



JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 9, 2026

12:25 p.m.

Videoconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Chair; Mr. David Slayton, Vice-Chair; Hon. Carol Corrigan; Hon. Joan K. Irion; Mr. Charles Johnson; Hon. Jeffrey C. Kauffman; Hon. Ricardo R. Ocampo; Mr. Craig Peters

Advisory Body Members Absent: Ms. Kate Bieker

Others Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Liaison, Information Technology Advisory Committee; Mr. John Yee; Judicial Council staff

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the January 12, 2026, 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

Technology-Related Budget Change Proposal concepts for Fiscal Year (FY) 2027-28 (Action Required)

Mr. John Yee, Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council, presented non-information security technology-related Budget Change Proposal concepts from Judicial Council Information Technology.

Action: The committee reviewed and discussed the technology-related Budget Change Proposal concepts from Judicial Council Information Technology for FY 2027-28 and approved recommending them for submission to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee for consideration.

Item 3

Judicial Branch Technology: Assembly Bill 716 (AB 716) Implementation Outcomes on Remote Public Access (Action Required)

Mr. Andraé Randolph, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council, presented a draft report on the implementation outcomes of AB 716, which requires courts to provide public audio access to courtroom proceedings when courthouses are physically closed.

Action: The committee reviewed the report and approved recommending it for submission to the Judicial Council.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved by the advisory body on [enter date].



JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 19, 2026

10:00 a.m.

Videoconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Chair; Mr. David Slayton, Vice-Chair; Ms. Kate Bieker; Hon. Joan K. Irion; Mr. Charles Johnson; Hon. Jeffrey C. Kauffman; Hon. Ricardo R. Ocampo; Mr. Craig Peters

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Carol Corrigan

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 10:00 a.m. and took roll call.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM

Item 1

IT Modernization Program: Fiscal Year (FY) 2025–26 Redistribution of Branchwide Funding (Action Required)

Mr. John Yee, Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council, presented a proposal to redistribute IT Modernization Branchwide Funding from FY 2025–26.

Action: The committee discussed the proposal and approved redistributing any returned FY 2025–26 IT Modernization Branchwide Funding—estimated at \$647,753 and not to exceed \$2 million—toward the Web Content Accessibility Compliance Program.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved by the advisory body on [enter date].

Judicial Branch 2027–28 Budget Change Concept

Requesting Entity	Data Analytics Advisory Committee
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Proposal Title	Judicial Branch Data Analytics Modernization
-----------------------	--

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council of California requests 9 positions and \$9.8 million General Fund in fiscal year (FY) 2027–28; an additional 9 positions and \$12.5 million General Fund in FY 2028–29; an additional 7 positions for an ongoing total of 25 positions and \$13.9 million General Fund in FY 2029–30, \$11.8 million General Fund in FY 2030–31 and \$6.6 million ongoing to address the technology and staffing needs to improve and modernize branch data collection to enhance data reporting, improve accountability and transparency, and better serve the public.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes No

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes No

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes No

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)
Positions	9.0	18.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Personal Services	\$964,000	\$3,698,000	\$5,083,000	\$5,083,000	\$5,083,000
Operating Expenses & Equipment	8,795,000	8,795,000	8,795,000	6,675,000	1,555,000
Local Assistance					
Total	\$9,759,000	\$12,493,000	\$13,878,000	\$11,758,000	\$6,638,000
One-time	7,240,000	7,240,000	7,240,000	5,120,000	0
Ongoing	2,519,000	5,253,000	6,638,000	6,638,000	6,638,000

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

Problem or Issue

The Judicial Council aims to modernize its outdated analytics technology to move beyond basic reporting and toward actionable insights. This modernization will enable more frequent and reliable data validation, ensuring decision-makers have access to timely and accurate information. It will also equip courts with analytic tools that unlock meaningful insights from case management system data to support informed business and operational decisions. In addition, improved analytics will strengthen the branch’s ability to respond to information requests about programs and outcomes, and to provide high-quality data and analysis in support of branch budget proposals and the evaluation of proposed legislation.

The proposal will reduce data management costs and improve efficiency by consolidating multiple data reporting functions onto a single, modern technology platform and replacing aging technical infrastructure. For example, in 2024, the Judicial Council managed over 170 distinct data collections to meet required statewide reporting obligations. Many of these collections rely on surveys or other manual data entry methods, which are time-intensive and prone to data quality and completeness issues. Modern data solutions can automate or streamline portions of these processes, resulting in greater efficiency, improved accuracy, and more reliable data.

In addition, the proposal addresses critical risks associated with aging technical infrastructure. The Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS), a statewide repository for court workload data, is currently housed on unsupported and obsolete technology and must be replaced to ensure system reliability, security, and continuity of operations. The FTE requested in this proposal will be used to manage data reporting, data validation, and analytics across multiple Judicial Council teams that support data reporting at the Council. The staff request is staggered over multiple years as the project transitions from the “build” phase, during which contracted staff will supply the staffing needs doing specialized work to design and build the platform, to the “maintenance and support” phase. Transitioning to modern systems will also reduce the data reporting burden on courts, freeing court staff to focus more of their time on core operational responsibilities.

Improved data management and access directly support the courts’ ability to serve the public more effectively and equitably. Analytics enable courts to identify bottlenecks in court processes, allocate resources to meet workload demands, and gather and analyze public feedback. Together, these capabilities enhance transparency, responsiveness, and the branch’s ability to make data-informed decisions that improve outcomes for the communities it serves.

Background/History of Problem

Better data-driven decision-making across California’s courts enables long-term planning, supports sound policymaking, and improves the courts’ ability to serve the public effectively. These benefits were especially evident during the COVID-19 pandemic, when access to timely and reliable data was critical to helping the Legislature understand the pandemic’s impact on court operations and access to justice.

However, many judicial branch data systems rely on antiquated technologies originally designed in the 1990s. These systems are increasingly costly to maintain, as programmers with the specialized skills

needed to support them are difficult to find. Moreover, legacy technologies cannot meet modern security standards or effectively interface with contemporary systems, creating operational risk and limiting the branch's ability to modernize.

Prior legislative investments in modern case management systems for trial courts, as well as pilot programs focused on data analytics, have demonstrated that new approaches to data management can significantly improve statewide data reporting. While case management systems capture critical operational data, they are not designed to perform advanced analytics. When paired with modern data reporting and analytic tools, however, these systems can generate insights into court workflows, identify inefficiencies, and support more effective resource allocation.

Building on these efforts, a series of pilot programs, funded through prior Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) and implemented across a diverse group of courts representing varying sizes and case management systems, tested analytical solutions in real-world settings. These pilots enabled the judicial branch to develop and refine a scalable data model, increasing its complexity and applicability across courts.

This proposal builds on those prior investments by establishing a modern, enterprise-level data platform for trial and appellate courts and the Judicial Council. The platform will integrate with modern case management systems to provide enhanced data management, validation, and analytical capabilities. Together, these tools will help courts more effectively track and manage case flow, support operational decision-making, and advance the branch's core goal of providing timely and equitable access to justice.

Impact of Denial of Proposal

Without this investment, the aging infrastructure that supports JBSIS, the branch's primary data asset for case flow reporting and analysis, would remain at risk of failure and continue to operate on hardware and software that are no longer secure or supported. The judicial branch would also be required to maintain outdated technologies to manage critical data assets, increasing costs, operational risk, and reliance on increasingly scarce technical expertise. In addition, the full value of prior BCP investments would not be realized, as earlier phases and pilot programs were limited to a subset of trial courts, leaving the branch without a consistent, statewide solution.

Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal

This proposal will deliver measurable improvements in how the judicial branch manages, validates, and uses data to support court operations and policy decision-making. By establishing a modern, enterprise-level data and analytics platform, the branch will significantly increase the number of trial and appellate courts with access to analytic tools needed for effective workload management and case flow decision-making. Courts will be better equipped to monitor performance, identify bottlenecks, and allocate resources based on timely and reliable data.

The proposal will also expand the number of validated datasets available on the data reporting platform, improving data quality, consistency, and confidence in statewide reporting. Standardized data management and validation processes will strengthen the branch's ability to respond efficiently to legislative, executive,

and internal data requests related to court operations, programs, and outcomes. As more information becomes readily available through centralized and validated datasets, the need for ad hoc data requests to trial courts will decrease, reducing administrative burden and allowing court staff to focus on core operational responsibilities.

Accountability will be ensured through clear performance measures, including tracking the number of courts onboarded to the analytics platform, the volume of validated datasets available for reporting and analysis, response times to data requests, and reductions in ad hoc reporting requests. Collectively, these outcomes will demonstrate that the proposal not only modernizes the branch's data infrastructure, but also delivers sustained operational efficiencies, improved transparency, and stronger support for data-driven decision-making across California's courts.

Required Review/Approval

Data Analytics Advisory Committee

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

Goal III: Modernization and Management of Administration
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
Goal VI: Branch wide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

Approval

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

Director Signature: Leah Rose-Goodwin

Contact Name: Leah Rose-Goodwin

Judicial Branch 2027–28 Budget Change Concept

Requesting Entity	Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee
--------------------------	--

Proposal Title	Proposition 66 in Courts of Appeal
-----------------------	------------------------------------

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council of California requests 14.5 positions and \$9.9 million General Fund in fiscal year (FY) 2027–28 and \$9.4 million General Fund in FY 2028–29 and ongoing for the Courts of Appeal to address the new workload associated with the implementation of Proposition 66 (Prop 66), the Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes No

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes No

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes No

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)
Positions	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5
Personal Services	\$3,718,000	\$3,718,000	\$3,718,000	\$3,718,000	\$3,718,000
Operating Expenses & Equipment	935,000	738,000	738,000	738,000	738,000
Local Assistance/ Contracts	5,275,000	4,965,000	4,965,000	4,965,000	4,965,000
Total	\$9,928,000	\$9,421,000	\$9,421,000	\$9,421,000	\$9,421,000
One-time	310,000				
Ongoing	9,618,000	9,421,000	9,421,000	9,421,000	9,421,000

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

Problem or Issue

Prop 66 was approved without funding or resources and the new workload cannot be absorbed by existing resources and staffing for the Courts of Appeal. Approximately 150 petitions were transferred from the Supreme Court to the trial courts, a majority of which are still pending in the trial courts and will likely result in an appeal under Prop 66.

Currently, 50 petitions have proceeded to final disposition in the trial courts and are now in the Courts of Appeal, 43 petitions have been stayed (without counsel) due to lack of funding for habeas corpus appeal counsel. Seven are moving forward despite the lack of funding because counsel comes from an agency such as Habeas Corpus Resource Center or Federal Public Defenders that do not need payment from the Courts of Appeal to proceed with the appeals.

The estimated workload calculation projects that one-fourth (38) of the 150 cases will be appealed in each year beginning in 2027–28. If funding is not provided to the Courts of Appeal, the courts will have to absorb over 12.5 full-time equivalents (FTE) each fiscal year resulting from the estimated 38 cases that will be appealed, with each case requiring approximately four months FTE to review and prepare. This will delay all appeals, slowing down the process of justice, which is precisely the opposite of what the proponents of Prop 66 and, by extension, the majority of Californians wanted when Prop 66 was passed.

Currently there is a backlog and there are approximately 354 California condemned incarcerated persons awaiting appointment of Habeas Corpus counsel, 61 percent of all condemned persons. Of the 354, 142 have had death judgment affirmed and approximately 138 of these incarcerated persons have been waiting for counsel for more than 20 years. Incarcerated persons are being denied their constitutional and statutory rights to challenge their convictions and sentences. Prior to passage of Prop 66, the Supreme Court handled the appointment of counsel, and habeas corpus petitions were filed directly in the Supreme Court. Prop 66 transferred initial appointment authority to the trial courts and directed the filing of habeas petitions there to be followed by an appeal to the Courts of Appeal. Prop 66 did not appropriate funds to the Courts of Appeal for additional resources to address the new petitions related to Prop 66. In addition, the current resources and staff of the Courts of Appeal cannot absorb the anticipated increase in workload. The requested funding will promote the interests of the fair administration of justice by allowing cases to proceed to final resolution, benefiting both the unrepresented and the victim's family members. Of the 354 persons awaiting the appointment of habeas counsel, four have two death judgments for a total of 358 death judgments. Of those 142 (39 percent) have been affirmed on direct appeal.

The Courts of Appeal staff will be required to do different and additional work than what was required of the Supreme Court when it considered death-penalty petitions before Prop 66. Unlike what was required by the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal will be required to issue full written opinions, resolve interlocutory writ petitions taken from trial court rulings, decide multiple pre-decision motions, and consider petitions for rehearing.

The estimated workload calculation is based on averaging two types of anticipated appeals: appeals from initial petitions, which will require extensive work; and appeals from second or subsequent petitions, which will often require less work. For appeals from initial petitions, an FTE position will need an average

of six months to prepare a draft opinion. For appeals from second or subsequent petitions, an FTE position will need from one week to several months to prepare a memorandum or draft decision. Averaging these estimates results in the need for one FTE position to work on a case for four months.

Counsel has already been appointed to all 150 cases transferred to the trial courts, and most of the decisions issued in these cases will be appealed under Prop 66. The Courts of Appeal cannot assume, however, that because a petitioner had representation in the trial court, the petitioner will also have representation on appeal. Under applicable court rules, unless the petitioner and counsel expressly request continued representation, new counsel must be appointed. This concept projects that the Courts of Appeal will be required to appoint and compensate counsel in half of the estimated 38 appeals filed each year through FY 2028–29.

Background/History of Problem

On November 8, 2016, the California electorate approved Prop 66, the Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016. This act made a variety of changes to the statutes relating to review of death penalty (or “capital”) cases in the California courts, many of which were focused on reducing the time spent on this review. Among other provisions, Prop 66 effected several changes to the procedures for filing, hearing, and making decisions on death penalty-related habeas corpus petitions. The act did not take effect immediately on approval by the electorate because its constitutionality was challenged in a petition filed in the California Supreme Court, *Briggs v. Brown* (S238309). On Oct. 25, 2017, the Supreme Court’s opinion in *Briggs v. Brown* became final (2017 3 Cal.5th 808), and the act took effect.

Before Prop 66, habeas corpus petitions related to capital convictions were filed in and decided by the Supreme Court. Under Prop 66, these petitions are generally to be decided by the trial courts and then appealed to the Courts of Appeal. Habeas corpus proceedings represent a new workload and the need for new staffing for the Courts of Appeal. Staffing requested includes one supervising appellate court attorney, 11.5 senior appellate court attorneys, and two judicial assistants.

The Courts of Appeal request for new additional staff is intended to handle these appeals. Because these cases involve the death penalty, they are extraordinarily hard fought and involve many complex issues. The Courts of Appeal will be required to do different and additional work than was required of the Supreme Court in resolving pre-Prop 66 petitions. Unlike the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal will have to issue full written opinions, resolve interlocutory writ petitions taken from superior court rulings, decide multiple pre-decision motions, and consider petitions for rehearing. The estimated workload calculation is based on averaging two types of anticipated appeals: appeals from initial petitions, which will require extensive work, and appeals from second or subsequent petitions, which will require less work.

These delays in appointment of counsel are not only against the interests of justice and fairness but substantially increase both the litigation costs of each case and the incarceration costs associated with the delay in providing a substantial number of condemned incarcerated persons potential relief from their death judgments. Although the issue of responsible party for payment to appointed counsel for trial court habeas proceedings and the rate of pay is still to be determined, the component of this request that seeks additional funding for appointed and assisted counsel at the current capital case rate of \$155/hour for

matters in the Courts of Appeal which will help address one aspect of the chronic shortage. However, if the current \$155/hour rate through FY 2025–26 for capital appointments changes in FY 2026–27 (with a separate proposed BCP to increase the current appointment rate by \$25 for FY 2026–27), additional funds will be needed in the FY 2027–28 budget cycle to obtain adequate funds for any approved increases in capital appointment rates. Currently, as of January 2026, there are 61 Prop 66 cases statewide in the Courts of Appeal: 43 cases stayed; 13 cases dismissed; 13 cases under the Federal Public Defenders Office and State Public Defenders Office or in opinion/motion stage. Without funding, the current 43 Prop 66 statewide cases will continue to be stayed, and access to justice will be denied to appellants and families of victims.

Impact of Denial of Proposal

The Courts of Appeal will not have the resources (i.e., funding and staff) to address the new workload resulting from the passage of Prop 66, the Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016. All habeas corpus petitions related to capital convictions appeals will be delayed, slowing the process of justice, which is inconsistent with the intent of Prop 66 when passed by the California voters. As noted, there are currently 43 Prop 66 cases statewide without counsel being appointed. Denial of this request will increase the number of Prop 66 cases without counsel and create a backlog for Prop 66 cases.

Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal

With approval of this proposal, the Courts of Appeal will be able to hire and develop professional staff to handle habeas corpus appeals to review and render timely opinions to provide relief to prisoners without counsel. The Courts of Appeal will have the necessary resources (funding and staff) to support the new workload and other costs (including appointed counsel, investigation, records storage, and technology upgrades) to adequately address the appeals and the costs associated with the implementation of Prop 66 in the Courts of Appeal.

With the approval of this proposal, many underrepresented groups would benefit from providing timely justice. The National Academy of Sciences and others have estimated that approximately 4 percent of condemned incarcerated persons may be innocent, suggesting that as many as 14 of California’s approximately 354 unrepresented condemned incarcerated persons may have potentially meritorious claims of innocence. Racial and ethnic minorities are disparately impacted, with African Americans comprising approximately 33.6 percent of California’s death row (as compared to approximately six percent of the general population). Additionally, the Death Row U.S.A Winter 2026 (as of Jan. 1, 2026), a quarterly report by the Legal Defense Fund, lists California’s inmates on Death Row in the below categories:

California Death Row Stats as Jan. 1, 2026										
Total	Black		White		Latino/a		Native American		Asian	
580	195	33.6%	187	32.2%	166	28.6%	7	1.2%	25	4.3%

Approval of this proposal will also provide timely processing of these cases and provide equity for all Californian’s including families who are seeking timely justice for the victims and families of incarcerated persons in the habeas corpus petition cases. In addition, these funds will reduce the amount of time

innocent incarcerated persons serve in prison awaiting an appeal, as the families on both sides continue to wait for their day in court and closure.

Finally, successful implementation of this proposal will be manifested through prompt hiring and training of new staff members, allowing the new workload created by Prop 66 to be addressed appropriately and not overwhelming the Courts of Appeal. Accountability will be measured through attorney recruitment and will help in the process of reducing the backlog of habeas counsel appointments to prisoners on death row.

Required Review/Approval

Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee

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

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion

Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public

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

Approval

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

Director Signature: *Amber Barnett*

Contact Name: **Deborah Collier-Tucker**