



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

## COURT TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH NONPUBLIC SESSION

October 31, 2014  
10:00 AM – 11:00 AM  
Teleconference

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair; Hon. Glen M. Reiser, Vice Chair; ; Hon. Joan Buchanan (Ms. Diana Glick); Mr. Jake Chatters; Hon. Robert B. Freedman; Ms. Diana Herbert; Ms. Susan Matherly; Hon. Louis R. Mauro; Hon. James Mize; Hon. James D. Otto; Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Pat Patterson; Hon. Emily E. Vasquez; Mr. Don Willenburg

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton; Prof. Dorothy J. Glancy; Hon. Thomas Hollenhorst; Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson; Hon. Daniel P. Maguire; Hon. Marsha Slough; Hon. Theodore M. Weathers; Hon. Peter J. Wilson

**Others Present:** Hon. David De Alba; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Patrick O'Donnell; Ms. Julie Bagoye; Ms. Tara Lundstrom; Mr. Manny Floresca; Ms. Jessica Craven; Hon. Peter Siggins; Hon. Julie Culver; Hon. Sheila Hanson; Hon. Kyle Brodie

#### OPEN MEETING

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM, and took roll call.

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the July 18, 2014 Court Technology Advisory Committee meeting.

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–5)

##### Item 1

##### Opening Remarks and Chair Report

**Update:** Hon. Terence Bruiniers, CTAC Chair provided updates to members. He noted there were no public comments received prior to this meeting. He then thanked the following outgoing CTAC members for their service during challenging times: Hon. Glen Reiser, 9 years; Hon. Thomas Hollenhorst, 3 years; Hon. James Otto, 10 years; Hon. Emily Vasquez, 12 years; Ms. Susan Matherly, 4 years; and Ms. Diana Herbert, 4 years. Today's meeting is also their last day of service with CTAC.

The Chair noted there will be nine new members as of November 1: Hon. Kyle Brodie; Hon. Julie Culver; Hon. Sheila Hanson; Hon. Samantha Jessner; Hon. Alan Perkins; Hon. Peter Siggins; Hon. Theodore Zayner; Mr. Brian Cotta; and Mr. David Yamasaki. The new Vice-Chair will be Hon. Robert Freedman. CTAC will discuss the liaison and subcommittee vacancies in the future; new members advised to let the Chair know if they have any preference for subcommittee assignments.

At the December meeting CTAC will begin developing its annual agenda and it will be finalized in 2015.

Justice Bruiniers provided an update on the transition from CTAC to ITAC. The ITAC name change is effective Jul 1, 2015 with a Rule of Court amendment proposal being led by JCTC. Key changes are: name change and charge; ability to standup limited term, fluid workstreams; and fostering an increase in court IT representation. The annual agenda process is protracted to account for transition.

Lastly, Justice Bruiniers reported on the Data Exchange (DX) Workstream. The objective of the workstream is to identify exchanges that need standards and to develop the appropriate standards. The DX workstream is on an accelerated path. CTAC is expected to be asked to sign off in November. Mr. David Yamasaki has been appointed as the Chair and membership will include CTAC members and Court Information Officers (CIOs). Making selections within the next couple weeks, if members would like to participate on this workstream, please contact the Chair.

## Item 2

### **Judicial Council's (internal) Technology Committee (JCTC) Update**

**Update:** Hon. David De Alba, Vice-Chair of JCTC provided an update to CTAC. Judge Herman was unavailable to present the update at CTAC.

Governance, Funding, and Strategic Plan update: At the August 2014 meeting, the Judicial Council approved the plan, but with minor changes to language access. The Technology Planning Task Force has now sunset.

Work has begun on a new plan to transition CTAC to the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). Targeting the name change by Rule of Court to be in place July 1.

One focus of the JCTC is the Data Exchange Workstream with justice partners and the courts. DMV has been the most recent issue the courts have experienced while rolling out their case management systems. JCTC has approved this project for CTAC to take this project on as the lead.

JCTC members are Judge James Herman, Judge David De Alba, Judge David Buckley, Judge Emily Elias, Mr. Rick Fieldstein, Mr. Mark Rabino, advisory members are Justice Terence Bruniniers and Judge Marsha Slough

Judge De Alba asked Mr. Patrick O'Donnell to provide an update on the AB 2073 pilot project in Orange. The court was asked to provide feedback on the pilot's cost effectiveness, cost of program to participants, impact to all parties on fee waivers, and

ease of usage of the e-filing program. The JCTC and the Judicial Council approved the report in September for submission to the Legislature. The report included positive findings overall.

### Item 3

#### Joint Appellate Technology Subcommittee Report

**Update:** Hon. Louis Mauro, Chair provided an update on the JATS projects.

1. Modernize appellate court rules for e-filing and e-business: The subcommittee approved a proposed amendment to rule 8.71 and forwarded it to CTAC and the Appellate Advisory Committee (AAC) for review.
2. Develop branch policy on public access to electronic appellate court records: Work has commenced with a goal of forwarding proposed rule amendments to CTAC and the AAC for review in 2015.
3. Collaborate on statewide appellate court technology implementations: JATS will work with the appellate courts implementing e-filing as needed.

Finally, JATS is available to coordinate with subcommittees on rule and policy matters concerning appellate courts.

### Item 4

#### Rules & Policy Subcommittee Report

**Update:** Mr. Patrick O'Donnell provided an update as Judge Buckley having been appointed to the Judicial Council is no longer on CTAC or subcommittee Chair. Vice-Chair Professor Glancy was unavailable to attend today's meeting. There are three main areas of focus for the R&P Subcommittee.

1. Modernize trial court rules to support e-business: Ad-hoc joint subcommittee completed review of amended titles 2 and 3; CTAC to work with fellow advisory committees to develop amendment for other titles.
2. Develop standards for electronic signatures: CEAC ad-hoc subcommittee to meet to develop technical standards; staff will pass along R&P research conducted to date. R&P will be involved when asked for input.
3. Develop privacy policy for electronic court records that could be use by all courts: Chair directed staff to create initial draft; will need to reassign work following CTAC Nov. 1 membership changes. Justice Bruiniers mentioned Judge Culver (new member) has extensive knowledge in this area that might be of use with this project.

### Item 5

#### Projects Subcommittee Report

**Update:**

Hon. Glen Reiser, Chair provided an update on the Projects Subcommittee work.

1. Survey and summarize current state branch e-filing: This project was completed and report findings posted.
2. Explore opportunities to expand remote interpreting: Participating in ad-hoc group exploring path forward and possible pilot project.
3. Study and identify opportunities to expand remote video appearances: Surveyed judicial officers for state of the branch remote video uses; sharing preliminary draft report with CTAC at this meeting.
4. Evaluate the feasibility of branch SRL E-Services portal: This project remains on hold.
5. Evaluate and continue development of e-business webinar series: Launched e-business webinar in July 2014 on remote video in the courts.
6. Maintain and improve branch remote video resource center: This is the location where all resources materials and webinars will be stored for use by the courts.

Judge Reiser also provided an update on the preliminary report of findings on the Video Remote Technology (VRT) Survey project. Developed a survey asking all trial courts judges if they have used remote technology in their court room or if they had considered using it. Some highlights of the findings are: 20% response rate from trial court judges with a variety of geographic locations; 25.6% have used VRT in courtrooms over broad case types; wide range of uses, mostly to accommodate someone who has issues with appearing in court; VRT was being used for many different reasons; and many different platforms are being used. Overall, judges seemed receptive to using VRT in their courtrooms. It would be a good idea to share the final report with the judges so they can see what others are using in their courtrooms.

Justice Bruiniers added that this survey is informational and will be distributed to the JCTC, Judicial Council, Presiding Judges and CEOs as well as the judges that participated in the survey. Judge Vasquez made one suggestions that the VRT webinar be mentioned in the report as it supports the findings of this report.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 AM.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.