

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
Meeting Minutes—June 26–27, 2014
Ronald M. George State Office Complex
William C. Vickrey Judicial Council Conference Center
Malcolm M. Lucas Board Room
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 2014
NON-BUSINESS MEETING—CLOSED MEETING AND
PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY-CLIENT DISCUSSIONS
(RULE 10.6(A) AND RULE 10.6(B))

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. and was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2014
BUSINESS MEETING—OPEN MEETING
(RULE 10.6(A))

Judicial Council members present: Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye; Court of Appeal Justices Judith Ashmann-Gerst, Harry E. Hull, Jr., and Douglas P. Miller; Judges Stephen H. Baker, James R. Brandlin, David De Alba, Emilie H. Elias, Teri L. Jackson, Gary Nadler, Mary Ann O’Malley, David Rosenberg, David M. Rubin, and Dean T. Stout; Assembly Member Richard Bloom; Mr. James P. Fox and Mr. Mark P. Robinson, Jr.; **advisory members present:** Judges Robert A. Glusman, James E. Herman, Morris D. Jacobson, Brian L. McCabe, Kenneth K. So, Charles D. Wachob, and Brian Walsh; Supreme Court Clerk Frank A. McGuire; Commissioner Sue Alexander; Court Executive Officers Mary Beth Todd and David H. Yamasaki; **secretary to the council:** Judge Steven Jahr, Administrative Director of the Courts.

Members absent: Supreme Court Justice Marvin R. Baxter; State Senator Noreen Evans; Mr. Mark G. Bonino and Ms. Angela J. Davis.

Incoming members present: Judges Marla O. Anderson, Daniel J. Buckley, Martin J. Tangeman, and Joan P. Weber; Commissioner David E. Gunn; Court Executive Officer Richard D. Feldstein; Ms. Donna D’Angelo Melby and Ms. Debra Elaine Pole.

Speakers present: Presiding Judge Marla O. Anderson, Superior Court of California, County of Monterey; Judge Laurie M. Earl, Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento; Judge William F. Highberger, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles; Ms. Kimberly

Flener, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Butte (by phone); Mr. Jarrod Orr, Fiscal Administrator, Superior Court of California, County of Butte (by phone).

Others present: Associate Justice Maria P. Rivera, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Four; Ms. Rosa Junqueiro, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin; Mr. Brian Taylor, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Solano; Ms. Lezlee Offutt, Case Records Manager, Superior Court of California, County of Solano; Ms. Lisa Leonard, Lead Process Clerk, Superior Court of California, County of Solano; **media representatives:** Ms. Maria Dinzeo, *Courthouse News Service*; Mr. Paul Jones, *Daily Journal*.

Call to Order

Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Chair of the Judicial Council, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Malcolm M. Lucas Board Room of the William C. Vickrey Judicial Council Conference Center in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex.

The Chief Justice welcomed the newly-appointed Judicial Council members in attendance at the meeting, whose terms will begin on September 15, 2014: Judges Marla O. Anderson, Daniel J. Buckley, Martin J. Tangeman, and Joan P. Weber; Commissioner David E. Gunn; Court Executive Officer Richard D. Feldstein; and State Bar of California appointees Ms. Donna D'Angelo Melby and Ms. Debra Elaine Pole. She also noted that new appointee Presiding Judge Brian John Back was unable to attend the meeting.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Judicial Council approved the minutes of the April 24–25, 2014, Judicial Council meeting.

Statement and Directives from the Chief Justice

Exercising executive privilege as chair of the Judicial Council, the Chief Justice deferred her regular report summarizing her engagements and ongoing outreach activities on behalf of the judicial branch since the previous council meeting to the July council meeting. She also deferred the Administrative Director's report and the presentations by the Judicial Council internal committees to the July council meeting.

The Chief Justice proceeded to raise an issue that has been apparent since she took office in 2011: the role and relationship of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to the Judicial Council. She explained that when she and others advocate for the public on behalf of the judicial branch, they often encounter confusion among those who believe that the Judicial Council and the AOC are two separate entities when, in fact, they are not. The Chief Justice clarified that the AOC is the administrative staff that exists to support the Judicial Council in carrying out its duties.

To address the issue, the Chief Justice directed the chairs of the council's five internal committees to prepare an amendment to the California Rules of Court for the council's formal action at its July meeting that unifies the Judicial Council, as the governing body, with its staff

under one name: “Judicial Council.” She explained that retiring the name “Administrative Office of the Courts” creates more clarity and transparency about the role and governance responsibilities of the Judicial Council and mirrors the standard practice of other government bodies that do not provide separate names for their staffs.

The Chief Justice also directed the Administrative Director of the Courts and his executive office to implement, as soon as possible, all necessary identity, organizational, and operational changes in order to complete the execution of the retirement of the name.

In a discussion after the Chief Justice’s announcement, council members expressed their agreement with the proposal. Specifically, Justice Miller, chair of the council’s Executive and Planning Committee, noted that the identity change reflects the significant and substantive changes that the council has made in its governance policies and responsibilities over the last three years and eliminates the confusion that many of the council members have confronted. Judge Jahr, the Administrative Director of the Courts, also expressed his approval of the proposal by stating that the retirement of the name at once changes everything and, at the same time, changes nothing because only one entity has ever existed: the Judicial Council. He noted that neither in the Constitution, in statute, in rules, or in other formal methods was a separate staff entity ever created. The change, however, does emphasize that the Judicial Council is the governing body with a staff that supports it, and it also reflects a culture change that is already under way.

Judicial Council Members’ Trial Court Liaison Reports

The following Judicial Council members reported on their liaison visits with their assigned courts:

- Judge Stephen H. Baker, on his visit to the Superior Court of California, County of Trinity;
- Judge Robert A. Glusman, on his visit to the Superior Court of California, County of Lassen;
- Judge James E. Herman, on his visit to the Superior Court of California, County of Ventura; and
- Commissioner Sue Alexander, on her visits to the Superior Courts of California, Counties of Alpine and El Dorado.

At the conclusion of the liaison reports, Judge David Rosenberg, the council’s liaison to the Superior Court of Solano County, introduced the court’s Mentoring in the Courts program and welcomed two of the court’s employees seated in the audience who are participating in the program: Ms. Lezlee Offutt, Case Records Manager, and Ms. Lisa Leonard, Lead Process Clerk.

Written Comments Received

No written comments were received.

Public Comment

No requests from the public to speak were received.

Consent Agenda (Items A–D)

Item A Civil Jury Instructions (CACI): New, Revised, and Revoked Instructions and Verdict Forms

The Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions recommended that the Judicial Council approve for publication the civil jury instructions prepared by the committee. On Judicial Council approval, the instructions would be published in the midyear supplement to the official 2014 edition of the *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions*.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014, approved for publication under rules 2.1050 and 10.58 of the California Rules of Court the civil jury instructions prepared by the committee. The instructions will be published in the midyear supplement to the official 2014 edition of the *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions (CACI)*.

Item B Judicial Branch Administration: Audit Report for Judicial Council Acceptance

The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch and the AOC recommended that the Judicial Council accept the audit report entitled *Audit of the Superior Court of California, County of Sutter*. This acceptance is consistent with the policy approved by the Judicial Council on August 27, 2010, which specifies Judicial Council acceptance of audit reports as the last step to finalization of the reports before their placement on the California Courts public website to facilitate public access. Acceptance and publication of these reports promote transparent accountability and provide the courts with information to minimize future financial, compliance, and operational risk.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014, accepted the “pending” audit report dated November 2013, entitled: *Audit of the Superior Court of California, County of Sutter*, resulting in the audit report progressing from “pending” status to “final” status, and in the publication of the final report on the California Courts public website.

Item C Report to the Legislature: Findings from the Senate Bill 678 (California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009) Program

The AOC recommended that the Judicial Council receive the *Report on the California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009: Findings from the SB 678 Program (2014)* and direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to submit this report to the California Legislature and Governor, as mandated by Penal Code section 1232. Under the statute, the AOC is required to submit a comprehensive report on the implementation of the act—including information on the effectiveness of the act and specific recommendations regarding resource

allocations and additional collaboration—no later than 18 months after the initial receipt of funding under the act and annually thereafter. The report was developed in consultation with the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Department of Finance, and the Chief Probation Officers of California.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014:

1. Received the *Report on the California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009: Findings From the SB 678 Program (2014)* documenting findings, implementation activities, and potential recommendations related to the California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009 (SB 678); and
2. Directed the Administrative Director of the Courts to submit this report to the California Legislature and Governor by July 1, 2014, to comply with Penal Code section 1232, which requires the AOC, in consultation with the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Department of Finance, and the Chief Probation Officers of California, to submit to the Governor and the Legislature annually a comprehensive report on the implementation of the SB 678 program, including information on the effectiveness of the program and policy recommendations regarding resource allocation for improvements to the SB 678 program.

Item D Judicial Branch Report to the Legislature: Evaluation of Cost-Effectiveness of the Governor George Deukmejian Courthouse

The AOC recommended that the Judicial Council direct the AOC to submit a report on the cost-effectiveness of the Governor George Deukmejian Courthouse in the City of Long Beach to the appropriate budget and policy committees of the Legislature, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the Legislative Analyst’s Office, and the state Department of Finance by June 30, 2014, to meet Senate Bill 75 statutory reporting requirements. The report assesses and compares this performance-based infrastructure project with three other court construction projects delivered using traditional procurement methods.

Council action

The Judicial Council directed the AOC to submit the report, *Governor George Deukmejian Courthouse: Evaluation of Cost-Effectiveness—Report to the California Legislature as Required by Senate Bill 75 (Stats. 2013, ch. 31)*, to the appropriate budget and policy committees of the Legislature, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the Legislative Analyst’s Office, and the state Department of Finance by June 30, 2014, to meet SB 75 statutory reporting requirements.

Discussion Agenda (Items E–L)

Item E Court Facilities: Modernization of the Hollywood Courthouse

The AOC recommended that the Judicial Council adopt performance criteria for the design-build method to deliver the construction of a modernized Hollywood Courthouse. The AOC also recommended that the council adopt the competitive prequalification and selection process for design-build entities and directed that the award be made to the design-build entity whose proposal is judged as providing the best value in meeting the interests of the council and the objectives of the capital project.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014:

1. Adopted *Hollywood Courthouse Modernization Project: Design-Build Performance Criteria* and *Hollywood Courthouse Modernization Project: Prequalification and Selection Process for Design-Build Entities* defined and required by state statute.
2. Directed that the award be made to the design-build entity whose proposal is judged as providing the best value in meeting the interests of the council and the objectives of the capital project per state statute.

Item F Administrative Office of the Courts: A Report on Services Provided by Staff to the Judicial Council

The AOC Executive Office presented a report providing a high-level comprehensive inventory of all current programs, projects, and activities of staff to the Judicial Council in service to the judicial branch, sister branches of state government, the federal government, local and national justice partners, community organizations, and the public. This informational report demonstrated how staff services directly impact and align with the goals of the Chief Justice's Access 3D initiative that provides a framework and vision for the future of the judicial branch focused on equal, physical, and remote access for users of the California court system.

No council action

Item G Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Trust Fund Funding for Specific Costs in 2014–2015 and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Allocation Reductions for 2014–2015

For fiscal year (FY) 2014–2015, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommended an allocation of \$154.6 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) consisting of \$20.6 million for various trial court-related projects and programs, \$124.8 million for

reimbursement of various trial court costs, including court-appointed dependency counsel, and \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs, as well as a process for adjusting 2014–2015 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund allocations approved by the council. As a result of the enactment of the 2014 State Budget, the TCBAC intends to bring additional recommendations for the council’s consideration at its July 29, 2014, meeting and may also bring back changes to what was recommended or other allocations already approved by the council.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014:

1. Approved an allocation of \$20.56 million from the TCTF Programs 30.05 and 30.15 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015, which consists of funding to maintain three projects and programs at their 2013–2014 allocation levels and increases and decreases for six projects and programs that net to an overall decrease of \$2.83 million.
2. Approved an allocation of \$124.8 million from the TCTF Program 45.10 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015 for reimbursement of various trial court costs, including court-appointed dependency counsel, but also approved consideration of any revised recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee following enactment of the 2014 State Budget.
3. Approved an allocation of \$9.2 million from the TCTF Program 45.10 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015 for criminal justice realignment costs in the following manner:
 - a. Allocation of \$4.6 million, with each court’s share based 50 percent on population and 50 percent on the FY 2013–2014 first, second, and third quarter workload data (number of petitions to revoke/modify postrelease community supervision and parole) submitted to the Criminal Justice Court Services Office (CJCSO) pursuant to Penal Code section 13155, as described in this report and displayed in column F of Attachment F; and
 - b. Direction to AOC Fiscal Services Office staff to allocate the remaining \$4.6 million based solely on updated FY 2013–2014 fourth quarter and FY 2014–2015 first quarter workload data submitted to the CJCSO pursuant to Penal Code section 13155.
4. To prepare for the likely outcome that the Budget Act of 2014 will continue to require the transfer of \$20 million from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund, approved the following process for reducing by \$14.6 million (from \$78.5 million to \$63.9 million) the level of 2014–2015 allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund approved by the council in April 2014:

- a. Move the \$6.3 million allocation for the V2 and V3 programs back to the TCTF;
- b. Exempt from reduction the Workers' Compensation Reserve allocation of \$1.2 million, which is the estimated workers' compensation tail claim settlement amount that is nonreducible and must be paid; and
- c. Implement an 11.7 percent allocation reduction at the AOC division level, and request the three divisions, in consultation with the relevant advisory committees, governing board, and other immediate stakeholders, to recommend to the council, at its July business meeting, how the reduction should be allocated to the programs and projects managed by the divisions.

Item H Trial Court Budget: Encumbrances

The TCBCAC recommended that the Judicial Council approve new policies related to encumbrances of trial court funds. These new policies would provide guidance to the trial courts in complying with Government Code section 77203.

Council action

The Judicial Council adopted the following policies, effective June 27, 2014:

1. To encumber current fiscal year money, courts have to have a valid contract or agreement by June 30 of the current year. Contracts may be encumbered as of the execution date, as long as the contract does not state or imply a delay in delivery to the next fiscal year.
2. Courts have the current fiscal year plus two subsequent fiscal years to liquidate the encumbrance.
3. If encumbered funds are not liquidated (unliquidated encumbrances) by the end of the third fiscal year (current year plus two subsequent years), then the portion of the unliquidated funds that was above the cap in the year it was encumbered will revert to the originating state fund (i.e., state TCTF, State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund) through allocation reductions. Any amount of the encumbrance that was not expensed when liquidated, regardless of when the liquidation occurs, will be reverted to the originating fund.
4. If work changes, requiring an amendment, in subsequent years of the contract or agreement, any new funding must come from the current fiscal year and has two subsequent years from the current fiscal year to be liquidated.
5. The fund balance should not be used for ongoing expenses. Ongoing expenses should be part of a court's annual budget; however, if encumbering the current year's fund balance would allow the court time to make structural changes to its

budget to include this expense or would provide the court greater budget flexibility in the following fiscal year, encumbering the current year's fund balance would be appropriate. All other rules, such as 1 and 6, must be complied with. Examples of ongoing expenses are rent or lease of space, maintenance charges for a case management system after implementation, printer/copier maintenance, janitorial contracts, and security screening services.

6. Courts cannot encumber for multiple years time-and-materials or not-to-exceed contracts, or agreements that don't define deliverables. These include contracts or agreements for which specific goods or services are not assigned a value and that are not associated with specific delivery or start dates; for example, master agreements and Phoenix blanket purchase orders.
7. Encumbrances in a given fiscal year cannot be for more than three years regardless of the contractual terms. A contract or agreement, such as a facility lease, may be longer, but a fourth and fifth year would have its portion of the lease encumbered in subsequent years.

Item I Budget: Fiscal Year 2015–2016 Budget Requests for Trial Courts

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommended that the Judicial Council approve the proposed fiscal year 2015–2016 budget requests for the trial courts. Submittal of budget change proposals (BCPs) is the standard process for proposing funding adjustments in the State Budget. For the current fiscal year, the BCPs are to be submitted to the state Department of Finance by September 15, 2014.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014, approved the preparation and submission of FY 2015–2016 budget change proposals to the state Department of Finance for the trial courts for the following programs:

1. Trial court reinvestment—closing the funding gap;
2. Trial court employee benefit and salary increases;
3. Technology;
4. Judgeships;
5. Court facilities;
6. Court-appointed dependency counsel;

7. Changes to statutory language regarding the 2 percent TCTF reserve if the reevaluation of process results in a need for changes;
8. Trial Court Trust Fund backfill, if not addressed in the 2014 budget; and
9. State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund negative fund balance, if not addressed in the 2014 budget.

Item J Trial Court Allocations: Cash Advance Process

Given new workload associated with the new statutory authority for the TCTF to receive an up-to-2-year loan, not to exceed \$150 million, from three other Judicial Branch-related special funds to address courts' cash flow problems, the TCBAC recommended that the Judicial Council approve minor revisions to the Supplemental Funding application form and process only as it relates to cash advance requests.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014, amended the Application for Supplemental Funding Form instructions to:

1. Encourage courts to submit cash advance requests 30 days prior to the date when the cash is needed;
2. Require courts to complete up to two cash advance request templates, which AOC Treasury Services unit staff will assist courts in completing, when requesting a cash advance; and
3. Change the number of business days that the director of the AOC Fiscal Services Office is required to render a decision from 5 days to 10 days.

Item K Trial Court Allocations: Children's Waiting Room Distribution

The TCBAC recommended that the Judicial Council adopt a policy and procedure for courts to request a children's waiting room distribution—for the purpose of operating and maintaining children's waiting rooms—from the applicable, collected first paper civil filing fees that are deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund. The Superior Courts of Monterey and Butte Counties are requesting a children's waiting room distribution of \$5 effective July 1, 2014.

Council action

The Judicial Council, effective June 27, 2014:

1. Adopted the policy and procedure for courts to request a children's waiting room distribution that is described in the report.

2. Required courts to reapply for a children's waiting room distribution under the conditions described in the report and, if and when the council denies a reapplication, consider directing the applicant to return any unspent distributions to the TCTF.
3. Approved the requests of the Superior Courts of Monterey and Butte Counties for children's waiting room distributions of \$5 effective July 1, 2014.
4. Requested the TCBAC to advise the council on whether or not there should be a limit on how far in advance of opening a children's waiting room a court could request a distribution.

Item L Judicial Council Distinguished Service Awards: Recipients for 2014

The chairs of five Judicial Council internal committees, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P), the Rules and Projects Committee, the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, the Judicial Council Technology Committee, and the Litigation Management Committee, recommended that the council approve the recommended recipients of the 2014 Judicial Council of California Distinguished Service Awards. These annual awards, the highest honors bestowed by the judicial branch, recognize individuals who exemplify the leadership strengths that create significant and positive contributions to court administration in California.

Council action

The Judicial Council approved the following recipients of the 2014 Judicial Council of California Distinguished Service Awards:

Ronald M. George Award for Judicial Excellence

Hon. Tricia A. Bigelow, Presiding Justice

California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Eight

William C. Vickrey Leadership in Judicial Administration Award

Mr. Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer

Administrative Office of the Courts

Bernard E. Witkin Amicus Curiae Award

Mr. Ralph J. Shapiro, Attorney at Law

Shapiro Family Trust Foundation

Stanley Mosk Defender of Justice Award

Bench-Bar Coalition, Open Courts Coalition, and State Bar of California

Richard D. Huffman Justice for Children & Families Award
Hon. Michael Nash, Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Excellence in Judicial Education Award
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan, Associate Justice
California Supreme Court; and
Hon. Mark B. Simons, Associate Justice
California Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Five

The awards will be presented at a ceremony to take place on Thursday, August 21, 2014, from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m., in conjunction with the August council meeting.

Information Only Items (No Action Required)

INFO 1 Judicial Council: Implementation of Judicial Council Directives on AOC Restructuring

The chair of E&P submitted an informational report on the implementation of the Judicial Council AOC Restructuring Directives, as approved by the council on August 31, 2012. The AOC Restructuring Directives specifically direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to report to E&P before each Judicial Council meeting on every directive. The informational report provided an update on the progress of implementation efforts.

INFO 2 Trial Courts: Quarterly Investment Report for First Quarter 2014

This *Trial Court Quarterly Investment Report* provided the financial results for the funds invested by the AOC on behalf of the trial courts as part of the judicial branch treasury program. The report was submitted under agenda item 10, Resolutions Regarding Investment Activities for the Trial Courts, approved by the Judicial Council on February 27, 2004, and covers the period of January 1, 2014, through March 31, 2014.

INFO 3 Court Facilities: Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report, Quarter 3 of Fiscal Year 2013–2014

The Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee (TCFMAC) has completed its facility modification funding for the third quarter of FY 2013–2014. In compliance with the *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy*, adopted by the Judicial Council on July 27, 2012, the TCFMAC submitted its *Trial Court Facility Modification Quarterly Activity Report: Quarter 3, Fiscal Year 2013–2014* as information for the council.

Circulating Orders (Approved Since the April Business Meeting)

- Circulating Order (CO-14-03)—Judicial Council: Nonvoting Council Position

Appointment Orders (Since the April Business Meeting)

- May 27, 2014: Judicial Council Member Liaison assignments reflecting the appointment of Judge Dean T. Stout as liaison to the AOC’s Center for Families, Children & the Courts, and reflecting that he will no longer serve as a liaison to the AOC’s Center for Judiciary Education and Research.
- May 27, 2014: Appointments to the Judicial Council effective September 15, 2014, and for terms ending September 14, 2017.
- June 2, 2014: Appointments to the Judicial Council effective September 15, 2014, and for terms ending September 14, 2017.

Adjournment

In Memoriam

The Chief Justice adjourned the meeting in remembrance of the following judicial colleagues recently deceased, honoring their service to their courts and to the cause of justice:

- Hon. Walter L. Blackwell III (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino
- Hon. Juelann K. Cathey (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
- Hon. Thomas F. Curtin (Ret.), Bay Municipal Court
- Hon. Nels B. Fransen (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin
- Hon. William H. Kennedy (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of San Diego
- Hon. William A. Masterson (Ret.), Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District
- Hon. William L. Mock (Ret.) Orange County Municipal Court
- Hon. Christopher G. Money (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of San Luis Obispo
- Hon. Frank R. Moore (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Riverside
- Hon. John F. Quirk (Ret.), Tulare County Municipal Court
- Hon. Jennie Rhine (Ret.), Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Adjournment

With the meeting’s public business completed, the Chief Justice adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steven Jahr', written over a horizontal line.

Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts and
Secretary to the Judicial Council