory Committee  
Court Executives Advisory Committee  
Appellate Advisory Committee

### Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion  
Goal III: Modernization and Management of Administration  
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public

Please use this space to add any additional considerations.

### Approval

*I certify that I have reviewed this concept, and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.*

**Director Signature:** Type your name to enter signature.

**Contact Name:** Name of person who will respond to questions on concept information.



## Judicial Council of California

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

**Submitted by**

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

**Report Type**

Information

**Date of Report**

January 12, 2026

**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](leginfo.legislature.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.