



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

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

MEMORANDUM

Date

June 29, 2007

Action Requested

For Your Information

To

Members of the Judicial Council

Deadline

N/A

From

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts

Contact

William C. Vickrey
415-865-4235 phone
415-865-4244 fax
william.vickrey@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Report from the Administrative Director of
the Courts

The following information highlights some of the many activities that have taken place since the last Judicial Council meeting in April to further the Judicial Council's goals and agenda for the judicial branch. Please note that this memorandum follows a new format. The first section provides a summary of these activities, and the second section provides more detailed information. Page references to the more detailed information are provided in the summary section.

SUMMARY

(Page numbers next to the segment headings reference more detailed information.)

Legislation and Budget

Judicial Council–Sponsored Legislation (page 7). Current key council-sponsored legislative priorities include new judgeships, the state appropriations limit (SAL), facilities, court interpreters, and conservatorship/guardianship reform. Several new courthouse construction projects (ultimately totaling over \$1.2 billion) were also approved.

Resource Allocation Study (RAS) (page 9). Annual updates are being made.

Judicial Council Activities

Riverside County Backlog Reduction Program (page 9). With seven new Judgeship positions anticipated in the immediate future, Chief Justice Ronald M. George, Superior Court of Riverside County Presiding Judge Richard Todd Fields, and Riverside County District Attorney Rod Pacheco, announced a two prong plan to improve access to civil courts and to provide timely adjudication of criminal cases. Because of the rapid growth of the county population a significant backlog of criminal cases has reduced access to the civil courts and resulted in substantial delays in resolving criminal cases. This backlog is largely the result of a significant increase in population and caseload in the county without a proportional increase in judgeships over the past several years.

- The Chief Justice will appoint a team of experienced criminal judges (retired and active) that will focus their efforts over the next several months on reducing the backlog of felony cases. The team will be led by Judge David S. Wesley of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.
- The Chief Justice has formed a task force comprised of the Riverside County justice system leaders, chaired by Justice Richard D. Huffman, to develop an overall plan to effectively manage future filings in a manner that provides for a timely resolution of criminal cases while providing access to the civil courts. The initial meetings for both groups are to occur in July.

Bench-Bar Coalition Meeting in Sacramento (page 10). A team comprised of almost 50 judges, court executive officers, bar association leaders, and legal services directors went to the State Capitol in May to meet with key legislators and discuss pending legislation crucial to the judicial branch.

Internal Committee, Advisory Committee, and Task Force Meetings (page 11). The following committees met since the last Judicial Council meeting:

- Executive and Planning Committee;
- Court Technology Advisory Committee;
- Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions;
- Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee;
- Traffic Advisory Committee;
- Court Executives Advisory Committee Audit Program Working Group;
- Court Executives Advisory Committee Court Administration Ethics Working Group;
- Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER);
- Probate Conservatorship Task Force;
- Trial Court Budget Working Group;
- Resource Allocation Study (RAS) Working Group;
- Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force;
- Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care ; and
- Working Group on Court Security.

CCPOR Awarded \$1 Million Grant (page 16). The Administrative Office of the Courts was recently awarded a \$1 million grant from the federally funded Justice Assistance Grant program for the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR). CCPOR grew out of a recommendation to the Judicial Council in October 2006 from its Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force. The development of the California CCMS project and the leadership of the Orange County Superior Court provided the opportunity for this exciting new development.

Judicial Affirmation of CALCRIM (page 17). The Judicial Council's revised criminal jury instructions have been affirmed several times in the Courts of Appeal.

Judicial Council Participation in Juror Appreciation Week (page 17). Bookmarks promoting jury service and certificates of recognition signed by the Chief Justice and the local presiding judge were distributed this past May.

Steering Committee and Task Forces to Ensure Judicial Quality, Impartiality, and Accountability (page 17). Chief Justice George recently appointed four task forces coordinated by a steering committee, chaired by Justice Ming Chin, to further study and make recommendations regarding the four approaches identified at last November's Summit of Judicial Leaders to address contemporary challenges to judicial impartiality arising from judicial elections and attacks on judges and courts.

Infrastructure Initiatives

Facilities (page 18). To date, 112 facilities in 29 counties have been transferred or are included in executed transfer agreements under the provisions of Senate Bill 1732 (including three transfers in Humboldt County as recently as this past Tuesday, June 26). For the 2007–

2008 fiscal year, the Legislature approved \$31.246 million for the acquisition phase of nine new facility projects, as well as \$4.703 million for the design phase of three ongoing projects. The total cost for the nine new facility projects will be \$1.2 billion. The total cost for the existing three facility projects will be \$82 million. The AOC Office of Court Construction and Management (OCCM) continues efforts to retain an outside financial advisor to assist in structuring more effective and flexible funding, construction, facility operation, and delivery models. Discussions between the AOC and the Legislature continue in exploring options regarding funding, including a bond for adequate courthouse construction.

OCCM has had several major milestone events related to its capital program, including the opening of a new courthouse in Merced on June 8, 2007. This facility is the first new court facility to be constructed in Merced County since 1950 and meets the Judicial Council's standards for the design of trial court facilities. The project was collaboratively funded, in part using a first-time capital appropriation from the judicial branch State Court Facilities Construction Fund, which, as a collaborative effort, contributed to the courthouse's completion and transfer to the state. Justice Baxter, Vice-Chair of the Judicial Council, provided the dedication address.

Technology (page 20). A total of 50 courts have completed LAN/WAN upgrades. The California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) successfully completed its third annual disaster recovery exercise this past May. Several courts throughout the state are in various stages of preparing to deploy e-filing solutions. Progress continues to be made regarding data integration for the trial courts and its justice system partners. The California Courts Case Management System (CCMS) and Phoenix continue to be successfully deployed throughout the state, including enhancing CCMS V2 to allow courts to send data directly to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). On the appellate side, the Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) was deployed to two more Court of Appeal appellate districts and the Supreme Court—Court Appointed Counsel System (SCACS) Phase Two went live on June 11. The appellate cases Web site was enhanced to improve public access to appellate case information.

Administrative Office of the Courts

Security (page 23). The AOC's Emergency Response and Security (ERS) team has created a *Personal Security for Judicial Officers* brochure that it will distribute in various locations. ERS has also purchased and is deploying to the courts a Web-based Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP) tool that will assist courts in recovering from disasters. In addition, ERS is conducting security surveys/reviews for the courts, judges, and justices and is developing a judicial privacy opt-out program that is intended to remove a judicial officer's personal information from the Web. Finally, ERS has completed implementation of the AOC Badge Program and has revised procedures for providing security at off-site AOC events.

Regional Offices (page 26). In response to requests from presiding judges and newly appointed judges for the AOC to provide judges with an opportunity to meet and discuss

issues of common interest, the regional offices recently hosted a series of very well received roundtable forums for judicial officers with civil, family and juvenile, and criminal assignments. Requests were made for future meetings.

Media (page 26). Several media-related items and events occurred since April, including the distribution of a new *Courts Illustrated* video, the inaugural meeting of the Bench/Bar/Media Committee, and the first statewide meeting of court public information officers.

Judicial Retirement System II (page 27) – The AOC has engaged two outside consultants to evaluate issues involving JRS II.

B. E. Witkin Judicial College Celebrates 40 Years (page 28). This year marks the 40th anniversary of the B. E. Witkin Judicial College. One hundred and nineteen judges, commissioners, and referees attended the intensive two-week program at the University of California at Berkeley's Clark Kerr campus. Judge Tricia Ann Bigelow of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is chair of the New Judge Education Committee, and Judge Eddie C. Sturgeon of the Superior Court of San Diego County is vice-chair. Together, they provide judicial leadership for the New Judge Orientation Program as well as for the Judicial College.

Judicial Symposium on Public Safety, Sentencing, and Corrections (page 28). The AOC Scholar-in-Residence, Roger Warren, brought together state and national experts joined California judges and justice system partners to explore the attributes of California's sentencing and corrections systems in relation to models in other states. Evidence-based sentencing practices; roles and models of sentencing commissions, adult correction programs, probations and other community sentencing options were among the topics discussed.

Branchwide Professional Excellence/Education (page 28). Recording and reporting forms for education were approved by the Judicial Council Executive and Planning Committee and distributed to the trial courts. A Serranus Web page on the new minimum education rules was recently launched. In addition, numerous educational events took place during this time, including a new symposium on sentencing reform; separate conferences on technology, self-represented litigants, family dispute resolution, and collaborative justice courts; as well as broadcasts, programs, and institutes offered through the AOC Education Division.

Web Services and Development (page 33). Updated software and new hardware were installed to provide statistics for AOC Web sites. A new interactive calculator for the Judges' Retirement System II (JRS II) was developed, tested, and put into production on Serranus. Finally, an effort to redesign the AOC Web site is scheduled to begin this month.

Other AOC Initiatives (page 34). The CourTools project will begin a second round of implementation with the addition of two more courts. The project is continuing in the Superior Court of San Mateo County. A methodology has been developed for allocating \$32

million in new funding for data auditing and collection regarding the conservatorship project. Technical assistant teams were deployed to assist courts in implementing action plans for the family law caseload management project. The JusticeCorps program was awarded a new three-year grant. Several meetings were held with trial court leadership on procedural fairness.

Legislation and Budget

On Friday, June 1, 2007, the budget conference committee began meeting to resolve the differences between the Assembly and Senate actions on various budget issues. Several judicial branch issues were part of this process. Although the committee has not yet completed its work, as of June 20, 2007, it acted on all judicial branch issues except for the proposal to change the Judges' Retirement System II (JRS II). Once the conference committee completes its work, any unresolved issues may be sent to the Governor and leaders of both houses and both parties (the "Big Five"). The budget will be then be voted on in each house. The end of the fiscal year is June 30. A copy of the most current status report is attached for your reference.

It should be noted that, in addition to several group meetings with key legislative leaders and members from the Governor's staff, the Chief Justice, Ronald G. Overholt, Kathleen T. Howard, and I held numerous individual meetings with legislators during this legislative session in an effort to move forward on the legislative initiatives crucial to the judicial branch.

Following is a summary of the actions taken to date:

- **SAL.** Approved state appropriations limit funding of \$126.621 and supplemental reporting language that specifies allocation of this funding.
- **Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act of 2006.** A \$17.377 million General Fund augmentation to implement the provisions of Statutes 2006, chapters 492 and 493. Funding is proposed for a two-year limited term basis to allow the Administrative Office of the Courts time to assess the impact of the legislation and develop a more fully developed proposal to address the ongoing funding need.
- **Senate Bill 145 (Corbett).** Passed the Assembly Judiciary Committee on June 26 on a strong bipartisan vote. SB 145 would extend the deadline for the transfer of court facilities through December 31, 2008. Transfers can continue with no penalty for 12 months, but if transfers occur later than June 30, 2008, and a county has not made meaningful progress toward a transfer agreement, the county would pay a penalty of a higher County Facility Payment (CFP). The bill will next be heard in the Assembly Appropriations Committee and then will go to the Assembly floor. SB 145 is an urgency measure and will take effect immediately upon the Governor's signature.
- **Judgeships and SJO Conversions.** Approved funding for 100 new trial court judgeships over two years and the conversion of 162 subordinate judicial officers (SJOs) at the rate of 16 per year. The Legislature needs to pass Assembly Bill 159 (Jones) to create the new positions.
- **Access to Justice.** Approved \$2.5 million to expand self-help programs and approved budget bill language to earmark \$5.2 million per year of existing interpreter funding to be

made available to courts for increased compensation for court interpreters and for interpreter training and recruitment.

- **Court Security.** The Governor proposed an augmentation for court security in the May budget revise. Last week, the conference committee closed out the court security item at \$0. It is critical that this issue is resolved at the Big Five level, and we are working to bring together an agreement on court security that will address the current funding deficiencies and bring courts up to standard for court security. The proposal that has been discussed in conference committee is endorsed by both the courts and sheriffs.
- **AOC Workload Adjustment.** Denied a program workload adjustment for new positions at the AOC.
- **Judges' Retirement System II.** Open. Cost and timing remain significant hurdles.

Court Facilities - The Legislature approved \$31.246 million for the acquisition phase of nine new facility projects as well as \$4.703 million for the design phase of three ongoing projects. The total cost for the nine new facility projects will be \$1.2 billion. The total cost for the existing three facility projects will be \$82 million. Following is a breakdown by county.

Funding was approved to begin the first phase of nine new courthouses:

- **Calaveras County.** New San Andreas courthouse: \$845,000 for the acquisition phase of a 4-courtroom 39,900-square-foot courthouse;
- **Lassen County.** New Susanville courthouse: \$1.478 million for the acquisition phase of a 3-courtroom 36,600-square-foot courthouse;
- **Los Angeles County.** New Long Beach courthouse: \$5.889 million for equity buy-out to construct a new 31-courtroom 304,480-square-foot courthouse;
- **Madera County.** New Madera courthouse: \$3.440 million for the acquisition phase to construct a new 11-courtroom 110,000-square-foot courthouse;
- **Riverside County.** New Riverside midcounty region courthouse: \$3.283 million for the acquisition phase to construct a new 6-courtroom 60,725-square-foot courthouse;
- **San Benito County.** New Hollister courthouse: \$541,000 for the acquisition phase to construct a new 3-courtroom 36,500-square-foot courthouse;
- **San Bernardino County.** New San Bernardino courthouse: \$4.774 million for the acquisition phase to construct a new 36-courtroom 356,390-square-foot courthouse;
- **San Joaquin County.** New Stockton courthouse: \$3.327 million for the acquisition phase to construct a new 29-courtroom 256,720-square-foot courthouse; and
- **Tulare County.** New Porterville courthouse: \$4.426 million for the acquisition phase to construct a new 9-courtroom 90,000-square-foot courthouse.

Additional funding was approved for three courthouses for which funding had been provided in prior years:

- **Contra Costa County.** New Antioch area courthouse: \$3.632 million for the working drawings phase to construct a new 7-courtroom 73,500-square-foot courthouse;

- **Mono County.** New Mammoth Lakes courthouse: \$725,000 for the workings drawings phase to construct a new 20,000-square-foot courthouse; and
- **Plumas and Sierra Counties.** New Portola/Loyalton courthouse: \$346,000 for the working drawings phase to construct a new 6,500-square-foot courthouse.

Resource Allocation Study (RAS) Model Update for Fiscal Year 2007–2008 Trial Court Budget. Annual updates are being made to the Resource Allocation Study Model for use in budget allocation for the equity and workload growth portion of the trial court budget. Data to be updated in the model includes filings data and judicial officer data, as well as schedule 7A data for trial court employees. Selected case weights in the RAS model are being adjusted as a result of legislative mandates requiring specific procedures for handling conservatorship cases.

Judicial Council Activities

A Two-Prong Plan to Reduce Felony Case Backlog and Improve Access to Civil Courts in Riverside County

Riverside County Backlog Reduction Program. Following a series of communications among Chief Justice Ronald M. George, Superior Court of Riverside County Presiding Judge Richard Todd Fields, and Riverside County District Attorney Rod Pacheco, as well as contacts from other stakeholders, such as the Riverside County Bar Association, the Chief Justice has, under authority granted to him by the California Constitution, recently assigned a team of both active and retired judges experienced in handling criminal cases to serve in the Superior Court of Riverside County for the next four months and to concentrate their efforts solely on disposing of the court's criminal case backlog. This additional judicial assistance will help promote public safety and maintain access to civil justice.

For almost 20 years, a rapidly growing population in the area (a 76 percent increase since 1989) and consequential increase in caseload, coupled with an insufficient relative increase in new judgeships (just three new positions or a 6.5 percent increase during the same period), has resulted in an enormous backlog of criminal cases; a backlog so great that the Chief Justice determined it could compromise public safety.¹ In addition, this backlog also threatens the ability of the county's families to resolve child custody disputes and juvenile dependency matters, as well as impacting public access to the civil courts. It must be noted that Riverside Superior Court has performed heroically in an attempt to grapple with this backlog. In 2006 alone, the court completed more than 800 criminal jury trials, a record number. But even these tremendous efforts are not enough.

¹ "The large backlog of criminal cases contributes to the recurrence of 'last day' cases that must go to trial or risk dismissal, and to the potential compromise of public safety if dismissals occur because there are insufficient resources to handle cases in timely fashion." (Judicial Council News Release, June 15, 2007.)

Specifically, the Chief Justice has assigned Judge David S. Wesley of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County to serve as supervising judge of the backlog reduction team. He will be responsible for assigning cases among the strike team judges. Judge Wesley was chosen due to his exceptional leadership skills and his extensive experience in case management, criminal calendaring processes, and assignment of long-cause matters in high-volume felony courts. Superior Court of Riverside County Supervising Judge Helios Hernandez will continue to handle the court's master calendar, where he has worked diligently to maximize the use of the court's limited resources.

The 50 new judgeships recently approved by the Legislature will help ameliorate the problem over the next year. Seven of these new positions have been allocated to the Superior Court of Riverside County.

Riverside Case Management Task Force. Associate Justice Richard D. Huffman of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One (San Diego), who chairs the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee, has been tapped to lead the Riverside Case Management Task Force. This task force is charged with developing an overall plan for both reducing the backlog in the court and improving the management of incoming cases. Justice Huffman has already met with justice system leaders and has scheduled another meeting for July 16.

AOC staff is providing expertise and assistance in this effort with the Southern Regional Office taking a lead role.

Bench-Bar Coalition (BBC) Meeting in Sacramento

A team comprised of almost 50 judges, court executive officers, bar association leaders, and legal services directors went to the State Capitol in May for the Bench-Bar Coalition's second "Day in Sacramento" of 2007. The event coincided with the release of the May revision to the state budget and the activity in the budget committees. The range of topics covered the most critical judicial branch issues, including 50 new judgeships in the courts with the most pressing workloads, funding for new facilities where they are critically needed, access to justice issues, and modifying the judicial retirement system to assist in attracting and retaining the most qualified applicants for judicial positions. Legislators who would be considering the judicial branch budget or considering through their committee assignments pending Judicial Council-sponsored legislation and who would be instrumental in legislative action on these bills as they make their way to the Assembly and Senate floors for key votes were the focus of these in-depth discussions. The teams' composition was carefully balanced to include representation based on geography; court, bar, and legal services perspectives; familiarity with the key messages; and relationships with targeted legislators. In a debriefing that followed the appointments, BBC members expressed confidence that the insights gained from the dialogue on local and statewide

judicial branch issues would help the coalition develop strategies for ongoing communications with legislators and staff in their districts.

Background of the BBC. The BBC, founded in 1993 under the leadership of the California Association of Local Bars (CALB), the State Bar of California, and the Judicial Council, enhances communication and coordinates the activities of the judicial community with the state, local, and specialty bars on issues of common interest—particularly in the legislative arena. Among the benefits derived from the coalition has been the development of strong working relationships and better communication between the judiciary and members of the bar, as well as enhanced advocacy efforts with the Legislature. The bar has kept the coalition informed about issues important to the Commission on Equal Access to Justice and the State Bar. BBC membership includes judges and the presidents, past presidents, presidents-elect, executive directors, or other persons designated by the president of a state, local, minority, or specialty bar association, legal services organization, or statewide organization dedicated to improving the justice system. The BBC is currently cochaired by Joel Miliband of Rus Miliband & Smith, Irvine, and Anthony P. Capozzi of Capozzi Law Offices, Fresno, immediate past president of the State Bar of California.

The BBC's next quarterly conference call will be held on Monday, July 23, 2007, 4:00–5:00 p.m. The next BBC membership meeting will be held at the 2007 California Bench-Bar Biannual Conference on Friday, September 28, 2007, 8:00–10:30 a.m., at the Anaheim Marriott.

Internal Committee, Advisory Committee, and Task Force Meetings

Executive and Planning Committee. The Executive and Planning Committee awarded 20 superior courts a total of \$1,408,935 from the fiscal year 2006–2007 Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund to assist the courts in planning, implementing, and improving mediation and settlement programs for general civil cases and small claims and unlawful detainer proceedings under the Civil Mediation and Settlement Program Grants program. The AOC Office of the General Counsel also hosted two workshops to help courts assess their needs for a civil mediation or settlement program and plan a program to address any identified needs. The Civil Mediation and Settlement Program Grants project is intended to help achieve the goal of Standards of Judicial Administration standard 10.70(a) that all courts should implement mediation programs for civil cases as part of their core operations and is a centerpiece of the Administrative Office of the Courts' efforts to help trial courts plan and implement mediation and other settlement programs.

The Executive and Planning Committee also awarded the Superior Courts of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Stanislaus Counties grants of \$110,000 each from the fiscal year Trial Court Improvement Fund to conduct pilot programs to help self-represented litigants in small claims and limited civil cases effectively participate in mediation and settlement programs. This pilot project program is intended to address recommendations in the 2005 study *Trust and Confidence in the California Courts: A Survey of the Public and Attorneys* by helping self-represented litigants, particularly those with limited English proficiency, to be aware of the availability and

potential benefits of mediation and settlement programs and to understand the legal issues and possible outcomes in their cases so they can make informed choices during these processes.

Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC). The CTAC published proposed amendments to the rules on e-filing and e-access. These rules include state-level rules for electronic service. In a joint effort between CTAC and the Appellate Advisory Committee, the Appellate E-Filing and E-Access Workgroup has proposed rules that are out for comment that would allow filers of civil appellate briefs to serve a single electronic copy of that brief on the Supreme Court. The current practice is to submit four paper copies, which are then transferred to the state law libraries. If adopted, these rules would go into affect in January 2008.

Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions. The advisory committee held a special meeting on May 24, 2007, to give expedited treatment to revisions required to punitive damages instructions because of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Philip Morris USA v. Williams (2007) 127 S.Ct. 1057* (punitive damages award based in part on jury's desire to punish defendant for harming nonparties amounted to a taking of property from defendant without due process). These revisions are posted for public comment through July 13, 2007. The committee also approved a proposal for a new series of instructions on unlawful detainer. These instructions were first reviewed by the committee in May 2006 but were reconsidered in response to many public comments from attorneys and programs representing the interests of both landlords and tenants.

Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee. The advisory committee met on April 6, 2007, to develop its suggestions for inclusion in the 2007–2010 Operational Plan and to review proposed pretrial rules for civil cases. The committee subsequently reviewed and approved the civil pretrial rules and also proposed amended rules and legislation concerning appearances by telephone in civil cases. The proposed rules on civil pretrial procedures and telephone appearances are posted for public comment through July 13, 2007.

Traffic Advisory Committee. The advisory committee met on May 30, 2007, to approve proposed legislation to submit to the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee for sponsorship by the Judicial Council in response to the recent decision by the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, in *People v. Chavez (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 1340*. The proposed legislation would clarify existing law and follow the calculation of penalty assessments imposed in criminal cases in a way that is consistent with the Judicial Council's Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedules and statewide case management systems.

Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) Audit Program Working Group. This group was established to develop and prioritize recommendations to clarify and, where possible, improve the criteria on which courts are measured against audit standards and to foster information sharing and best practices as audit mentors for courts that are in need of further education and support. The Audit Program Working Group held its first face-to-face meeting on May 16, 2007, to clarify its charge and explore plans for informing and educating the courts on AOC audit practices. A second meeting is scheduled for June 25, 2007.

Court Executives Advisory Committee Court Administration Ethics Working Group. This group was established to provide recommendations to the CEAC regarding modifying the statewide code of ethics for court personnel; options for branch and local ethics training; and amendments or new provisions to current laws, rules, and policies related to court administration ethics. It held its first face-to-face meeting on May 29, 2007 to review a draft project plan and initiate a literature research on codes concerning ethical conduct.

Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research. At the direction of the Judicial Council during its October 2006 meeting, the Governing Committee of CJER began developing recommendations for minimum education for Supreme Court and Court of Appeal justices and personnel, as well as minimum education recommendations for AOC executives, managers, supervisors, and personnel. The governing committee was also directed to incorporate key provisions of the Standards of Judicial Administration related to education into the proposal. The governing committee met on May 8, 2007, to discuss the proposed rules it has developed and review and discuss the 39 public comments received on these proposed rules of court. The governing committee will submit its recommendation to the Judicial Council at the Council's August 2007 meeting.

2007 CJER Education Committee Application Process. The deadline to submit applications to serve on one of CJER's 20 education committees is June 30, 2007. The governing committee will consider applications and make appointments at its September meeting for terms beginning November 1, 2007. In an effort to increase collaboration and communication with other Judicial Council advisory committees, the governing committee now includes six members who serve concurrently on other Judicial Council advisory committees. The governing committee regularly receives oral reports from these members regarding their committees' efforts related to education, including legislation or rules or court being proposed that may include education or impact resources.

Meeting with Education Committee Leadership. At its February meeting, the governing committee identified some concerns and issues it wanted to discuss with its education committees² and determined to make a concentrated effort to encourage greater inclusiveness in planning and delivering education. Consequently, following its business meeting on May 8, the governing committee met with its education committee chairs and vice-chairs to discuss, among other topics,

- Increasing meetings between governing committee and education committee leadership,
- Providing additional overview courses for both new and experienced judges,
- Expanding the pool of faculty for all education offerings; and
- the Judicial Council's new Operational Plan.

² The Governing Committee of CJER appoints all the members of its various education committees. These education committees cover all substantive areas (e.g., civil, criminal, family law) as well as specific audiences (e.g., presiding judges, court staff, rural courts).

Probate Conservatorship Task Force. The task force reviewed and completed its draft report and is circulating it for a 60-day public comment period, which ends on June 29, 2007. There are 90 recommendations to improve the practice and management of probate conservatorship matters in the trial courts. The recommendations include seeking legislative and rule of court changes and guidelines and suggestions for trial courts to follow. The task force will meet on July 17, 2007, to consider comments and then will present the report to the Judicial Council at its August meeting.

Trial Court Budget Working Group. The budget working group met in May to discuss recommendations on proposed fiscal year 2007–2008 state appropriations limit funding allocations as well as pending fiscal year 2007–2008 budget augmentations. The working group conducted a follow-up meeting by phone in June to address outstanding issues on the pending budget change proposal relating to funding resources to support the Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act of 2006 and a proposal to adjust the payment policies for contract court interpreters. Recommendations will be presented to the council at its upcoming business meetings.

Resource Allocation Study Working Group. The Resource Allocation Study Working Group is comprised of 16 courts representing all sizes and geographic regions in the state. The working group meets yearly to review changes to the model and propose research needed to maintain the currency of the model. Agenda items for the meeting on June 15 included adjusting the conservatorship case weight to take into account new mandates, statewide measures of performance in jury management, and the mandate in Senate Bill 56 to report on measures of accountability and performance.

Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force. During May and June, the task force conducted three sets of regional court meetings in Santa Rosa, Burlingame, and Torrance. At the request of Chief Justice Ronald M. George, courts conducted community outreach efforts before the meetings in order to gather information about local issues. Then each court sent a team to the appropriate regional meeting. The meetings had three critical goals: (1) to provide a forum for courts to discuss local needs and develop or refine local court implementation plans for improving practice in domestic violence cases; (2) to gather judicial officers and court professionals to review and comment on the draft guidelines and practices developed by the task force; and (3) to design additional or alternative proposals, as needed, to improve the administration of justice in domestic violence cases. The attendees evaluated these meetings highly. Comments and suggestions were recorded and will be reviewed by the task force. The task force plans to submit its final report to the council at its December 2007 meeting.

Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care. The Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care, chaired by Justice Carlos R. Moreno, met in Riverside on June 20–22 for its sixth meeting. The focus of the commission's meeting was improving foster care outcomes through court collaboration with partner agencies, prisons, and tribes, all of which play critical roles in foster children's lives. The commission meeting examined court responsibility

and leadership for community collaboration. The commission also had focused discussions on collaboration between courts and agencies regarding children who cross over between the dependency and delinquency sides of the juvenile court, collaboration between courts and tribes, and starting local commissions in each of California's 58 counties.

The commission toured the California Institute for Women, a correctional facility for women in Corona. The tour included visits of a number of programs designed to keep women prisoners connected with their children, including the future construction of a wing of the prison that will allow inmates who give birth to children in prison to keep their children with them for up to 18 months. The commission also heard from Utah Judge Sharon McCully, who discussed the Utah juvenile court systems and how collaborative efforts in Utah have led to significant resources for the juvenile courts and significant improvements in the child welfare system. The commission also heard from two panels that discussed collaborative efforts between the courts and Native American tribes in implementing the federal Indian Child Welfare Act. One panel discussed the efforts by the Superior Court of Riverside County to work with local tribal courts in resolving issues concerning Indian children, and the other panel discussed efforts at the state level to improve relations between the courts and the Native American tribes in California in regard to the placement of Indian children in foster care.

Working Group on Court Security. This working group met in May and discussed several issues:

1. *Funding Needs to Address Court Security Costs.* Justice Richard D. Aldrich reported that a group of court and sheriff representatives met with Mr. Vince Brown of the state Department of Finance to discuss funding needs to address court security costs. The group presented information about the deficit and the need for an infusion, noting that court security is often a matter of life and death and that funds for court security should take priority over many other requests. Justice Aldrich and Mr. Szalay have received positive feedback, and the request for funding is going to the Governor for consideration.
2. *Court Security Plan Requirements and Template.* Mr. Michael M. Roddy's subcommittee researched Government Code section 69925 compliance (court security plans). Because no rules of court are in place, the subcommittee developed a two-part solution to present to the working group: (1) a new rule of court for section 10.170 of the trial court governance rules and (2) a court security plan template. There was a unanimous voice vote to place the court security plan template in the Trial Court Policies and Procedures Manual which staff will follow up on. The group approved the draft rules of court after revision, and staff plan to present the proposed rules to the Judicial Council at its October 26 meeting.

3. *Security Costs—Allocation Process and Training.* Mr. Stephen H. Nash presented a revised process for determination of security funding needs for FY 2007–2008. Mr. Roddy noted that he tested the forms and found them simple, and Mr. Szalay noted the credibility and transparency that this would create between courts and sheriffs. Mr. Nash updated the working group on training sessions for completing SAL surveys. The locations and dates are:
 - Burbank on May 17;
 - San Francisco on May 21;
 - Hanford on May 30;
 - Sacramento on May 31; and
 - Redding on June 1.

4. *Status of Entrance Screening Equipment Purchases.* Mr. Malcolm Franklin reported to the group on three screening equipment programs wherein:
 - AOC reimburses the approved courts for a total of 97 new stations that were approved in the Budget Act of 2006;
 - AOC replaces outdated screening equipment for the courts that were approved for replacements by the Judicial Council at its October 2006 business meeting and for which funding was included in the Budget Act of 2006; and
 - ERS purchases equipment for courts not covered by those programs, based on need and the availability of Trial Court Improvement Funds (TCIF).

ERS has made 28 purchases for courts using TCIF, which has resulted in a vast improvement for courts that have received screening equipment.

5. *Other Security-Related Improvements.* Mr. Franklin reported on other security-related improvements that ERS is assisting courts with, including installation of 14 wireless duress systems and construction of several clerk's counters. Mr. Franklin also reported on the status of an AOC Request for Proposals (RFP) for a statewide provider of access and camera systems. The RFP will give courts the option of purchasing equipment, labor, and maintenance packages from the provider at prearranged prices.

California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) Awarded \$1 Million Grant

The Administrative Office of the Courts was recently awarded a \$1 million grant from the federally funded Justice Assistance Grant for the California Courts Protective Order Registry project. The AOC Executive Office Programs Division submitted the grant proposal last week to the California Council on Criminal Justice (CCCJ), the statutorily created entity responsible for approving Justice Assistance Grant requests. (CCCJ members include gubernatorial and legislative appointees, as well as the Attorney General and the Administrative Director of the Courts.) CCCJ members were enthusiastic about the proposal and approved the request unanimously. One member speaking in support of the proposal pointed out that a statewide

registry of protective and restraining orders would be beneficial for all aspects of the criminal justice system.

The California Courts Protective Order Registry is a centralized system for viewing protective orders and related information for the judicial branch, law enforcement agencies, and other justice partners across jurisdictions. It is a new Judicial Council project that arose out of an October 2006 recommendation to the Judicial Council from its Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force. This proposed project is critical to public safety as it will enable judges, court staff, and local law enforcement officers to better enforce protective orders without the existing jurisdictional limitations. As an initial phase, the AOC is partnering with MTG Management Consultants to interview a number of courts this summer to identify current court practices and to prepare requirements to implement a statewide solution usable by all courts.

Judicial Affirmation of CALCRIM

The *California Criminal Jury Instructions (CALCRIM)* have been upheld by the Courts of Appeal nine times in five different cases. Significantly, the reasonable doubt instructions, which are given in every case, were affirmed three times. Further signs that appellate courts acknowledge the accuracy and accessibility of *CALCRIM* include *People v. Thomas* (2007) 150 Cal.App.4th 461. In that case, the appellant argued that *CALCRIM* instructions were superior to *CALJIC* and the court's failure to use them constituted instructional error. Although Justice Boland did not find error, he agreed that *CALCRIM* instructions are "viewed as superior."

Judicial Council Participation in Juror Appreciation Week

Juror Appreciation Week is commemorated in the trial courts annually every second full week in May by California Assembly Resolution. Trial courts engage in recognition activities for jurors performing jury service during this week. This year the Judicial Council, via the AOC, distributed bookmarks promoting jury service, certificates of recognition signed by the Chief Justice and the local presiding judge, and magnets with the message "Jurors: Embodying Justice, Serving the Community."

Steering Committee and Task Forces to Ensure Judicial Quality, Impartiality, and Accountability

In November 2006, the California Judicial Council convened a Summit of Judicial Leaders to review challenges that have emerged across the country and to determine how the California judiciary can best exert its leadership to avoid or mitigate the occurrence or recurrence of these challenges in California. Four basic approaches were discussed at the summit and identified as potentially promising means by which to address these challenges in order to safeguard the right of all Californians to a highly qualified, impartial, and accountable judiciary:

1. Pursue possible modifications of California's existing judicial selection, retention, and removal processes;

2. Seek to better regulate and positively influence the campaign conduct of judicial candidates;
3. Pursue judicial campaign finance reform objectives; and
4. Improve public understanding of the role and decision-making processes of the judiciary, the voter's access to accurate and unbiased information about the qualifications of judicial candidates, and public trust in the California judiciary.

To that end, the Chief Justice has appointed Judicial Council task forces to review potential activities that the Judicial Council can pursue in each of these four areas to safeguard the quality, impartiality, and accountability of the California judiciary for all its citizens. The four task forces will present their resulting recommendations and reports to a Steering Committee to Ensure Judicial Quality, Impartiality, and Accountability, also appointed by the Chief Justice, that will subsequently report its recommendations to the Judicial Council.

Infrastructure Initiatives

Facilities

Current Transfers. The counties and the AOC have been making enormous progress on court facility transfers. This time last year, only 6 courthouses had transferred to the state; as of today, June 28, 2007, 112 facilities in 29 counties will have been transferred or will be included in executed transfer agreements under the provisions of Senate Bill 1732. We continue to negotiate with the counties for all remaining facilities. The trial court facilities legislation requires that all transfers be completed by June 30, 2007. While the AOC continues to negotiate with all counties, it has also encouraged the Legislature to pass legislation to extend the completion date of the transfers (Senate Bill 145; please see details in Legislation section above). Several large counties, including Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego, are negotiating countywide transfers that in the next several months will result in a doubling of the number of transfers.

Special mention should be made of the tremendous work of Chief Deputy Director Ronald G. Overholt, Director Kim Davis (OCCM), General Counsel Mary M. Roberts, and Director Kathleen T. Howard (Office of Governmental Affairs), as well as California State Association of Counties members Rubin Lopez and Elizabeth Howard, in making these transfers a reality. Kim Davis's staff at OCCM has been and continues to be especially effective working on this complex and critical endeavor. This progress would not have occurred without their expertise, talent, energy, and dedication.

Funding for Capital Projects. Nine capital projects have been approved by the budget conference committee and, barring any subsequent action, these projects will be included in the budget that the Legislature sends to the Governor. The Legislature approved \$31.246 million for the acquisition phase of nine new facility projects as well as 4.703 million for the design phase of three ongoing projects. The total cost for the nine new facility projects will

be \$1.2 billion. The total cost for the existing three facility projects will be \$82 million. The nine projects are in the counties of Calaveras, Lassen, Los Angeles (Long Beach), Madera, Riverside, San Benito, San Bernardino, San Joaquin, and Tulare. These projects will provide a total of 132 new courtrooms. The Long Beach project includes a unique public-private partnership delivery method that will leverage the value of the land occupied by the existing Long Beach courthouse to provide a new courthouse in the Long Beach area.

Alternate Funding Models. Pursuant to our efforts in exploring more effective and flexible funding and delivery models, OCCM has engaged in discussions with several advisory firms to understand their experience in structuring these transactions. OCCM will issue an RFP for these services in July of this year. The initial subject for this approach would be the Los Angeles–Long Beach capital project, but it may also be used on future capital projects.

Status of Bond Measure. The Chief Justice, Chief Deputy Director Overholt, and key OCCM staff met on June 19, 2007, with Senator Don Perata and his staff. The Senator said that he does not think there is any area in state government that has a better handle on its facility inventory, the conditions of buildings, and a plan for maintenance and replacement than the judiciary. The Senator is very interested in our capital program and will continue to support efforts to move our program forward.

Milestone Events. OCCM has had several major milestone events related to its capital program, including the following:

- Merced Courthouse ribbon cutting on June 8, 2007. This facility is the first new court facility to be constructed in Merced County since 1950. The new courthouse meets the Judicial Council's standards for the design of trial court facilities by providing secure hallways for the public, judicial officers, and staff and separate hallways and holding areas for in-custody defendants. The project was collaboratively funded by the county, court, and state, using county courthouse construction funds, civil assessments, court funds, and a first-time capital appropriation from the judicial branch State Court Facilities Construction Fund. What should be noted is that although the state was not required to under the provisions of SB 1732, it contributed slightly more than \$3 million toward the completion of this courthouse from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund. Because of this collaborative effort, the courthouse was completed and transferred to the state upon completion.
- Fresno new juvenile delinquency courthouse groundbreaking ceremony on May 18, 2007.
- Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District (Fresno County) courthouse completion in August 2007.
- Amador courthouse move-in on June 25, 2007.
- Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District (Orange County) new courthouse groundbreaking ceremony scheduled for October 2007.

Technology

Telecommunications Upgrades

Telecommunication infrastructure upgrades provide courts with a new platform, including circuits, cable/fiber, switches, and routers that effectively support secure access to the California Courts Technology Center and the many business applications in use today and to local initiatives such as IP-based telephony systems, videoconferencing, and new physical security monitoring systems. As court upgrades are completed, third-party network security monitoring is put into place to help secure court data. Funding has been provided to refresh LAN/WAN equipment in the courts that are reaching end of support. Equipment refresh installations begin in July 2007. A total of 50 courts have completed LAN/WAN upgrades. During this period, the Superior Court of San Bernardino County telecommunications update was completed. The Superior Court of Mono County adopted the LAN/WAN security model. The Superior Court of Placer County will move forward with the LAN/WAN project, with an anticipated duration of eight months.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) 2007 Recovery Exercise

The California Courts Technology Center completed its third annual disaster recovery exercise over the three-day Memorial Day weekend, successfully demonstrating that infrastructure, network services, and applications could be safely and securely backed-up, redirected, and restored at an alternate site in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Disaster recovery exercises test the strength of the CCTC recovery strategy and ensure that vital court services, as well as data and communications, can be restored at a designated location. Test findings help the judicial branch identify opportunities to strengthen the CCTC disaster recovery program. These tests are meant to be a learning experience for all involved and to validate procedures in the event of a real disaster. Staff in 17 superior courts, two Courts of Appeal, and Sacramento Shared Services volunteered to participate in testing over the holiday weekend.

E-filing

Around the state, courts are in various stages of preparation of deployment of e-filing solutions. The Superior Court of Orange County is deploying small claims e-filing with California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V3 by the end of June. The Superior Courts of San Diego and Sacramento Counties initiated deployment activities for civil and small claims e-filing with CCMS V3. The Superior Court of Ventura County plans to go live with CCMS V3 e-filing in August for civil case types. A day-long visioning session to create standard uniform e-filing statewide is being planned. Work is beginning on a RFP for statewide e-filing service providers. Work has begun on requirements for an e-filing service provider for self-represented litigants.

Data Integration

The AOC delivered the local integration assessment methodology results (LIAM) to the Superior Court of Sonoma County. This is the first step in analyzing the current court integration with justice partners as the court migrates to CCMS. Work has begun on the

Traffic and Criminal Data Exchanges Specifications (DES) Release 2.2. The DES will help automate and standardize exchange of information between two systems. Changes include restructuring the DES schemas to allow for better performance and maintenance, based on lessons learned from the CCMS V2 implementation in the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County.

California Court Case Management System

During the second quarter of 2007 CCMS, the Superior Courts of San Diego and Ventura Counties became the first courts to use V3 for all three case categories: civil, small claims, and probate. The construction of mental health functionality was completed in May, and both courts will implement this new functionality into their court operations in July 2007. The Superior Courts of Sacramento and Orange Counties continue their use of the application in probate and small claims.

A major milestone was accomplished on May 8, 2007 when the AOC and Deloitte Consulting reached an agreement to begin the development phase for V4. This phase of CCMS will include adding functionality for family law, juvenile dependency, and juvenile delinquency; as well as building other judicial branch components such as statewide reporting, court interpreter and court reporter scheduling, and a wide-ranging set of integration functionality with other justice partner applications.

Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Direct Access

The Superior Court of Fresno County, using CCMS V2, is able to send traffic information directly to the DMV but cannot transmit updates directly to court abstracts. A project has been initiated to provide direct access to the DMV and allow the court to update its DMV abstracts directly into the DMV system, in approximate real-time. This application should be live during summer 2007.

The Superior Court of Fresno County continued to use the V2 application in criminal and traffic, while the AOC engaged the services of Sybase and Deloitte Consulting to focus on stabilizing and enhancing performance of the system in its court operations. In addition, a set of application enhancements were approved by the court's change control board that include several changes to improve fiscal management, courtroom and case calendaring, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System and defect management. Once V2 has been stabilized with the new technical and product enhancements, the Superior Courts of San Luis Obispo, Solano, Sonoma, and Plumas Counties will reengage their deployment efforts.

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Systems

During the past quarter, the Phoenix technical support team successfully led and coordinated Phoenix business users at 12 courts and the AOC shared-services centers for the annual disaster recovery exercise at the California Court Technology Center at the end of May.

The Phoenix technical support team developed technical requirements documentation and assisted with hardware setup at the CCTC for the new trust accounting functionality that will be implemented next fiscal year. The team also coordinated with CCTC to establish connectivity to the CCTC and provide help desk training for the seven additional Phoenix Financial courts that are currently preparing for go-live in July 2007. In addition, the Phoenix technical support team continues to provide ongoing support for database, programming, workflow, and interfaces for the 43 existing live courts.

Enhanced Collections

The Enhanced Collections Unit is administering an award program established to assist courts in enhancing or establishing their collection programs. Thirty-six courts were selected, and the collections unit is monitoring program progress, contracts, consultants and expenditures. Ten courts were assisted with their collection programs, with visits made to superior courts in Inyo, Kern, Del Norte, Humboldt, and San Benito Counties. The unit assisted OGA with amendments to Assembly Bill 367 and participated in a hearing with Assembly Member Dave Jones.

Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS)

ACCMS was successfully deployed to two additional Courts of Appeal appellate districts in May and June 2007 (Division Two of the Fourth Appellate District and the Third Appellate District). The ACCMS team also completed several architecture changes that have dramatically improved the speed of the application. ACCMS replaces the two case management systems previously used by the Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court. The ACCMS rollout to the Second Appellate District and the Supreme Court is scheduled to be completed in 2007.

Supreme Court—Court Appointed Counsel System (SCACS)

The SCACS supports the processing of payment requests of court appointed counsel working on automatic appeals of capital cases for indigent appellants. SCACS Phase Two went live on June 11 with five modules that process time and costs payment requests, interface approved payment requests with Oracle Financials, allow direct deposit for attorneys' payments, track attorney appointment information, and generate e-mail or hard copy notifications for attorneys. The system also allows users to select different fiscal year funds from which to pay attorney payment requests and to track fiscal year end accruals.

Appellate Cases Web Site

Several improvements were made to the appellate cases Web site to improve public access to appellate court case information. In particular, the e-mail notification feature for key case updates now supports hundreds of interested users per case. The Web site is scheduled for infrastructure re-architecture later this year.

The site is <http://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov>.

Administrative Office of the Courts

Security

The Emergency Response and Security Unit is committed to ensuring the safety of all employees, court personnel, and the public through a comprehensive emergency planning and security program that seeks to provide the highest level of protection for the individuals, facilities, and property of the AOC and all California courts.

Personal Security for Judicial Officers. This brochure contains tips that judicial officers can follow to increase their personal safety at home, while traveling, and at the office. It also specifically addresses mail safety, reminds readers about Judicial Privacy Protection Training, and lists contact information for the Opt-Out Program (which assists judges with removing their personal information from Internet sites).

Web-Based Continuity of Operations Planning Tool. In the wake of 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina, continuity of operations planning (COOP) has become a vital element in emergency planning. Government organizations across the country at all levels—federal, state, and local—have begun preparing for emergencies by engaging their staff and committing the time and resources necessary to develop effective and realistic plans. The AOC initiated a COOP project to assist all courts statewide with plan development and ongoing plan maintenance. This project was partially funded with federal grants from the Department of Homeland Security. The AOC identified the following assumptions as essential for the long-term success of the project:

- COOP must be developed and maintained with a minimal allocation of time and human resources by the local courts.
- Most court planners will have practically no experience with COOP or emergency planning; therefore, effective guidance must be provided.
- Large and small courts will have slightly different requirements, and all project elements must address the range of needs in courts throughout the state. The Web-based system must be scalable for use by small, medium, and large courts.

The AOC researched COOP systems for two years before procuring a Web-based COOP tool. This system can be accessed through any Internet browser and uses HTTPS (Hypertext Transfer Protocol Over Secure Socket Layer) to provide an encrypted connection that safeguards information while it is in transit (i.e., from the user's browser to the Web site server). Along with providing access to this easy-to-use, comprehensive tool, the AOC will be conducting a series of hands-on training seminars at regional locations. Technical support and COOP consulting will also be available for all planners by telephone and the Internet. In the future, the AOC plans to expand the Web-based system and this program to assist local courts with other emergency

planning elements, such as planning for emergency operations, court security, and pandemic preparedness.

Security Surveys/Reviews for Courts. ERS provides security assessments as a service to the courts. It recently distributed a memorandum to judges and executive officers explaining the difference between the two types of assessments it offers and what the process is. Court executive officers should request the assessment from ERS. Once requested, ERS will assign a project manager to conduct the security assessment. Two types of assessments are provided: a security survey or a security review. The security survey is comprehensive while the security review is localized.

Generally, all of the court's facilities are visited, with an in-depth examination of their security needs. One facility or a part of one facility is visited, and the review is conducted to evaluate specific aspects of security that are of heightened concern to the court. On the day of the assessment, ERS will meet for approximately one and a half hours with the presiding judge, executive officer, court security, facilities manager, local sheriff, and anyone else the court would like to have involved. (For example, if there are particular concerns with the clerk's windows in the Traffic Department, the manager from that department may be invited or may be met with separately during the survey.)

The goal of the meeting is to highlight any specific security concerns of the court and to discuss its self-assessment. Following that initial meeting, a court representative should take ERS on a comprehensive tour of the facilities in question. During the tour, ERS will take numerous pictures and record notes (a handheld audio recorder may be used). Based on its observations, ERS will produce a report detailing the assessment of each visited facility's safety and security needs. It will also include recommendations for improved practices and standards that ERS believes will be useful in the court's future planning efforts. The report will be provided to the court within two months of the assessment. In ideal cases, ERS will return to the court with the assessment to debrief the executive officer and presiding judge.

Personal Security Survey. A statewide survey of judges and justices was conducted to assist the AOC's Personal Security Ad-Hoc Advisory Group in examining the personal security issues faced by California's judges and justices. The survey, which was published in January 2007 using online survey software, gathered information from a large group of judges and justices about the threats they have received within the past 12 months. The survey was conducted on the Internet and announced to judicial officers by e-mail, newsletter, and Serranus. It reached over 1,500 judicial officers, and the overall response rate was approximately 57 percent, with 855 completed questionnaires. Results are now ready to be shared with the Personal Security Ad-Hoc Advisory Group. The group will discuss survey results with the Working Group on Court Security and will use the results and recommendations in its efforts to improve safety and security in the courts.

Judicial Privacy Protection Opt-Out Program. In collaboration with the California Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Privacy Protection and the California Attorney General's Office, ERS created a Judicial Privacy Protection Opt-Out Program. This program, which was based on the enactment of California Government Code section 6254.21, was designed to enhance the safety of California's judicial officers by ensuring that their home addresses and telephone numbers—and, where requested, the home addresses and telephone numbers of their resident family members—are not publicly posted or displayed on the Internet.

Below is an update on the opt-out program, including the percentage increase from February's update. The opt-out forms are distributed to new judges and commissioners at New Judges Orientation, so the numbers will continue to grow. As of May:

- 109,575 records submitted for deletion (11 percent increase)
- 11,372 unique database entries (11 percent increase)
- 1,719 judicial officers participating (8 percent increase)
- 73 percent of judicial officers have participated (3 percent increase)
- 20 databases searched

ERS will continue its efforts to understand and improve safety and security in the California courts and to propose actions that will ensure the highest possible level of personal security for judicial officers.

AOC Badge Program. At this point, almost all AOC staff members have received a combined photo identification and access card (badge). This program helps ensure the safety and security of AOC staff and property. In the past, access to the AOC's secured facility was administered by the state Department of General Services. The new badge program gives ERS knowledge of and control over who has access to secured AOC areas. All of the old access cards to AOC areas have been deleted from the building's access system. Please note that the new badges do not currently provide access to the Northern/Central Regional Office, Office of Governmental Affairs, or Southern Regional Office. However, those offices are kept open to employees during business hours. The individual building managers in those offices issue separate cards as needed (i.e., for after-hours access). A badge policy is in progress to further ensure the safety and security of AOC staff and property.

Security Coordination for Off-site, AOC-Sponsored Events. The AOC typically designs, sponsors, and arranges a number of conferences, meetings, and social events that are held off site every year. Because the safety of our guests and employees is of vital concern, AOC has established ERS as the single point of contact for coordination of security, life safety, and medical emergency requirements for these events. Event coordinators will report all off-site, AOC-sponsored events to ERS as soon as possible using the designated form, and ERS staff will coordinate security providers and coverage as needed. In many instances, security and life safety

issues will not require specific attention; however, this new process will ensure that AOC- and council-sponsored events are documented and that the location and times are recorded by ERS.

Regional Offices

In response to requests from judges participating in the new judge meetings at the regional offices, roundtable forums were organized by each of the regional offices. A total of 114 judicial officers attended the roundtable forums, which were expertly facilitated by several judges.

The Northern/Central Regional Office hosted the Civil Roundtable Forum, facilitated by Judge Lee Smalley Edmon from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County and Judge Thomas M. Maddock from the Superior Court of Contra Costa County. Discussion topics included direct calendaring versus master calendaring, case disposition standards, settlement conferences, tentative rulings, and discovery.

The Bay Area/Northern Coastal Regional Office hosted a Forum on Family and Juvenile Cases. The forum was facilitated by Judge Jerilyn L. Borack of the Superior Court of Sacramento County, Judge Carol Isackson of the Superior Court of San Diego County, and Judge S. Patricia Spear of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Topics included handling interconnected family and juvenile cases, the unified courts model, sharing information, and related statutes and rules of court.

The Southern Regional Office hosted the Criminal Roundtable Forum, which was facilitated by Judge Steven R. Van Sicklen of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Discussion topics included jury issues, courtroom assignments, direct calendaring versus master calendaring, settlement discussions, sanctions, voir dire, juror questions, discovery, and sentencing.

Attendees at the roundtable forums will each receive educational credit. They noted that the forums were beneficial to learn about alternate solutions to common problems. Many participants reported a desire to implement effective strategies in their own courts that were shared by their colleagues from across the state. They look forward to additional opportunities to interact with their colleagues in this format.

Media

Courts Illustrated Video. *Courts Illustrated* is a new video featuring local courts using innovative and problem-solving techniques to address issues facing their communities. The 58-minute video is a combination of news segments from around the state originally broadcast on *California Courts News* (CCN) and factual information about California's court system. Copies were provided to every court to support Juror Appreciation Week and for ongoing use in jury assembly rooms or other public areas of the court. The video is in a DVD format and is looped to automatically repeat. *Courts Illustrated* will be updated at least annually.

The Judicial Council Bench/Bar/Media (BBM) Committee. The inaugural meeting of the Bench/Bar/Media Committee (BBM) was held May 11, 2007. The BBM will seek to improve working relationships among judicial officers, lawyers, and journalists who report on the courts

and legal issues. A number of states have been successful in bringing together representatives of these three important groups to address areas of conflict and enhance their respective contributions to an open, independent, and impartial system of justice. The BBM was formed after conversations between Chief Justice and Ralph Alldredge, member of the board of directors of the California Newspaper Publishers Association. Although the official charge of the committee has not been established, we expect that the committee would study such issues as public and press access to court records, cameras and other electronic coverage of court proceedings, high-profile trials, and the significant role that educational programs may have in improving the mutual understanding among the bench, the bar, and journalists.

A BBM steering committee is planned to be formed in the near future. The steering committee will have representation from the courts, bar, and press, as well as other groups that were present at the first meeting, such as First Amendment associations. It will be responsible for (1) setting the direction of the main committee; (2) recommending membership of the full BBM committee to the Chief Justice; and (3) creating working groups to study such issues as public access to court records, cameras in court, and best practices for handling high profile cases, among other topics.

Statewide Meeting of Court Public Information Officers (PIOs). The first Statewide Meeting of Court Public Information Officers was held in San Francisco on June 22, 2007. This effort grew out of a Modernization Fund grant received by the AOC Public Information Office to sponsor the meeting, following requests by trial court PIOs to have regular meetings. Lynn Holton, Peter Allen, and Leanne Kozak collaborated on creating the agenda and organizing the event, which was a great success. Almost 50 public information officers, court executives, managers, and staff attended the educational program. The AOC developed a media training curriculum for the courts that was designed for PIOs of varying experience levels and for other court professionals who handle media relations and outreach activities. The sessions covered high-profile trials, successful media relations, effective interviewing techniques, and how to resolve challenging media situations.

Judges' Retirement System II

In order to have the best information available to the Judicial Council in its continuing efforts to pursue reforms of the Judges' Retirement System II, two consulting firms have been engaged to provide needed background information on judicial retirement issues. Mercer Investment Consulting is reviewing the asset allocation strategy for the Judicial Retirement Fund as well as the Public Employees Retirement Fund, which is part of the larger California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) fund. Pension Cube, which has expertise in actuarial analysis, was retained to evaluate the JRS II cost estimates and to analyze the variables that affect the costs of benefit formula changes.

Branchwide Professional Excellence/Education

B. E. Witkin Judicial College Celebrates 40 Years. In 1966, Judge Don Fretz obtained funding that resulted in the first judicial college in 1967. That first college was the only educational program for judges in the state of California. This single event in 1967 has now expanded to encompass the vast, rich, educational opportunities that the AOC's Education Division (originally created in 1973 as the Center for Judicial Education and Research from an agreement in 1972 between the California Judges Association and the Judicial Council) currently provides, including our publication, online, and broadcast offerings, as well as education and training in every assignment, from criminal law to family law, and on topics such as ethics for judges, science and the law, and complex civil and collaborative courts.

2007 California Judicial Symposium on Public Safety, Sentencing, and Corrections.³ This invitation-only event, held in June at Newport Beach, brought together supervising criminal court judges and other judicial leaders; officials from the California Department of Justice and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; representatives from law enforcement, prosecution, defense, and probation agencies; representatives of counties; academics; and individuals from victim, business, and nonprofit communities to promote better understanding of California's current approach to sentencing and corrections in relation to alternative approaches to public safety that have been adopted in other jurisdictions. Courses included: *State Sentencing Systems; Sentencing Commissions; Crime, Incarceration, Disparities, Recidivism, and Corrections Costs; State and Community Corrections Systems; Parole, Post Release Supervision, and Re-Entry; Evidence Based Practices: What Works to Reduce Recidivism, Sentencing Information Systems.*

Minimum Education Recording and Reporting Forms. Earlier this year, the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee approved the content for the forms that are to be used by trial court judges for recording and reporting their participation in education events. These forms were subsequently presented to the trial court judges. At the request of the presiding judges, AOC staff is developing electronic/automated recording and reporting forms for individual judges and for the presiding judges' aggregate reports. User testing is currently under way. The automated forms will be demonstrated to the presiding judges and court executive officers on July 19. Whether a court will use the automated forms or fillable Word documents will be left to the discretion of the presiding judge. Once decided, the appropriate documents will then be distributed to the courts during the two weeks following the July 19 demonstration.

Web Page on Minimum Education Requirements and Expectations. The Education Division has developed a "one-stop shopping" Serranus Web page on minimum education requirements and expectations. The goal of this site is to have one main source for all information related to education requirements and expectations. The site is divided into two sections:

- Judicial Education; and

³ This was an inaugural program developed in collaboration with the AOC scholar-in-residence, Judge Roger K. Warren (Ret.).

- Trial Court Executive, Management, and Personnel Education.

The section for judicial education includes:

- *Requirements and Expectations*: A summary of the requirements and expectations, links to the rules of court, links to other required education in the rules of court and various California codes, and a link to information about qualifying ethics;
- *Recording and Reporting*: Information on what must be recorded and reported, the aggregate education reporting form, the individual judge education recording and reporting form, and a form for local courts to modify as a certificate of participation for education courses offered by the court;
- *About Education Requirements and Expectations*: A history of the rules of court adopted by the Judicial Council at its October 20, 2006, meeting that went into effect January 1, 2007; and
- *Resources*: Guidelines for implementation of the rules, answers to frequently asked questions (FAQs), a form to request approval of a course for education credit sponsored by a group not included in the approved providers list, and templates to assist in developing individual learning plans.

The section for trial court executive, management, and personnel education includes:

- *Requirements*: A summary of the requirements and links to the rules of court; and
- *Resources*: Guidelines for implementation of the rules, answers to frequently asked questions (FAQs), a form for local courts to modify as a certificate of participation for education courses offered by the court, a form to request approval of a course for education credit sponsored by a group not included in the approved providers list, and templates to assist in developing individual learning plans.

Court Security Funding Training. Five training sessions were held throughout the state in May and early June for sheriff and court personnel involved with preparing and submitting security cost data to ensure that AOC staff will have complete and accurate data for the purpose of allocation development. This training represents part of our efforts to streamline the security cost survey process for FY 2007–2008 and to make it easier to understand so that the data can be more easily compiled and verified. The anticipated result is that courts will receive FY 2007–2008 security funding allocations in a timely manner.

Law Curriculum/Law-Themed Education Meeting. The AOC hosted a June 15, 2007, meeting organized by Dr. Sarah Redfield, a visiting professor at University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law. The purpose of the meeting was for participants to:

- Consider the nature of law-themed curricula or units that would offer the best approach in California schools and that can be shared in California;

- Discuss ways the legal community can better partner with and support law-themed schools and work; and
- Consider obstacles to ideas and how to overcome them.

Meeting participants discussed some of the AOC's major projects in the area of law-related education and the promotion of future careers in the bar and on the bench to diverse populations. Although the AOC does not have a specific focus concerning promoting law-themed schools, the AOC invited Dr. Fran Chadwick of California State University at San Marcos, the consultant overseeing the AOC's K-12 Teacher Training Institute, to attend and provide her perspective regarding civics curriculum development.

Attendees at the meeting included Mr. Gary Hoachlander, director of ConnectED in Oakland, an Irvine Foundation-funded project that promotes and supports various career-themed education tracks in secondary schools. Other meeting attendees included Ms. Pat Lee (director, Council on Access and Fairness, State Bar of California), Mr. Stuart Forsyth (executive director, Los Angeles County Bar Association), Ms. Elizabeth Parker (dean, University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law), Dr. Pat Ainsworth (assistant superintendent; secondary, postsecondary, and adult education; California Department of Education), other academics, a representative from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and a senior fellow from the Stupski Foundation.

2007 Judicial Branch Information Technology Conference. Over 190 court executive officers; appellate court clerk/administrators; information technology (IT) leaders from the superior courts, Courts of Appeal, and Supreme Court; and AOC staff attended the June 14, 2007, Judicial Branch Information Technology Conference in San Francisco. The theme was the "Judicial Branch Enterprise Model: Supporting Quality and Justice in a New Era of Information Technology." Presenters included Professor Clark Kelso, chief information officer for the State of California; Supreme Court Associate Justice Ming W. Chin; Presiding Judge Terence L. Bruiniers of the Superior Court of Contra Costa County and vice-chair of the Court Technology Advisory Committee; Justice Laurence Donald Kay (Ret.); Judge Joseph Spero, U.S. District Court; IT directors for the courts; and other government and business partners.

2007 California Conference on Self-Represented Litigants. The 2007 California Conference on Self-Represented Litigants was a week of events in San Francisco, May 14-18, 2007, beginning with required training for Assembly Bill 1058 family law facilitators and ending with a meeting of the national Self-Represented Litigation Network. Three hundred judicial officers, court administrators, family law facilitators, and self-help center providers convened with experts from across the country to discuss strategies to improve access and services for self-represented litigants.

2007 Family Dispute Resolution Statewide Educational Institute. The 2007 Family Dispute Resolution Statewide Educational Institute brought together over 400 court-connected child custody and juvenile dependency mediators from across California for mandatory continuing

education. Some workshops were held in conjunction with the Family Law Institute, which provided judges and mediators the opportunity to attend workshops of common interest.

Collaborative Justice Courts. Collaborative Justice Project staff coordinated and facilitated workshops at several state and national educational symposia, including a national meeting of participants in the Council of State Governments initiative to address mentally ill offenders, a national symposia on problem-solving courts coordinated by the Center for Court Innovation, the statewide conference of the Office of Traffic Safety, and the national and state conferences of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals and California Association of Drug Court Professionals.

Peer Court DUI Prevention Strategies Program Curriculum. The Judicial Council of California and Administrative Office of the Courts, in partnership with California's peer/youth court system, has developed and is currently implementing a statewide Peer Courts DUI Prevention Strategies Program Curriculum. The goal of the program is to educate at-risk youths and their parents on the dangers and consequences of driving under the influence and to engender long-lasting changes in their attitudes and behaviors.

Every Child, Every Hearing. This booklet was published and distributed statewide. It offers key questions (with accompanying citations) that must be asked and followed up on for every child in the dependency system. For children served by the juvenile courts, consistent inquiry into these questions is necessary to help them transition to their home of origin or to another permanent plan when reunification is not possible.

Other Educational Events. The AOC Education Division offered numerous educational events for the courts in April, May, and June:

- **New Judge Orientation** (May 7–11; 12 participants)
- **Cow County Judges Institute**

(May 16–18 in Rohnert Park; 79 participants)

Courses included: *Children of Domestic Violence; Sex Crimes Sentencing; Felony Sentencing After Cunningham v. California; Search and Seizure Update; Small Claims; Guardianships and De Facto Parents in Family Court; Civil Law and Motion; Juvenile Dependency Overview; Ethics Roundtable: Overcoming Language Barriers; Computer Course: Lexis-Nexis HotDocs® Software for CALCRIM; Family Law Overview; The New Relationship Between Drug Courts and Proposition 36 Funding: Are You About to Lose Funding?; Computer Course: Lexis-Nexis Research; Alternative Courts Roundtable: Find Solutions to Your Frustrations; Computer Course: Outlook and Word Tips and Tricks; Mental Health and Competency: An Overview of Criminal and Civil Issues; Unlawful Detainers; Computer Course: Westlaw Research; DUI Trials; Computer Course: Child Support Calculation Software.*

B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California (June 10–22 in Berkeley; 117 participants). This year marks the 40th anniversary of the Judicial College and nearly 50 courses were offered.

Courses included: 3 Strikes; Alcohol and other Drugs (AOD) and the Courts; Americans With Disabilities Act; Arraignments and Bail; Basic Civil Law; Basic Criminal Law; Basic Family Law; Basic Juvenile Law—Delinquency; Basic Juvenile Law—Dependency; Calendar Management; Civil Case Management; Civil Discovery; Civil Posttrial Motions; Civil Settlement Techniques and Live Settlement Conference; Computer Basics: Practical Tools and Techniques Every Bench Officer Should Know and Use Computer Tools (Including HotDocs Jury Instructions); Confessions and Admissions; Courtroom Control; Criminal and Civil Law Update; Criminal Discovery; Criminal Jury Instructions; Criminal Sexual Assault; Default Judgments; Documentary and Electronic Evidence; Domestic Violence Awareness; DUI Trials; Effective Jury Management; Evidence; Science and the Law: Handling Experts; Felony Sentencing 100; Felony Sentencing 200; Judicial Ethics Forum; Marsden and Faretta; MBTI—Understanding Personalities; Measure for Measure: A Trial Judge's Guide to the Philosophy of Judging; Misdemeanor Sentencing; Personal Security and Judicial Privacy Protection; Pitchess Motions; Preliminary Hearings and 995s; Proposition 36 Drug Courts; Search and Seizure; Search Warrant Basics; Small Claims and Consumer Law; Specialty Court Principles; Speedy Trials; Spoken Language; Interpreters; Trials; Unlawful Detainers; Traffic; Working With Self-Represented Litigants.

- **Qualifying Ethics Program; Third Cycle.** The third iteration of the Judicial Council's Qualifying Ethics Program is well under way. Since April, five programs have been offered throughout the state with the number of participants ranging from 15 to 37.
- **Phoenix New User Training.** This education consists of a series of courses to train court personnel who will be using Phoenix. The first series of courses began in late May, by invitation only, in San Diego, Santa Ana, and San Francisco. Courses were then offered on the topics of requisitions, buyer, accounts payable, and general ledger for various size audiences on multiple dates in multiple locations.
- **Trial Court Manager/Supervisor Regional Trainings.** These education events are offered in each of the AOC's regional offices. Since April, several programs have been offered consisting of the Core 40 (introduction to supervision) and Dispute Resolution Skills courses with approximately 30 participants at each program.
- **Court Staff Regional Trainings.** These courses are offered in each of the AOC's regional offices. Since April, several programs have been offered consisting of the Traffic Office Procedure, DMV Abstract Training, and Death Penalty Appeals courses with approximately 18 to 37 participants at each program.

- **Broadcasts.** Since April, several broadcasts have been conducted and covered the following topics:
 - Orientation to the Judicial Branch;
 - *California Courts News* (CCN), offered four times;
 - Integrated Disability Management (for managers and supervisors);
 - Continuing the Dialogue: Overcoming Language Barriers;
 - Preventing and Responding to Sexual Harassment (for judicial officers);
 - Great Minds: Trial Pitfalls, featuring Justice Paul Turner;
 - Preventing and Responding to Sexual Harassment (for managers and supervisors); and
 - Sexual Harassment Awareness and Prevention (for staff).

- **AOC Education.** Since April, the following education events were offered to AOC staff in the San Francisco and Burbank offices:
 - Earthquake Preparedness;
 - Shelter in Place;
 - Disaster Response Team;
 - AOC New Employee Orientation;
 - Integrated Disability Management: Reasonable Accommodation and Injury and Illness Prevention (for managers and supervisors);
 - Assault Prevention Theory;
 - Assault Prevention Workshop;
 - Adult CPR/First Aid/AED Training;
 - Supervising and Managing at the AOC (for new managers and supervisors);
 - Earthquake Preparedness;
 - Shelter in Place (Burbank); and
 - Preventing and Responding to Sexual Harassment (for managers and supervisors).

Web Services and Development

Enhancements to AOC Web sites. Updated software and new hardware were installed to provide statistics for AOC Web sites. This software will provide more timely statistics and will help the AOC design more responsive Web sites. The Trial Court Planning Web site was enhanced to accept online submissions of strategic plans. The site was already accepting online submissions of trial court operational plans. In addition, there were changes to the existing Trial Court Operational Plans and the Annual Progress Report sections of the site. Information Services provided business systems analyst support to the Center for Families, Children & the Courts. A request for proposal (RFP) to develop a driving under the influence prevention Web site was drafted, responses to the RFP were evaluated, and a vendor was chosen.

JRS II. A new interactive calculator for the Judges' Retirement System II (JRS II) was developed, tested, and put into production on Serranus. The JRS II Monetary Credit Plan

Estimator is a financial planning tool to provide guidance to judges in determining the probable value of future JRS II Monetary Credit Account balances.

AOC Web Redesign. This effort is scheduled to begin in June 2007 and conclude with the redesign and relaunch of all AOC-maintained Web sites in January 2008. The project will include the creation of a new graphic design scheme for all sites, as well as improved information architecture to help site users find information more easily. The project will be guided by a Web Services Council comprised of managers from the Executive Office Programs Division; Education Division/CJER; Information Services Division; and Center for Families, Children & the Courts. Stakeholders throughout the AOC as well as the appellate courts and the Supreme Court will be consulted throughout the project. The official kick-off date for the project is June 20, 2007.

Other AOC Initiatives

CourTools Court Performance Measures Project Phase II. The CourTools project will begin a second round of implementation with the addition of two more courts. The project will begin in June 2007. The set of 10 core performance measures will be implemented in two additional trial courts. The measures included are the following: Access and Fairness, Clearance Rates, Time to Disposition, Age of Active Pending Caseload, Trial Date Certainty, Reliability and Integrity of Case Files, Collection of Monetary Penalties, Effective Use of Jurors, Court Employee Satisfaction, and Cost per Case.

Conservatorship Data Auditing/Data Collection. A methodology has been developed for allocating \$32 million in new funding over two years. This methodology was presented to the Trial Court Budget Working Group. A follow-up validation of data in 19 courts was conducted as well as a case-file review of conservatorship cases in one court.

Access and Fairness Survey of Court Users in San Mateo County. After the completion of the CourTools pilot project in two California trial courts, the Superior Courts of San Mateo and San Joaquin Counties, the Superior Court of San Mateo County has requested assistance to continue to collect data on selected measures. The AOC will assist the court in the second-year implementation of the Access and Fairness survey (measure 1). This is a survey conducted at the court and open to all court users on a single day. The survey will be implemented in all court locations in San Mateo County on two days at the end of July.

Family Law Caseflow Management Project. Teams organized by CFCC have completed technical assistance to the Superior Courts of San Diego, Fresno, Sonoma, and Orange Counties. These courts requested assistance in implementing some or all of the action plans they had crafted at the November 2005 workshops on Family Law Caseflow Management, as well as input on their general caseflow operations and business practices. The technical assistance teams consisted of Deborah Chase, project manager; John Greacen, project consultant; other CFCC staff; and judges and court staff from other courts working as subject matter experts. The teams spent three days at each court conducting interviews and observing courtroom and business

operations. At the end of the third day, specific observations and recommendations were discussed with the court. Visits to the courts in Ventura, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties are scheduled later this summer.

JusticeCorps Grant. California Volunteers, the state AmeriCorps grantor, awarded the proposed expanded California JusticeCorps program a new three-year grant beginning this July. The full \$750,000 annual request will be funded. This grant award will allow expansion of the JusticeCorps program this fall to include:

- In Los Angeles County, approximately 160 students serving 300 hours and another 7–8 students serving full time; and
- In the Bay Area, approximately 100 students serving 300 hours and another student serving full time.

In addition, this grant allows the use of AmeriCorps positions to start an initial program in San Diego County with about 20 students serving 300 hours.

Court Leadership Meetings Focusing on Procedural Fairness. Meetings were held with the leadership of seven superior courts in April and May to discuss strategies and priorities on enhancing public trust and confidence through a procedural fairness focus. Meetings took place in April and May with leaders of the Superior Courts of Orange, Riverside, San Diego, Sacramento, Tehama, Mendocino, and Contra Costa Counties.

The outcomes of the meetings included:

- Learning from court leaders what procedural fairness means in various court settings and how the elements of procedural fairness are addressed in specific court programs and court operations as a whole;
- The challenges of achieving procedural fairness in different case types and with varying levels of resources, particularly in high-volume case types;
- Examples of approaches designed to overcome challenges and enhance “quality of justice”; and
- Suggestions concerning topic areas and areas of focus for the upcoming Task Force on Procedural Fairness in the Courts.

Staff summarized the outcomes of the meetings and shared their findings with AOC executive leadership. The knowledge gained from the visits is assisting in development of a proposed change and scope of work for the task force, which will launch in September 2007.



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

770 L Street, Suite 700 • Sacramento, California 95814-3393

Telephone 916-323-3121 • Fax 916-323-4347 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Ronald M. George
Members of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee
William C. Vickrey, Administrative Director of the Courts

FROM: Kathleen Howard, Director
Office of Governmental Affairs

DATE: June 27, 2007

RE: Status of 2007 legislation considered by the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee

Following is the status report on 2007 legislation considered by the Judicial Council's Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC) during the 2007-2008 legislative session. The bills are listed in numerical order by house (Assembly and Senate) and are indexed by subject matter. The second column, "description" summarizes the relevant portions of the bill—and the version of the bill—on which the PCLC position is based. The description column also includes an updated summary to reflect the most current version of the bill. The "Judicial Council position" column tracks the council's initial position and any subsequent change to that position.

The text of all versions of a bill, committee analyses, vote information, history, and bill status can be found on the Legislature's website (including past session information) at: <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.html>

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee Action on 2007 Legislation
and Status of Bills

Judicial Council-sponsored Legislation (See Appendix)

AB 159 (Jones) – Courts: judgeships.....	A
AB 227 (Beall) – Trial court funding.....	A
AB 367 (De León) – Court-ordered debts.....	B
AB 467 (Feuer) – Courts: access to justice.....	B
AB 926 (Evans) – Civil discovery.....	C
AB 1248 (Evans) – Courts.....	C
AB 1464 (Benoit) – Vehicles: preclusion of vehicle registration and issuance of arrest warrant.....	C
SB 145 (Corbett) – Court facilities.....	D
SB 340 (Ackerman) – Access to Criminal History Information by Court Investigators.....	D
SB 396 (Ridley-Thomas) – Dispute Resolution.....	D

Legislation Index by Subject

<u>Civil and Small Claims</u>		
AB 500 (Lieu) – Civil actions: telephonic appearances	4	<u>Fees, Fines, and Penalties</u>
AB 926 (Evans) – Civil discovery	6	SB 396 (Ridley-Thomas) – Dispute Resolution
AB 1126 (Eng) – Civil discovery: unlawful detainer; subpoenas	6	SB 539 (Margett) – Trial Court Trust Fund
AB 1264 (Eng) – Courts: delay reduction: status conferences	7	<u>Judicial Officers</u>
		AB 159 (Jones) – Courts: judgeships
<u>Court Facilities, Employees, and Technology</u>		<u>Juries</u>
AB 163 (Mendoza) – Trial courts: limited-term employees	2	AB 1557 (Feuer) – Jury selection: peremptory challenges
AB 276 (Solorio) – Trial courts: limited-term employees	2	<u>Juvenile Delinquency</u>
AB 582 (Evans) – Court transcription fees	5	AB 1547 (Beall) – Juvenile court: termination of jurisdiction
AB 863 (Davis) – Los Angeles County Superior Court Employees	6	<u>Juvenile Dependency</u>
AB 1340 (Jones) – Safe and Secure Court Facility Bond Act of 2008	7	AB 369 (Solorio) – Child abuse reporting
AB 1726 (Committee on Judiciary) – Evidence: court interpreters	9	SB 241 (Kuehl) – Minors: legal representation: probate proceedings
SB 145 (Corbett) – Court facilities	10	<u>Miscellaneous</u>
SB 431 (Aanestad and Wiggins) – Public employees' retirement: Butte County and Solano County	12	AB 467 (Feuer) – Courts: access to justice
		AB 1723 (Committee on Judiciary) – Attorneys: interest on lawyer trust accounts
<u>Criminal Law and Procedure</u>		<u>Probate</u>
AB 1424 (Davis) – Elder abuse: continuances	8	AB 1727 (Committee on Judiciary) – Conservators and Guardians
AB 1582 (Calderon, C.) – Crimes: marijuana: possession: penalty	9	SB 800 (Corbett) – Conservators and guardians: care plans
AB 1660 (La Malfa) – Victims' rights: presence during criminal proceedings	9	<u>Traffic</u>
SB 340 (Ackerman) – Access to Criminal History Information by Court Investigators	11	AB 112 (Wolk) – Highways: Safety Enhancement Double Fine Zones
		AB 117 (Beall) – Traffic offenses: additional assessment: traffic safety
<u>Family Law</u>		
SB 403 (Harman) – Child custody and visitation: drug and alcohol testing	11	

AB 758 (Plescia) – Vehicles: traffic violator schools: regulation
AB 1258 (Caballero) – Highways: Safety Enhancement Double Fine Zones
AB 1464 (Benoit) – Vehicles: Preclusion of vehicle registration and issuance of
arrest warrant

6

7

8

Trial Court Funding/Operations

AB 227 (Beall) – Trial court funding
AB 367 (De León) – Court-ordered debts
AB 1248 (Evans) – Courts

2

3

7

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee Action on 2007 Legislation
and Status of Bills

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 112 (June Clark)	<p>AB 112 (Wolk) – Highways, Safety Enhancement Double Fine Zones</p> <p>As amended March 12, 2007 Designates a segment of State Highway Route 12 in Solano and San Joaquin Counties as a Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone upon approval of specified county resolutions and until January 1, 2012.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 28, 2007 <i>Revises the procedures for designating double fine zones and designates a segment of State Highway Route 12 in Solano and San Joaquin Counties as a Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone.</i></p>	<p>Oppose; further complicates court fine structure. Moratorium until Judicial Council completes Fines Collection Task Force work.</p> <p>Update: <i>As amended June 28, 2007</i> <i>Oppose</i></p>	Author	Senate Public Safety Committee
AB 117 (June Clark)	<p>AB 117 (Beal) – Traffic offenses; additional assessment; traffic safety</p> <p>As introduced Provides that, until January 1, 2010, a county may choose to levy an additional assessment for a highway traffic violation in the amount of \$2 for every \$10 or fraction thereof, upon each base fine, excluding other penalty assessments, fees, or additions. Requires that the collected assessment be deposited in a Traffic Safety Committee Network fund, and that the monies be allocated so that, after deducting administrative costs, 85 percent shall be used in traffic safety programs approved by the county board of supervisors, and 15 percent shall be deposited in the county's courthouse construction fund.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended March 22, 2007 <i>Amendments narrow bill to authorize only Santa Clara County to elect to impose the \$2 assessment.</i></p>	<p>Oppose; further complicates court fine structure. Moratorium until Judicial Council completes Fines Collection Task Force work.</p>	Author	Senate Public Safety Committee
AB 159 (Donna Hershkowitz)	<p>AB 159 (Jones) – Courts; judgeships</p> <p>As introduced Creates 50 new superior court judgeships in fiscal year 2007-08, to be allocated pursuant to the model approved by the Judicial Council. Authorizes the conversion of certain eligible subordinate judicial officer positions, upon vacancy, to judgeships. Creates an unspecified number of appellate judicial positions.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 21, 2007 <i>Creates an unspecified number of new superior court judgeships in fiscal year 2007-08, to be allocated pursuant to the model approved by the Judicial Council. Authorizes the conversion of 162 subordinate judicial officers, in eligible courts, to judgeships. The conversion would occur upon vacancy, and is limited to 16 per year, statewide. Requires the Governor to report annually demographic gender, race, and ethnicity data of all judicial appointments or nominations.</i></p>	Sponsor	Judicial Council	Senate Judiciary Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 163 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 163 (Mendoza) – Trial courts: limited-term employees</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Prohibits the Superior Court of Los Angeles County from employing any limited-term law clerk for more than 180 days. Provides that any limited-term law clerk employed for more than 180 calendar days becomes a regular employee. This bill is similar to AB 176 (Bermudez) and AB 1797 (Bermudez), which were passed by the Legislature in 2005 and 2006 and were vetoed by the Governor.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 1, 2007</p> <p><i>Addresses another subject, no longer affects trial courts.</i></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>Update: <i>As amended March 28, 2007</i> <i>No position</i></p>	<p>American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)</p>	<p>Senate Governmental Organization Committee</p>
AB 227 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 227 (Beal) – Trial court funding</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Courtifies changes to the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) payments made by counties to the state for trial court funding. Changes are consistent with negotiated buyouts related to undesignated fees and AB 233 fees buyouts.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended March 22, 2007</p> <p><i>Same as above and corrects the new MOE for Mendocino County.</i></p>	<p>Sponsor</p>	<p>Judicial Council</p>	<p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>
AB 276 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 276 (Solarte) – Trial courts: limited-term employees</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Provides that a limited-term employee is a regular trial court employee if the limited-term employee has completed 180 days of service, and if the assignment, position, or project of the limited-term employee is an integral part of the long-term, regular work of the trial court. This bill is similar to AB 176 (Bermudez) and AB 1797 (Bermudez), which were passed by the Legislature in 2005 and 2006 and were vetoed by the Governor.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended March 15, 2007</p> <p><i>Spot bill; no substantive impact on trial courts.</i></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>Update: <i>As amended March 15, 2007</i> <i>No position</i></p>	<p>American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)</p>	<p>Assembly Public Employees, Retirement & Social Security Committee</p> <p>2-year bill</p>

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 367 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 367 (De Leon) – Court-ordered debts</p> <p>As introduced Establishes a task force on criminal court-ordered fines and penalties that will make recommendations for simplifying California's criminal fine and penalty assessment, collection, and distribution system. Reduces the minimum fine required by the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collection Program from \$250 to \$100 and expands the program to include collections for registration, pedestrian, and bicycle violations.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended May 15, 2007 <i>Same as above and 1) clarifies that it applies to traffic-related offenses, 2) requires the Judicial Council to develop performance measures and benchmarks to review the effectiveness of collection programs, and 3) requires the task force to document recent annual revenues from the various penalty assessments and surcharges and, to the extent feasible, evaluate the extent to which the amount of each penalty assessment and surcharge impacts total annual revenues and the actual amounts assessed.</i></p>	Sponsor	Judicial Council	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 369 (Tracy Kenny)	<p>AB 369 (Solero) – Child abuse reporting</p> <p>As introduced Authorizes CASA organizations in California to submit fingerprint information on prospective CASA volunteers to the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to determine whether there is relevant information pertaining to that individual in the Child Abuse Central Index (CACI), in addition to the criminal history information that is currently provided regarding each prospective volunteer.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 5, 2007 <i>Same as above; technical amendments.</i></p>	Support	California Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) Association	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 467 (Tracy Kenny)	<p>AB 467 (Feuer) – Courts' access to justice</p> <p>As introduced States legislative findings regarding court fee waivers and access to justice. Provides that equal justice requires that all persons have access to the court without regard to economic means. Further provides that those who are able to pay court fees should do so, and courts should recover previously waived fees when appropriate.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 4, 2007 <i>Revises and recasts provisions for court fee waivers for indigent litigants. Clarifies required application processing procedures. Requires recovery of fees in specified cases, and provides procedures for reconsideration of fee waivers during the pendency of the case. In addition, provides separate fee waiver application processing procedures for the appellate courts.</i></p>	Sponsor	Judicial Council	Senate Public Safety Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 500 (Daniel Pone)	<p>AB 500 (Lieu) – Civil actions, telephonic appearances</p> <p><i>As amended June 12, 2007</i></p> <p>Among other things, specifies generally that a party may appear by telephone in all general civil cases at case management conferences, and other specified conferences, hearings and proceedings. Provides that a court may require a party to appear in person at such hearings, conferences, or proceedings if the court determines, on a hearing-by-hearing basis, that a personal appearance would materially assist in the determination of the proceedings or in the effective management or resolution of the particular case.</p>	Support	Consumer Attorneys of California	Senate Appropriations Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
<p>AB 582 (Donna Hershkowitz)</p>	<p>AB 582 (Evans) - Court transcription fees</p> <p>As amended April 10, 2007</p> <p>Increases the fee for the original and copies of court reporter transcripts for three consecutive years by a specified amount, and then increases the fee annually by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI). Expands the 50 percent additional charge for daily copy service to criminal transcripts. Requires the Administrative Office of the Courts to publish an updated transcript fee schedule based on the increases tied to the CPI.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 1, 2007</p> <p>Increases the fee for the original and copies of court reporter transcripts for three consecutive years, and then increases the fee annually by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers. Expands the 50 percent additional charge for daily copy service to criminal transcripts. Requires the Administrative Office of the Courts to publish an updated transcript fee scheduled based on the increases tied to the CPI. Specifies a uniform format for all court transcripts, and increases access to the Transcript Reimbursement Fund for indigent pro per litigants.</p>	<p>Oppose unless amended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) adopt recommendations of Reporting of Record Task Force re: uniform transcripts 2) address impacts on low income litigants by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) providing for electronic recording in critical case types b) expanding access to Transcript Reimbursement Fund 3) provide funding outside of SAL <p>Update: As amended April 30, 2007 No position As amended June 1, 2007</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No position on amount of transcript rate increase or transcript costs, if funded outside of SAL. 2) Support uniform transcript standards, if amended to include additional uniformity recommendations of the RRTF. 3) Oppose unless amended to ensure changes to the Transcript Reimbursement Fund are sufficient to effectively mitigate the impact on low-income litigants. 	<p>Service Employees International Union</p>	<p>Senate Judiciary Committee</p>

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 758 (June Clark)	<p><u>AB 758 (Plescia) – Vehicles: Traffic violator schools; regulation</u></p> <p>As proposed to be amended Provides for the licensing and regulation of home study-based traffic violator schools by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV).</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 1, 2007 <i>Requires the Department of Motor Vehicles, on or before July 1, 2008, to submit a report to the Legislature containing a comprehensive plan with specified components by which the licensing of all driving instruction programs offered to traffic violators may be consolidated under the authority of the department.</i></p>	Support; relieve courts of inappropriate regulatory responsibility.	TrafficSchool.com Distance Learning Company, Inc.	Senate Transportation and Housing Committee
AB 863 (Eraina Ortega)	<p><u>AB 863 (Davis) – Los Angeles County Superior Court Employees</u></p> <p>As introduced Requires the Los Angeles Superior Court to pay each employee in specified bargaining units two months "back pay" in the amount the employee would have received if the employee's reclassification raise that occurred on October 1, 2005, had been made retroactive to August 1, 2005.</p>	No position	American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 926 (Daniel Pone)	<p><u>AB 926 (Evans) – Civil discovery</u></p> <p>As amended April 17, 2007 Amends three discovery statutes to clarify the time for production of documents. Provides that parties may agree to extend the time for inspection.</p>	Sponsor	Judicial Council	Senate Judiciary Committee
AB 1126 (Daniel Pone)	<p><u>AB 1126 (Eng) – Civil discovery; unlawful detainer; subpoenas</u></p> <p>As introduced February 23, 2007 Provides, among other things, that in unlawful detainer actions and other specified summary proceedings involving the possession of real property, a discovery motion may be made at any time upon giving five days notice. Requires the Judicial Council to adopt rules prescribing the time for the filing and service of opposition and reply papers relating to specified motions filed in connection with the above summary proceedings. Allows a plaintiff in those summary proceedings to propound interrogatories, make a demand for inspection, and make requests for admission without leave of court at any time that is five days after service of the summons on, or appearance by, the relevant party, whichever occurs first. Makes related changes to the procedures governing discovery in those summary proceedings.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended March 27, 2007 <i>Same as above, and makes technical changes conforming the provisions of law protecting employees whose records are subject to a subpoena to the provisions protecting consumers.</i></p>	Support	California Law Revision Commission	Senate Appropriations Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 1248 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 1248 (Eraina) — Courts</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Amending other things, makes technical and clarifying changes to the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act of 2005, clarifies the fine for production of documents pursuant to demand for production, and removes the cap on habeas investigations costs paid by the Supreme Court.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 19, 2007</p> <p>Same as above and allows the courts to charge the current "night court assessment" for court sessions held on weekends, allows the courts to collect bail forfeitures in installment payments without requiring the individual to make an appearance in court, allows staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts to staff a non-profit organization created by the Judicial Council, and requires the Judicial Council to establish a travel policy for the judicial branch, changes the date when the Judicial Council must adjust the amount a parent or guardian may be liable for minors' actions, and clarifies fine and penalty statutes to abrogate the decision in <i>People v. Chavez</i> (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 1340.</p>	Sponsor	Judicial Council	Senate Judiciary Committee
AB 1258 (June Clark)	<p>AB 1258 (Caballero) — Highways: Safety Enhancement Double Fine Zones</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Designates a segment of State Highway Route 101 and a segment of County Road 16 in Monterey County as Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zones.</p>	Oppose; further complicates court fine structure. Moratorium until Judicial Council completes Fines Collection Task Force work.	Author	Assembly Transportation Committee 2-year bill
AB 1264 (Daniel Pone)	<p>AB 1264 (Eng) — Courts: delay reduction, status conferences</p> <p>As amended April 11, 2007</p> <p>Among other things, restricts the court's ability to set various status conferences, other than the initial case management conference and the pre-trial status conference. Prohibits delay reduction rules from requiring the severance of unnamed defendants prior to the conclusion of the introduction of evidence at trial, except upon stipulation or motion of the parties.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 20, 2007</p> <p>Prohibits delay reduction rules from requiring the severance of unnamed defendants prior to the conclusion of the introduction of evidence at trial, except upon stipulation or motion of the parties.</p>	None while negotiations with sponsor continue. [Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee designee to assist OGA staff in negotiations with the author and sponsor.]	Consumer Attorneys of California	Senate Judiciary Committee
AB 1340 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 1340 (Jones) — Safe and Secure Court Facility Bond Act of 2008</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Authorizes a ballot measure for the issuance of \$2 billion in bonds for the acquisition, design, construction, or renovation of court facilities</p>	Support	Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger	Assembly Judiciary Committee 2-year bill

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 1424 (June Clark)	<p><u>AB 1424 (Davis) – Elder abuse: continuance</u></p> <p>As introduced Among other things, adds cases involving elder or dependent abuse to the list of types of cases that are categorically eligible for a good cause continuance in criminal proceedings under Penal Code section 1050.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended March 29, 2007 Deletes provisions that were basis of council opposition.</p>	<p>Oppose unless amended; inappropriately interferes with court's authority.</p> <p>Update: As amended March 29, 2007 Opposition withdrawn</p>	Los Angeles City Attorney Rocky Delgado	Senate Public Safety Committee
AB 1464 (June Clark)	<p><u>AB 1464 (Benoit) – Vehicles: Preclusion of vehicle registration and issuance of arrest warrant</u></p> <p>As introduced Allows the court, after proper notice to the owner/violator, to report a failure to appear on an unsigned citation issued for an owner-responsibility offense to the Department of Motor Vehicles for a hold to be placed on the registration of the vehicle involved in the offense. To ensure due process rights are protected, requires notice to the owner/violator, and allows 21 days for response if the owner/violator was not present when the citation is issued, rather than the usual 10 days.</p>	Sponsor	Judicial Council	Senate Public Safety Committee
AB 1547 (Tracy Kenny)	<p><u>AB 1547 (Beall) – Juvenile court: termination of jurisdiction</u></p> <p>As introduced Authorizes the juvenile court to order the probation department to provide a variety of services to a delinquent ward approaching the age of majority. These services include providing information on siblings, securing a birth certificate, social security card, and DMV identification card as appropriate; and assisting the ward in obtaining Medi-Cal or other health insurance, transitional housing or other housing assistance, and employment or higher education. These services are currently required to be provided to all dependent children approaching majority (Welfare and Institutions Code section 391). Further requires the Judicial Council to develop and implement standards and forms as necessary to implement the bill (also analogous to the dependency provisions).</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended April 19, 2007 Requires probation to deliver the services described above at least six months before a hearing to terminate jurisdiction which will be occurring when the ward is approaching 18 years of age. In addition, allows the probation department to demonstrate that it has offered the required services to the ward and the services were refused by ward in lieu of reporting to the court that services were provided.</p>	Support	Author	Assembly Appropriations Committee— Suspense file. 2-year bill
AB 1557 (June Clark)	<p><u>AB 1557 (Feier) – Jury selection: peremptory challenges</u></p> <p>As introduced Reduces peremptory challenges to 6 per side in all misdemeanor cases, rather than only those misdemeanors resulting in imprisonment for 90 days or less.</p>	Support; improves jury system.	California Judges Association	Assembly Inactive File 2-year bill

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 1582 (June Clark)	AB 1582 (Calderon, C.) — Crimes, marijuana, possession, penalty As introduced Reclassifies from a misdemeanor to an infraction a first offense for possession of not more than 28.5 grams of marijuana, and would make it an alternate infraction/misdemeanor for a second or subsequent offense.	Support, more efficient use of jurors and courts' time.	Judge Quentin Kopp (Ret.)	Assembly Public Safety Committee 2-year bill
AB 1660 (June Clark)	AB 1660 (La Malfa) — Victims, rights, presence during criminal proceedings As amended March 29, 2007 Deletes the court's authority to exclude a victim or a designated victim's representative from a criminal proceeding. <i>UPDATE: As amended June 6, 2007</i> <i>Provides that after a victim has testified in a criminal proceeding, the victim or his or her designee has a right to be present at any subsequent proceedings, except as specified.</i>	Oppose	Doris Tate Crime Victims Bureau, Crime Victims United, and Force 100	Senate Public Safety Committee
AB 1723 (Tracy Kenny)	AB 1723 (Committee on Judiciary) — Attorneys, interest on lawyer trust accounts As amended May 2, 2007 Requires banks that hold interest on lawyer trust accounts (IOLTA) to allow those accounts to participate in higher-paying investment products, or receive an interest rate that is comparable to the rates paid by those investment products (referred to as IOLTA comparability). <i>UPDATE: As amended June 13, 2007</i> <i>Same as above; nonsubstantive amendments.</i>	Support	State Bar of California	Senate Judiciary Committee
AB 1726 (Eraina Ortega)	AB 1726 (Committee on Judiciary) — Evidence, court interpreters As introduced Requires that an interpreter be present whenever needed in any civil matter, including family law and probate, or in any court-ordered or court-provided alternative dispute resolution, including mediation and arbitration. Requires that unless a party has notified the court that he or she has made arrangements for a private interpreter, the court shall provide the interpreter. Specifies a priority order for when an interpreter will be provided if there are insufficient interpreters or funding available. Limits funding provided for this purpose to \$10 million.	Support in concept contingent on funding and workability.	Assembly Member Dave Jones	Assembly Appropriations Committee— Suspense file. 2-year bill

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 1727 (Daniel Pone)	<p>AB 1727 (Committee on Judiciary) – Conservators and Guardians</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Sections 1-8 of the bill contain a number of technical and conforming amendments to the Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act of 2006. Section 9 of the bill would revise the law governing the invalidation of donative transfers to care custodians by disallowing such transfers only in cases where the instrument creating or modifying the donative transfer is dated after the date that the person receiving the transfer became the care custodian for that transfer.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 20, 2007</p> <p>Among other things, authorizes a public guardian or a county's adult protective services agency, upon a showing of probable cause that a person is in substantial danger of abuse or neglect, to petition a court for orders in connection with an investigation of whether the appointment of the public guardian would be appropriate. Revises provisions permitting release of confidential medical information to a probate court investigator. Requires the Judicial Council to adopt rules necessary for an expedited procedure that would authorize by court order a release of confidential medical information. Prohibits a conservatorship of the person or of the estate from being granted unless the court makes an express finding that the granting of the conservatorship is the least restrictive alternative needed for the protection of the conservatee. Creates new requirements on courts when guardianships and conservatorships are transferred from other jurisdictions. Establishes notice requirements for termination of a temporary conservatorship under specified circumstances. Requires private professional conservators to provide information about themselves and their association with proposed conservatees in certain petitions. Requires courts to assure compliance with requirements regarding inventories and accountings, and with requirements for submission of a care plan and a report contingent upon the passage of SB 800, as specified. Requires, as part of a review of a conservatorship, that a court investigator review the accounting of the conservatee's estate with the conservatee, to the extent practicable, and requires that specified confidential information be kept in separate attachments and not provided in reports sent to certain relatives of a conservatee. Requires courts to coordinate investigations with filings of accountings if feasible, and requires the Judicial Council to develop guidelines for reviewing accountings and detecting fraud.</p> <p>Revises the law governing the invalidation of donative transfers to care custodians by disallowing transfers only in cases where the instrument creating or modifying the donative transfer is dated after the date that the person receiving the transfer became the care custodian for that transfer. Contains a number of technical and conforming amendments to the Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act of 2006.</p>	<p>Support sections 1-8; no position on section 9 as it presents a policy issue outside the council's purview.</p> <p>Update: As amended June 20, 2007 Support (no position on Sec. 30 re: donative transfers to care custodians).</p>	Author	Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 145 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>SB 145 (Corbett) – Court facilities</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Corrects an incorrect cross-reference.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended February 27, 2007</p> <p>Extends the deadline for the transfer of court facilities from counties to the state from June 30, 2007 to December 31, 2008. This is an urgency bill, taking effect upon signature of the Governor.</p>	Sponsor	Judicial Council	Assembly Appropriations Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
SB 241 (Tracy Kenny)	<p>SB 241 (Kuehl) – Minors, legal representation, probate proceedings</p> <p>As amended April 30, 2007</p> <p>Adds to the existing statute authorizing the court to appoint counsel for a minor in a probate guardianship proceeding the clear authority for the court to require the county pay the costs of that counsel if the parents of the child cannot pay, and requires the Judicial Council to adopt financial eligibility guidelines to assist the court in determining whether the parents have the ability to pay the costs of the counsel.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended May 24, 2007</p> <p><i>In addition to the above, adds a reference to existing authority to appoint the public defender to represent a proposed ward or conservatee upon a finding of inability to pay.</i></p>	Support	Author	Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 340 (Daniel Pone)	<p>SB 340 (Ackerman) – Access to Criminal History Information by Court Investigators</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Expands the list of agencies entitled to receive criminal history reports by adding an agency performing conservatorship investigations related to a proposed conservator under the Latterman-Petris-Shorr (LPS) Act.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 21, 2007</p> <p><i>In addition to the above, broadens list of agencies entitled to receive criminal history reports to include probate court conservatorship and guardianship investigators.</i></p>	Support and co-sponsor if amended to broaden the list of agencies entitled to receive criminal history reports from the Department of Justice to include court investigators in connection with investigations of proposed guardians and conservators under the Probate Code.	California Judges Association	Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 396 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>SB 396 (Kiddley-Thomas) – Dispute Resolution</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Increases the portion of the filing fee that is distributed to dispute resolution programs from an amount not to exceed \$8 to an amount not to exceed \$12.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended April 24, 2007</p> <p><i>Requires the Judicial Council to establish the Commission of Civil Fees in the Courts, and removes the cap on distributions of fees to dispute resolution programs if the filing fee is increased for this purpose.</i></p>	Oppose	California Dispute Resolution Council	Assembly Judiciary Committee
SB 403 (Tracy Kenny)	<p>SB 403 (Hartman) – Child custody and visitation, drug and alcohol testing</p> <p>As amended May 1, 2007</p> <p>Extends until January 1, 2009, the sunset date on the statute authorizing the court to order a person seeking custody or visitation of a child to undergo testing for drug or alcohol abuse.</p>	Support	Judicial Council	Assembly Judiciary Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
SB 431 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>SB 431 (Aarnestad and Wiggins) - Public employees' retirement: Butte County and Solano County</p> <p>As introduced Requires the assets and liabilities of the Superior Courts of Butte and Solano Counties and the Counties of Butte and Solano to be separated based on a computation determined by an actuary retroactive to June 30, 2002. Following the separation of assets and liabilities, requires the courts to participate in a risk pool created by the California Public Employees' Retirement System.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 21, 2007 <i>Requires the Public Employees' Retirement System to prepare a separate computation of the assets and liabilities of the trial court and each county for the Counties of Butte and Solano, as determined by the actuary.</i></p>	<p>Oppose unless amended to clarify the authority of consenting courts and counties to enter separate contracts and to specify how to separate members' assets and liabilities.</p> <p>Update: As amended June 21, 2007 <i>Pending Judicial Council action.</i></p>	Butte County and Solano County	Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 539 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>SB 539 (Margel) - Trial Court Trust Fund</p> <p>As proposed to be amended This bill would (1) establish a tiered penalty structure that reduces the retroactive penalty to the amount that the revenue would have earned had it been receiving interest in the State Treasury's pooled money investment rate (an amount closer to four to six percent) so long as the court or county remits the revenue within 30 to 45 days, as specified, from the time the error is discovered; and (2) require the entity found in error to make the payment directly to the state (currently the county is required to pay the state and seek reimbursement from the court, if the court is at fault).</p> <p>SB 539 will be amended to delete the new penalty structure (described as item 1, above) prior to the bill's hearing on April 10. Only the amendment to Government Code Section 68085 (j) on page 6 will remain in the bill. This is the section identified as (2), above.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended April 9, 2007 <i>Consistent with above.</i></p>	Neutral	State Association of County Auditors	Assembly Appropriations Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
SB 800 (Daniel Pone)	<p><u>SB 800 (Corbett) – Conservators and guardians, care plans</u></p> <p>As introduced Requires a conservator or guardian to submit to the court within 45 days of appointment a plan for the care, custody, control, and, if applicable, the education of the ward or conservatee. As part of this plan, the bill would require an assessment of the strengths of the conservatee's or ward's family, an assessment of appropriate residential placement, and a schedule of visits between the ward or conservatee and the conservator or guardian, as well as visits between the ward or conservatee and his or her family.</p> <p>UPDATE: As amended June 21, 2007 Among other things, requires a conservator to submit to the court within 90 days of appointment a general plan for the care, custody, and control of the conservatee, including a plan for meeting the conservatee's financial needs. Provides that at the expiration of one year after the initial appointment of the conservator and thereafter as required by the court, the conservator must submit to the court a follow-up report on the general plan. Requires the Judicial Council to develop and adopt mandatory forms for this purpose, including a detailed list of subjects the forms must address. Requires prior court approval before a conservatee may be removed from his or her personal residence (except for temporary moves that are required for medical treatment and convalescence), and establishes new court procedures for this purpose. Requires the Judicial Council, by July 1, 2008, to develop notices and declarations as necessary to implement these provisions. Provides that counsel shall be appointed for an allegedly incapacitated spouse in cases where the other spouse petitions for a substantial transfer of assets of the community or of the incapacitated spouse, unless the court finds that the allegedly incapacitated spouse has competently retained independent counsel for the proceedings or the spouse's interests are already being protected, as specified. Adds provisions governing vexatious litigants in conservatorship cases, modeled after analogous provisions in the guardianship area.</p>	<p>Support in concept</p> <p>Update: As amended June 21, 2007 Support if amended to: (1) Harmonize level of care requirements with new general plan provisions; and (2) harmonize with AB 1727 to avoid duplication and confusion.</p>	Author	Assembly Appropriations Committee

Appendix
Status of 2007 Judicial Council-sponsored Legislation

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
<p>AB 159 (Donna Hershkowitz)</p>	<p>AB 159 (Jones) – Courts: judgeships</p> <p>As introduced Creates 50 new superior court judgeships in fiscal year 2007-08, to be allocated pursuant to the model approved by the Judicial Council. Authorizes the conversion of certain eligible subordinate judicial officer positions, upon vacancy, to judgeships. Creates an unspecified number of appellate judicial positions.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended, June 21, 2007</i> <i>Creates an unspecified number of new superior court judgeships in fiscal year 2007-08, to be allocated pursuant to the model approved by the Judicial Council. Authorizes the conversion of 162 subordinate judicial officers, in eligible courts, to judgeships. The conversion would occur upon vacancy, and is limited to 16 per year, statewide. Requires the Governor to report annually demographic gender, race, and ethnicity data of all judicial appointments or nominations.</i></p>	<p>Judicial Council</p>	<p>Senate Judiciary Committee</p>
<p>AB 227 (Eraina Ortega)</p>	<p>AB 227 (Beall) – Trial court funding</p> <p>As introduced Codifies changes to the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) payments made by counties to the state for trial court funding. Changes are consistent with negotiated buyouts related to undesignated fees and AB 233 fees buyouts.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended March 22, 2007</i> <i>Same as above and corrects the new MOE for Mendocino County.</i></p>	<p>Judicial Council</p>	<p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>

Appendix
Status of 2007 Judicial Council-sponsored Legislation

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 367 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 367 (De Leon) – Court-ordered debts</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Establishes a task force on criminal court-ordered fines and penalties that will make recommendations for simplifying California's criminal fine and penalty assessment, collection, and distribution system. Reduces the minimum fine required by the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collection Program from \$250 to \$100 and expands the program to include collections for registration, pedestrian, and bicycle violations.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended May 15, 2007</i></p> <p><i>Same as above and 1) clarifies that it applies to traffic-related offenses, 2) requires the Judicial Council to develop performance measures and benchmarks to review the effectiveness of collection programs, and 3) requires the task force to document recent annual revenues from the various penalty assessments and surcharges and, to the extent feasible, evaluate the extent to which the amount of each penalty assessment and surcharge impacts total annual revenues and the actual amounts assessed.</i></p>	Judicial Council	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 467 (Tracy Kenny)	<p>AB 467 (Feuer) – Courts: access to justice</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>States legislative findings regarding court fee waivers and access to justice. Provides that equal justice requires that all persons have access to the court without regard to economic means. Further provides that those who are able to pay court fees should do so, and courts should recover previously waived fees when appropriate.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended June 4, 2007</i></p> <p><i>Revises and recasts provisions for court fee waivers for indigent litigants. Clarifies required application processing procedures. Requires recovery of fees in specified cases, and provides procedures for reconsideration of fee waivers during the pendency of the case. In addition, provides separate fee waiver application processing procedures for the appellate courts.</i></p>	Judicial Council	Senate Judiciary Committee

Appendix
Status of 2007 Judicial Council-sponsored Legislation

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
AB 926 (Daniel Pone)	<p>AB 926 (Evans) – Civil discovery</p> <p>As amended April 17, 2007</p> <p>Amends three discovery statutes to clarify the time for production of documents. Provides that parties may agree to extend the time for inspection.</p>	Judicial Council	Senate Judiciary Committee
AB 1248 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>AB 1248 (Evans) – Courts</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Among other things, makes technical and clarifying changes to the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act of 2005, clarifies the fine for production of documents pursuant to demand for production, and removes the cap on habeas investigations costs paid by the Supreme Court.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended June 19, 2007</i></p> <p><i>Same as above and allows the courts to charge the current "night court assessment" for court sessions held on weekends, allows the courts to collect bail forfeitures in installment payments without requiring the individual to make an appearance in court, allows staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts to staff a non-profit organization created by the Judicial Council, and requires the Judicial Council to establish a travel policy for the judicial branch, changes the date when the Judicial Council must adjust the amount a parent or guardian may be liable for minors' actions, and clarifies fine and penalty statutes to abrogate the decision in People v. Chavez (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 1340.</i></p>	Judicial Council	Senate Judiciary Committee
AB 1464 (June Clark)	<p>AB 1464 (Beiron) – Vehicles, prohibition of vehicle registration and issuance of arrest warrant</p> <p>As introduced</p> <p>Allows the court, after proper notice to the owner/violator, to report a failure to appear on an unsigned citation issued for an owner-responsibility offense to the Department of Motor Vehicles for a hold to be placed on the registration of the vehicle involved in the offense. To ensure due process rights are protected, requires notice to the owner/violator, and allows 21 days for response if the owner/violator was not present when the citation is issued, rather than the usual 10 days.</p>	Judicial Council	Senate Public Safety Committee

Appendix
Status of 2007 Judicial Council-sponsored Legislation

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Sponsor	Status as of June 27, 2007
SB 145 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>SB 145 (Corbett) – Court facilities</p> <p>As introduced Corrects an incorrect cross-reference.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended February 27, 2007</i> <i>Extends the deadline for the transfer of court facilities from counties to the state from June 30, 2007 to December 31, 2008. This is an urgency bill, taking effect upon signature of the Governor.</i></p>	Judicial Council	Assembly Judiciary Committee
SB 340 (Daniel Pone)	<p>SB 340 (Ackerman) – Access to Criminal History Information by Court Investigators</p> <p>As introduced Expands the list of agencies entitled to receive criminal history reports by adding an agency performing conservatorship investigations related to a proposed conservator under the Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) Act.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended June 21, 2007</i> <i>In addition to the above, broadens list of agencies entitled to receive criminal history reports to include probate court conservatorship and guardianship investigators.</i></p>	California Judges Association and Judicial Council	
SB 396 (Eraina Ortega)	<p>SB 396 (Ridley-Thomas) – Dispute Resolution</p> <p>As introduced Increases the portion of the filing fee that is distributed to dispute resolution programs from an amount not to exceed \$8 to an amount not to exceed \$12.</p> <p><i>UPDATE: As amended April 24, 2007</i> <i>Requires the Judicial Council to establish the Commission of Civil Fees in the Courts, and removes the cap on distributions of fees to dispute programs if the filing fee is increased for this purpose.</i></p>	California Dispute Resolution Council and Judicial Council	



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

OFFICE OF COURT CONSTRUCTION
AND MANAGEMENT

COMPLETED TRANSFER AGREEMENTS

UPDATED: 06/26/07

Transfer No.	County	Building Name	Effective Date of Transfer	Transfer Type
1	Riverside	Larson Justice Center	4/19/2005	Deferred Transfer of Title
2	Mono	Mono Superior Court	9/13/2005	Transfer of Responsibility
3	Riverside	Moreno Valley	10/18/2005	Transfer of Responsibility
4	San Joaquin	Lodi Branch- Dept. 2	1/3/2006	Transfer of Title
5	Plumas	Portola Court Facility	4/7/2006	Transfer of Responsibility
6	Contra Costa	Pittsburg-Delta	5/26/2006	Transfer of Responsibility/Transfer of Title
7	Mariposa	Mariposa County Courthouse	6/27/2006	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
8	San Bernardino	Rancho Juvenile Traffic Court	6/27/2006	Transfer of Responsibility
9	Sacramento	Credit Union Bldg.	6/30/2006	Transfer of Responsibility
10	Lassen	Lassen County Court	8/10/2006	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
11	Fresno	Kerman Court	9/1/2006	Transfer of Responsibility
12	Sacramento	Finance -Payroll-HR	10/1/2006	Transfer of Responsibility
13	Fresno	Sanger Court	11/1/2006	Transfer of Responsibility
14	Yolo	Traffic Court	11/1/2006	Transfer of Responsibility
15	Siskiyou	Eddy Building	1/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
16	Sonoma	Empire Annex	1/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
17	Sonoma	Coddington Annex	1/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
18	Sonoma	Coddington Annex B2	1/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
19	Sonoma	Family Court Services	1/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
20	Modoc	Modoc County Courthouse	1/4/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
21	Riverside	1903 Courthouse	1/8/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
22	Riverside	1933 Courthouse	1/8/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
23	Riverside	Bar Association	1/8/2007	Consolidated
24	Riverside	Old Riverside Municipal Court	1/8/2007	Consolidated
25	Riverside	4275 Lemon Street	1/8/2007	Consolidated
26	Trinity	Trinity County Courthouse	1/8/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
27	Inyo	Superior Court 2	2/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
28	Contra Costa	Concord-Mt. Diablo District	2/21/2007	Transfer of Title
29	Merced	Old Court	2/21/2007	Transfer of Title
30	Fresno	Kingsburg Court	3/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
31	Fresno	Fowler Court	3/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
32	Plumas	Chester Civic Complex	3/6/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
33	Plumas	Greenville Justice Court	3/6/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
34	Plumas	Quincy Courthouse	3/7/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
35	Fresno	Juvenile Delinquency Court	3/13/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
36	Placer	Historic Courthouse	4/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
37	Sacramento	Erickson Bldg.	4/1/2007	Lease Assignment
38	Siskiyou	Weed Satellite Court	4/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
39	Merced	New Downtown Merced Courthouse	4/2/2007	Transfer of Responsibility/ Deferred Transfer of Title
40	Merced	Adobe	4/2/2007	Consolidated
41	Merced	Criminal Trailer	4/2/2007	Consolidated
42	Merced	Jury Commissioner	4/2/2007	Consolidated
43	Merced	Courtrooms 7 & 8	4/2/2007	Consolidated
44	Merced	Courtroom 5	4/2/2007	Consolidated

Consolidated - There is no longer a court facility at this address as operations are now supported in another facility.



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

OFFICE OF COURT CONSTRUCTION
AND MANAGEMENT

COMPLETED TRANSFER AGREEMENTS

UPDATED: 06/26/07

Transfer No.	County	Building Name	Effective Date of Transfer	Transfer Type
45	Merced	Department 4	4/2/2007	Consolidated
46	Merced	Family Law Facilitator	4/2/2007	Consolidated
47	Madera	Madera County Superior Court	4/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
48	Madera	Court Executive Office	4/30/2007	Consolidated
49	Madera	Modular Courtroom	4/30/2007	Consolidated
50	Madera	Borden Court Building	4/30/2007	Consolidated
51	Madera	Chowchilla Division	4/30/2007	Consolidated
52	Madera	Sierra Courthouse	4/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
53	Alameda	U.S. Post Office	5/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
54	Madera	Family Court Services	5/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
55	San Bernardino	Mental Health Office and Courtroom	5/1/2007	MOU for Limited or Part-Time Use Facility
56	San Joaquin	Stockton Courthouse	5/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
57	Yolo	Historic Courthouse	5/7/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
58	Yolo	Old Jail (Department 9)	5/7/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
59	Yolo	Family Support	5/7/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
60	Yolo	I.O.O.F.	5/7/2007	Consolidated
61	Calaveras	Calaveras Historic Courthouse	5/22/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
62	Tulare	Tulare Division	5/22/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
63	Tulare	Porterville Courthouse	5/22/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
64	Calaveras	Legal Bldg.	6/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
65	Calaveras	Legal Bldg. Modular	6/1/2007	Consolidated
66	Riverside	Hall of Justice	6/1/2007	Deferred Transfer of Title
67	Riverside	Banning	6/1/2007	Deferred Transfer of Title
68	Riverside	Banning (FSB)	6/1/2007	Consolidated
69	Riverside	Banning Parking Lot	6/1/2007	Consolidated
70	Sacramento	800 9th St.	6/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
71	Humboldt	Humboldt County Courthouse (Eureka)	6/5/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
72	Humboldt	Veteran's Memorial	6/5/2007	Consolidated
73	Merced	Los Bancos Courtroom	6/25/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
74	Merced	Iris Garrett Juvenile Justice Correctional Complex	6/25/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
75	Merced	Juvenile Hall	6/25/2007	Consolidated
76	Humboldt	Juvenile Courtroom	6/26/2007	MOU for Limited or Part-Time Use Facility
77	Humboldt	Hoopa Courthouse	6/26/2007	MOU for Limited or Part-Time Use Facility
78	Humboldt	John Hayes Memorial Veterans Hall	6/26/2007	MOU for Limited or Part-Time Use Facility
79	Alameda	Rene C. Davidson	6/29/2007	MOU for Continued Use of Historic Facility
80	Alameda	County Administration Bldg.	6/29/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
81	Alameda	County Probation Center	6/29/2007	Consolidated
82	Alameda	John George Psychiatric Pavilion	6/29/2007	MOU for Limited or Part-Time Use Facility
83	Alameda	County Juvenile Hall	6/29/2007	Consolidated
84	Alameda	Juvenile Justice Center	6/29/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
85	Alameda	Winton Bldg.	6/29/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
86	Alameda	Gale - Schenone Hall of Justice	6/29/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
87	Alameda	George E. McDonald Hall of Justice	6/29/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
88	Alameda	Berkeley Courthouse	6/29/2007	Transfer of Responsibility

Consolidated - There is no longer a court facility at this address as operations are now supported in another facility.



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

OFFICE OF COURT CONSTRUCTION
AND MANAGEMENT

COMPLETED TRANSFER AGREEMENTS

UPDATED: 06/26/07

Transfer No.	County	Building Name	Effective Date of Transfer	Transfer Type
89	San Bernardino	Court Executive Office	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
90	San Bernardino	Appellate & Appeals North Annex	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
91	San Bernardino	Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
92	San Bernardino	San Bernardino Juvenile Traffic	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
93	San Bernardino	Redlands Courthouse	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
94	San Bernardino	Twin Peaks Courthouse	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
95	San Bernardino	Big Bear Courthouse	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
96	San Bernardino	San Bernardino Courthouse	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility/ Deferred Transfer of Title
97	San Bernardino	San Bernardino Courthouse - Annex	6/30/2007	Transfer of Responsibility/ Deferred Transfer of Title
98	Contra Costa	Executive Administration	7/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
99	Los Angeles	Long Beach Courthouse	7/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility/ Deferred Transfer of Title
100	San Benito	San Benito Courthouse	7/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
101	Siskiyou	Tulelake Satellite Court	7/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
102	Kings	Corcoran Court	7/15/2007	Transfer of Responsibility/ Deferred Transfer of Title
103	Butte	Paradise Courthouse	8/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
104	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara Juvenile Court	8/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
105	Solano	Hall of Justice	8/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
106	Solano	Law and Justice Center	8/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
107	Solano	Solano Justice Building	8/1/2007	Transfer of Responsibility
108	Alameda	Wiley W. Manuel Courthouse	9/14/2007	Transfer of Title
109	Alameda	Hayward Hall of Justice	9/14/2007	Transfer of Title
110	Alameda	Fremont Hall of Justice	9/14/2007	Transfer of Title
111	Butte	Chico Courthouse	10/1/2007	Transfer of Title
112	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara Jury Assembly Bldg.	10/1/2007	Transfer of Title