

JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEETING
Minutes of August 30, 2002, Meeting

The Judicial Council of California business meeting began at 8:40 a.m. on Friday, August 30, 2002, at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) in San Francisco, California, on the call of Chief Justice Ronald M. George, chair.

Judicial Council members present: Chief Justice Ronald M. George; Associate Justices Richard D. Aldrich, Marvin R. Baxter, Norman L. Epstein, and Richard D. Huffman; Judges Gail A. Andler, Aviva K. Bobb, Robert A. Dukes, Leonard P. Edwards, William C. Harrison, Brad R. Hill, Donna J. Hitchens, Ronald M. Sabraw, and Barbara Ann Zúñiga, Mr. John J. Collins, Ms. Pauline W. Gee, Mr. Rex Heeseman, and Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.; and **advisory members:** Associate Justice Ronald B. Robie; Judges Stephen Douglas Bradbury and Frederick Paul Horn; Commissioner Bobby R. Vincent, Ms. Susan Null, Mr. Arthur Sims, and Mr. Alan Slater.

Absent: Senator Martha M. Escutia, Assembly Member Ellen M. Corbett.

Others present included: Mr. William C. Vickrey, Justices Laurence D. Kay and William R. McGuinness; Judges John Conley, Kim G. Dunning, Eric L. Du Temple, C. Robert Jameson, Jack Komar, William A. McKinstry, Heather D. Morse, and Gregory C. O'Brien, Jr.; Mr. William C. Vickrey, Ms. Beth Jay, Ms. Tressa Sloan Kentner, Mr. David J. Pasternak, Ms. Jody Patel, Ms. Ann Miller Ravel, Ms. Yvette Rincon, Ms. Patricia H. Wong; **staff:** Ms. Shireen Advani, Ms. Pam Aguilar, Ms. Heather Anderson, Mr. Ralph Baird, Mr. Ricardo Beacon, Mr. Michael Bergeisen, Ms. Mara Bernstein, Mr. Dennis Blanchard, Ms. Dianne Bolotte, Mr. John Burke, Mr. James Carroll, Mr. Steven Chang, Ms. Roma Cheadle, Ms. Azucena Coronel, Mr. Blaine Corren, Ms. Gisele Corrie, Mr. Robert Emerson, Mr. Sean Faro, Mr. George Ferrick, Mr. Bob Fleshman, Ms. Denise Friday, Mr. Scott Gardner, Mr. Ruben Gomez, Ms. Janet Grove, Ms. Tina Hansen, Ms. Terri Harris, Ms. Lynn Holton, Ms. Emily Hopkins, Ms. Bonnie Hough, Ms. Susan Hough, Mr. Harry Jacobs, Mr. Mark Jacobson, Ms. Melissa Johnson, Mr. John A. Judnick, Mr. Ken Kann, Mr. David Koon, Mr. Shawn Landry, Ms. Sally Lee, Ms. Melanie Lewis, Mr. Robert Lowney, Mr. Ian Marsh, Ms. Jennifer McKee, Ms. Malissa Hathaway McKeith, Ms. Joanne Middleton, Mr. Frederick Miller, Ms. Suzanne Murphy, Ms. Vicki Muzny, Mr. Stephen Nash, Mr. Gary Norton, Mr. Ronald Overholt, Ms. Chris Patton, Ms. Nancy Polis, Mr. Mike Roddy, Mr. Michael Roosevelt, Ms. Beth Shirk, Ms. Lucy Smallsreed, Ms. Barbara Smith, Ms. Sonya Smith, Ms. Pat Sweeten, Mr. Frank Tang, Ms. Marcia Taylor, Ms. Nancy Taylor, Ms. Karen Thorson, and Ms. Pat Yerian; **media representatives:** Ms. Shannon Lafferty, *The Recorder*.

Except as noted, each action item on the agenda was unanimously approved on the motion made and seconded. (Tab letters and item numbers refer to the binder of Reports and

Recommendations dated August 30, 2002, that was sent to members in advance of the meeting.)

Special Comment

Chief Justice Ronald M. George welcomed new members of the council and others in attendance.

Public Comment Related to Trial Court Budget Issues

Chief Justice Ronald M. George noted that there had been no requests for public comment.

Approval of Judicial Council Meeting Minutes of April 19, 2002

The council approved the meeting minutes of April 19, 2002.

Judicial Council Committee Presentations

Executive and Planning Committee

Associate Justice Richard D. Huffman, chair, reported that the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) had met three times since the council's last business meeting. The committee met to set the agenda for the August 30, 2002, council meeting; in addition, they met August 29, 2002, to review some 400 applications for the various advisory committees of the Judicial Council. Although nearly finished with their review of nominations, the Executive and Planning Committee will meet once more to complete the selection process.

The committee also reviewed a report from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee's Selection Review Committee recommending the allocation of federal Access to Visitation Grant funds. The committee approved, on behalf of the Judicial Council, the allocation of \$884,807 to 16 superior courts for projects relating to 34 different counties.

Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee

Associate Justice Marvin R. Baxter, chair, expressed his thanks to all of the members of the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee (PCLC) for their fine service over the past year and gave special recognition to outgoing members Justice Richard D. Aldrich, Judge Leonard P. Edwards, Judge Donna Jo Hitchens, and Judge Stephen Douglas Bradbury.

The policy committee met had five times since the last council meeting. At its July 11 and July 31 meetings the committee took positions on five bills relating to criminal procedure, family law, and traffic.

At its August 16, 22, and 27, 2002, meetings the committee was briefed on late-breaking legislative developments on several issues, including summary judgment, court facilities, and court interpreters.

The Legislature is now in its final days of the 2001–2002 legislative session, the last day of which is Saturday, August 31, 2002. After the session ends, the Office of Governmental Affairs will prepare its annual *Court News* legislative summary to be published in November, highlighting the bills of interest to the courts and the judiciary.

Both Judicial Council sponsored legislation and bills on which the council has taken a position is available on the Judicial Council’s public Website.

In October the policy committee will review recommendations for 2003 council–sponsored legislation, which will be presented to the full Judicial Council in December.

Rules and Projects Committee

Associate Justice Ronald B. Robie, chair, reported that the Rules and Projects (RUPRO) Committee met on June 20, 2002, and July 11, 2002, to review new standards for court-appointed trial counsel in death penalty cases. The proposal was circulated out of cycle for public comment from July 8 to August 9, 2002, and will come before the council at its November business meeting.

On August 9, 2002, the committee met to discuss revisions to the appellate rules of the California Rules of Court. The proposal, the first part of the third installment, deals with appeals in non-capital criminal cases. The proposal is being circulated for comment from August 9 to October 11, 2002, with a proposed effective date of January 2004.

On August 29, 2002, the committee met to review the Judicial Council advisory committee and task force workplans.

Resolution by the Honorable Martha M. Escutia, Chair of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Commending Heather Anderson.

Mr. William C. Vickrey presented a resolution by Hon. Martha Escutia to Ms. Heather Anderson, commending her outstanding work on development and adoption of the Ethical Standards for Neutral Arbitrators. Ms. Anderson is a nationally recognized alternative dispute resolution expert, a senior attorney in the Office of General Counsel, and staff to the Judicial Council’s Alternative Dispute Resolution Subcommittee. It also commends Ms. Anderson’s work on the project to develop the proposed ethics standards as outstanding in every sense of the word.

Special Comment

Mr. William C. Vickrey announced that on August 31, 2002, Chief Justice Ronald M. George will take office as President-Elect of the Conference of Chief Justices and as the Chair Elect of the Board of Directors of the National Center for State Courts. Mr. Vickrey pointed out that this is not only a great honor for the Chief Justice but also a great honor for the state that he will lead the national organization of state court systems and the chief justices of the United States in their efforts to improve state court systems.

Mr. Vickrey also announced that the Chief Justice will be receiving the National Center for State Courts William H. Rehnquist Award for Excellence in October at the United States Supreme Court. This is the highest award for any jurist in the nation and is presented once a year at a special gathering in Washington, D.C., by Chief Justice Rehnquist.

Judicial Council Court Visit Report

Justice Richard D. Aldrich reported on visits to the following counties:

Trinity County

One of the key issues for the Trinity Courts is the concept of the AOC's role in relation to the small courts. Judge John K. Letton gave the team members constructive and productive suggestions for improving the information sharing between the Judicial Council and the small courts, for example, by involving more of those judges in council activities.

The main concern for the Trinity court is facilities. The buildings are overcrowded and without adequate facilities to house inmates. Concern was also expressed about obtaining more training for court clerks, especially in the area of appeals. They requested that funding be made available for training bilingual employees so that employees who do speak a second language can improve their speaking skills. Security is a major issue. Also, there is an acute shortage of court interpreters partially because of the courts remote locations.

Glenn County

Inadequate facilities are a problem in Glenn County as well. Juvenile offenders are led through the judge's chambers and next to his or her desk. There is no holding area for the felony adult offenders; they are brought in through the front door of the courthouse, through the public waiting room and into the back of the courtroom, where victims and witnesses are seated.

They also expressed the need to establish better communication between the rural courts and the AOC and Judicial Council.

Judge Brad R. Hill reported on visits to Alpine and Amador Counties. Judge Hill commended Mr. Shawn Landry for organizing a successful trip.

Amador County

Amador facilities are also inadequate but the court is slated to get considerably more space at an old hospital site. The court reported to the team that they are happy with a new case management system they designed and have now implemented. The court is also pleased with the concept of regional offices as well as the service that Mr. Mike Roddy and the AOC are providing them. The feeling is that this is a step in the right direction because the court would not have some necessary services available to them without help from the AOC.

Alpine County

The judges of the Alpine court reported that both of the judges travel to courts in other counties to assist as needed and as calendars permit. The courts contract for services. They have severed their relationship with the county with respect to payroll, collection, and janitorial services. The results have been increased efficiency and an overall reduction in expenses.

Special Comment

Chief Justice Ronald M. George announced that there were three visitors from Orange County present, welcoming Judges C. Robert Jameson, John Conley, and Kim G. Dunning to the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

Item 1 Drug Court Projects Grants Under the 2002–2003 Budget Act

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee and AOC staff proposed that grants be made to local jurisdictions for the purpose of implementing or enhancing collaborative justice courts. These courts include adult and juvenile drug courts, family treatment courts, teen/peer courts, adult and juvenile domestic violence/dating violence courts, adult and youth mental health courts, homeless courts, community courts, and balanced and restorative justice programs.

Council action:

Contingent on the passage of the 2002–2003 budget, the Judicial Council approved the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee’s recommendation that \$1 million of 2002–2003 Budget Act funds be used for California Drug Court Projects through the award of 20 to 30 mini-grants.

Item 2 Equal Access Fund: Distribution of IOLTA-Formula Grants

The State Bar Legal Services Trust Fund Commission (“the commission”) submitted a report regarding distribution of Equal Access Fund grants. The commission recommends that the Judicial Council approve distribution of \$8,550,000 according to the statutory formula. The Budget Act authorizing the Equal Access Fund provides that the Judicial Council must approve the commission’s recommendations if the Judicial Council determines that the awards comply with statutory and other relevant guidelines.

Council action:

The Judicial Council, pursuant to the Budget Act of 2001, approved the recommendation of the State Bar Legal Services Trust Fund Commission to allocate \$8,550,000 to legal service providers according to the formula established by Business and Professions Code section 6216.

Mr. Thomas J. Warwick recused himself from voting on Consent Agenda Item 2, regarding IOLTA grant funds, due to a conflict of interest because he serves on the board of the San Diego Legal Aid Society, which receives funding from the Equal Access Fund.

Item 3 Family Law: Renumbering All Forms (renumber forms 1281–1299.77, forms commencing with UIFSA and OMB, and form MC-150; revoke forms 1295.11a, 1297.90, 1297.91, 1297.92, and 1297.93)

On October 26, 2001, the Judicial Council approved a proposal to renumber all family law forms—including the governmental support, uniform paternity, and required federal forms—to make it easier for users to locate needed forms. The council also approved certain clerical and technical changes to the forms that would bring them into conformity with changes in the law and promote uniformity in the forms. In addition to clerical errors identified and corrected in the review process, the council approved technical amendments that were required to reflect three changes in laws that became effective January 1, 2002.

Council action:

The Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2003:

1. Renumbers forms 1281–1299.77 and forms commencing with UIFSA and OMB, and form MC-150, and adopts them as family law forms FL-100–FL-970.
2. Revokes forms 1295.11a, 1297.90, 1297.91, 1297.92, and 1297.93.

Item 4 Ethics Training: Educational Model for Second Cycle of Qualifying Ethics Training

To obtain Commission on Judicial Performance insurance coverage, a justice, judge, commissioner, or referee must, within a three-year cycle, complete a one-day Qualifying Ethics training. The training sessions will be offered in their current form through the end of 2002. In July 1999, the Judicial Council approved the one-day educational model for the first cycle. Because the proposed model for the next cycle of Qualifying Ethics trainings departs from the one-day model, the Judicial Council must approve the new model.

Council action:

The Judicial Council, effective August 30, 2002 approved the adoption of a new educational model for the second cycle of Qualifying Ethics training beginning in 2003 and continuing through the end of 2005, as follows:

1. Experienced justices, judges, commissioners, and referees who have completed the first cycle of training qualify during the second cycle by attending five hours of training consisting of a mandatory three-hour core course plus two hours of electives taken on a different date. Thus, they would be required to attend ethics training more than once during the three-year cycle. For elective components, alternatives to live delivery should be allowed so that the effectiveness of interactive distance learning technology can be explored.
2. New appointees qualify for the cycle during which they assume their position by completing the two-and-one-half-day ethics and fairness component of New Judge Orientation (NJO) and attending mandatory judicial ethics courses offered at the B. E. Witkin Judicial College.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

Item 5 Report and Recommendation on Fiscal Year 2003–2004 Statewide Trial Court Budget Request

Ms. Christine Hansen, Finance Division Director, and Mr. Stephen Nash, Assistant Director, presented the report. Mr. Nash provided an overview of the process that was used in setting the priorities and caps for the trial court budget requests for fiscal year

2003–2004. He described the budget development process including the provision of training to the court staff in writing well-justified and supported budget change requests, or BCRs.

It should be noted that pay equity adjustment requests were not included with the budget development package. The AOC Human Resources Division has been working with a consultant on a compensation and classification study. Courts will use the study and supplemental information developed in conjunction with it to determine which classifications may be included in a pay equity budget request. These requests may be market-driven or result from unification.

The courts will soon receive a package providing all the information needed to make their determinations, including pay ranges for specific classifications in four geographical areas. AOC Human Resources and Finance staff will review the court's requests and make recommendations to the AOC Executive Office. This will be the last year that pay equity requests related to unification may be submitted.

The Department of Finance (DOF) has issued budget letters to the Executive Branch departments that severely limit the budget requests that can be submitted. Funding for workload initiatives may only be requested if a budget reduction of an equal amount is submitted. Executive Branch departments are asked to submit proposals for a 20 percent ongoing budget reduction.

Based on this information and direction from the council at its March 1, 2002, meeting, staff decided that approved BCPs should be prioritized based on their critical need for funding. The recommendations outlined in the report before the council were based on that prioritization.

Four priority areas, 1, 2, 3, and 4, were established to categorize the BCPs. The numbers represent staff's attempts to group types of BCPs and do not indicate a level of importance. However, the Priority 1 items are mandated costs and appear to have the highest priority.

Priority 1

These items are critical and mandated and include requests for funding in areas where the court is required to either provide the service or pay the increased costs. This category also covers certain critical health and safety issues.

Priority 2

This category covers ongoing operational needs and includes requests for funding to either maintain existing levels of service or cover increased workload.

Priority 3

This priority level covers requests for achieving minimum service levels in specific program areas. Court reporting and legal research were established as areas of extraordinary requests. These requests were based on service-level ratio, with the goal of bringing courts and an attempt was made to bring courts up to a minimum level of service in these areas.

Priority 4

This category includes new and nonmandated and programs and program expansions.

Recommendations

The first recommendation is to approve augmentations in Priority 1 for a total of \$122.698 million, with one-time costs of \$2.992 million. This includes the court reporter conversion costs. This constitutes a 5.7 percent increase in the statewide budget of \$2.162 billion for fiscal year 2002–2003 as it is currently before the Legislature.

Funding in Priority 1 includes \$9.8 million for court interpreters, \$1.7 million for facilities areas involving health and safety issues, cost increases for child custody mediators and conservator investigators, \$553,000 to take over services from the counties, \$216,000 for human resources, \$6.7 million for increased county charges for services provided to the courts, and \$2.3 million for local needs, to assume services previously provided by the counties and convert temporary positions to permanent status as required by the IRS. The court-staff NSI figures were based on the previous year's. This amount is still to be negotiated, so the figure use was included as a placeholder for a future BCP. Priority 1 also includes postage rate increases, perimeter security for courts that currently have none, and increased lease costs for record storage.

Alternatives

Staff explained several alternatives available to the council regarding the budget recommendations. First it was indicated that if all of the items in Priorities 1–4 were approved that would represent about an 8.5 percent increase. All the requests listed made it through an extensive review, and have significant merit, though they are not all mandated costs.

A second alternative would be to approve items in Priorities 1–3 only since Priority 4 is for establishing new programs. The areas listed in Priorities 2 and 3 were felt by staff to be more compelling than those in Priority 4. Approving Priorities 1–3 would represent approximately an 8.1 percent increase in the trial court budget while approving only Priorities 1 and 2 would be an increase of 7.5 percent.

Staff recommendation 2 asks the council to approve resubmission to the DOF of any of the trial court items that may be removed from the budget still pending for fiscal year 2002–2003.

Recommendation 3 would authorize staff to proceed with sending out pay equity requests for information in both areas of unification and market-driven adjustments and for staff to then submit a BCP to the Department of Finance.

Recommendation 4 to directs the Administrative Director of the Courts to inform the Governor and the Department of Finance of all the needs regardless of the recommendations that the council makes today so the opportunity would exist, if things change, to continue with requesting those items that had been eliminated.

Recommendation 5 recommends delegating to the Administrative Director of the Courts the authority to make any technical adjustments that may become necessary as new information or figures become available.

Discussion

It was asked whether the employer share of health-care costs was included and whether the issue of increased costs had been resolved for the 2002–2003 fiscal year as to how the state is going to handle.

Staff indicated that the employer share of the health costs were included in the NSI and further stated that the state did provide more money that was passed on to the courts but that no resolution about how they will adjust the increased costs in January had been reached.

It was asked as to how items in Recommendation 2 that were not funded in the fiscal year would be prioritized. Staff replied that the unfunded items would have been placed in Priority 1 because all are either past-due costs or costs that the courts are already incurring. The prioritization done by staff was based on feedback from the presiding judges at CJAC earlier this year.

Concern was raised regarding whether the budget requests covered critical needs of of the three counties discussed in the site visit reports. It was stated that the budget requests will cover the counties' increased mandated costs. However, until staffing standards are established and we are able to begin to address staffing issues and are able to achieve some consistency in the funding of all of the courts, not all needs will be met.

It was asked whether the court interpreter costs were incorporated or whether those costs would still be an issue. Staff indicated that they hope to receive full funding to pay the courts for the interpreting costs they currently incur.

A motion was made to approve the five recommendations as stated in the report.

Council action:

The Judicial Council approved the following recommendations:

1. Augmentations to the fiscal year 2003–2004 statewide trial court budget that fall within Priority 1 (Critical Mandated), totaling \$122.698 million, including one-time costs of \$2.992 million;
2. Incorporation of court staff NSIs, security NSIs and retirement, family and children, increased county charges, and court interpreter costs from the fiscal year 2002–2003 budget change proposals (BCPs) into fiscal year 2003–2004 BCPs if the budget is passed before September 13 and these items are not included in the Budget Act;
3. Authorize AOC staff to review pay equity adjustment requests for requests due to unification (effective date after July 1, 2001, final year for this type of request) and those based on market-driven factors (effective date of July 1, 2000 and later). Owing to possible time constraints, delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to submit a BCP for those requests that are justified, without having to return to the council for further consideration;
4. Direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to notify the Governor of the need for all of the items approved on appeal, but submit formal BCPs only on the Priority 1 – Critical Mandated requests at this time; and
5. Delegate to the Administrative Director of the Courts the authority to make technical adjustments to the recommended fiscal year 2003–2004 statewide trial court budget.

The motion passed.

Item 6 Fiscal Year 2003–2004 Supreme Court and California Judicial Center Library Budgets, Courts of Appeal Budget, and Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts Budget

Ms. Christine Hansen indicated that in April 2002 the Finance Division sent out a request for budget change proposals. The Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal were not provided any specific restrictions or priority areas; however, the AOC divisions were instructed to limit their budget change proposals to essential services to the trial courts and major infrastructure deficiencies.

The recommendation is to proceed with two requests submitted by the Supreme Court:

1. Capital case habeas corpus staff to address the increase in the number of death penalty appeals and related habeas corpus petitions ready for Supreme Court action; and
2. California Judicial Center Library (CJCL) funding to cover price increases for subscription material, expenses necessary for the continual and effective operation of the CJCL.

The Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee reviewed the requests submitted by the Courts of Appeal, which totaled \$2.971 million. The committee determined that the following requests should be developed into BCPs:

1. Securing the judicial chambers floors for the 4th District, Division One;
2. Mediation of civil appeals in the 3rd District; and
3. Court appointed Counsel Program funding increases.

Requests for judicial salary increases were deferred.

The AOC submitted 41 requests totaling \$46.5 million and 210 positions that met the criteria of providing services to the courts and to resolve infrastructure issues. Requests were received from the Office of the General Counsel to support the regional offices, to provide legal services to the courts, and to improve traffic administration. The Center for Families, Children & the Courts requested funding for court assistance, improvements in juvenile justice, assistance for self-represented litigants, and increased family law costs for the facilitator program. Requests from the Center for Judicial Education and Research included staff development of online education courses for judges. Executive Office Programs requested funding for a caseload and workload analysis unit, development of trial court staffing standards, branch communications, advisory committee programs, and the new Reporting of the Record Task Force. Regional offices requested funding to add staff. The Finance requests included funding for trial court fiscal systems procurement, facilities, reclassification of positions, and computer-aided facilities management. Human Resources requested funding for staffing court interpreters, reclassifications, and labor relations. Information Services requested technology center staff for the courts, court management systems, judicial branch data exchange, judicial branch caseflow automation, and court user and technical support.

Priority categories were developed by AOC staff and three areas of concentration were determined:

1. Critical Mandated
2. Ongoing Operational Needs
3. New Nonmandated Initiatives and Program Expansion

AOC staff, in conjunction with the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal, reviewed the BCPs to identify their priority classifications. In consideration of the state's fiscal condition, only Priority 1, Critical Mandated BCPs are being recommended.

The Supreme Court is constitutionally obligated to directly review all death penalty cases. Hence, the request from the Habeas Corpus Resource Center addresses a sustained workload increase resulting from measures taken by the court, the Legislature, and the Governor.

- Creation of the Habeas Corpus Resource Center, which provides representation in habeas corpus proceedings in capital cases;
- An increase in the number of attorneys in the Public Defender's Office to provide representation in direct appeals; and
- An increase in the rate of pay for private counsel appointed to represent defendants on death row.

The court-appointed counsel request was a resubmission of a 2002–2003 BCP. The request is for increased contractual service costs for the Supreme Court's California Appellate Project. Redirection of funding from the court-appointed counsel program is being considered so the item has been deferred until it is determined whether the program can be covered with other court-appointed counsel funds. If necessary, a finance letter will be submitted in the spring.

Securing the judicial chambers floors for the 4th District has a cost of \$744,000. This is a request to acquire the balance of additional lease space on the third floor of the Symphony Towers building in downtown San Diego. The court would occupy all of the third, fourth, and fifth contiguous floors. Security is the primary factor because the justices' chambers are co-located on the fifth floor making public access possible. Justices walk through public hallways to reach public courtrooms and robing rooms, which can be a security hazard. Relocation of the courtroom to the third floor adjacent to the Clerk's office will consolidate public areas and enhance service to the public. Justice areas located on the fifth floor will become more secure by providing only authorized access to the floor.

In Priority 3, the mediation of civil appeals request is for establishment of a settlement conference program limited to certain civil appeals to reduce both court caseload and attorney costs for many litigants. This was submitted in 2002–2003 but was withdrawn due to budget reductions. If necessary, finance letter will be submitted in the spring.

Alternatives would be to approve selected items in the priorities.

The AOC has requested approximately \$7.8 million for 46 positions. The positions would cover the AOC's assumption of county-provided services. Five BCPs are being submitted for these services.

One BCP is for establishing legal services in the regional offices. The request is for four attorneys to provide assistance in 11 areas of trial court operations.

Another BCP addresses trial court accountability and would fund an accounting processing center to provide financial services to the trial courts. The request, for about \$2.125 million, includes an offset of approximately \$1 million. After the center and its core staff are established, any funding previously paid to the counties for services will be transferred through the budget process to the AOC to help fund the accounting processing center. Information is still being collected from the courts to determine each court's costs for these services.

The request includes a number of new positions:

A Supervising Accountant to develop and implement a statewide treasury service. All monies being held in existing county funds would be moved into a statewide treasury for investment and management.

The accounting processing center establishes thirty-two to operate the accounting center.

Three fiscal assistance positions to establish fiscal policies and procedures for the trial courts and assist in strategic fiscal planning.

Three auditor positions to help meet the staffing standards identified by the Bureau of State Audits and the State Controller's Office as well as to respond to the significant number of requests for services.

Two purchasing positions: a senior contract specialist and a business services technician to implement statewide purchasing options for the judiciary.

Four Human Resources positions to provide the additional assistance to the courts in labor negotiations, contract administration, and employee relations.

Eight positions and \$1 million to provide staff for trial court technology centers to minimize risk in the transition from county to state operating environments, leverage existing state assets for the trial courts, minimize expenses, and use shareable resources.

Seven AOC and Appellate Court user and technical support positions totaling \$3.5 million. No new IT staff has been hired during the AOC's recent period of growth, and current AOC and appellate court requests overwhelm existing resources.

Also under Priority 1 are ongoing existing service-cost increases. One portion of this funding, \$361,000, is for reclassified positions for the AOC, comparable to the pay-equity positions in the trial courts.

The Center for Families, Children & the Courts has requested funds to increase an interagency agreement with the Child Support Services for the program. Under a reimbursement arrangement the Family Law Facilitator program (AB 1058) will receive the funds and transfer them to the AOC. The AOC will need to request authority to receive the funds.

Priority 2 – Funding of \$4.9 million is requested for Ongoing Operational Needs. Included in the total is a request for five positions to add administrative coordinators to the regional offices to manage all of the meetings at their conference facilities. In addition, funds are requested to hire a senior human resources analyst to develop reliable and validated

standardized assessment tools for applicant testing and validation and make them available to the courts. The court interpreter program is requesting two positions to expand its recruitment, training, testing, and certification program. Under the category of court management systems, \$2.488 million is requested for 20 limited-term positions for five years to be located at the regional offices to provide case management systems services. Judicial branch data exchange requires 10 positions to support three parallel projects:

- Criminal history data exchange;
- Enterprise information exchange; and
- Enterprise reporting

Staff recommendations are:

1. Approve Priority 1 – Critical Mandated for a total of \$9.363 million which is about 3.2 percent of the current total General Fund budget for the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, California Judicial Center Library, and AOC combined;
2. Direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to notify the Governor of the needs of the BCPs in all priority areas and the deferred items, including additional judges and increased judicial salaries listed as deferred, and submit only the formal BCPs from Priority 1-Critical Mandated at this time;
3. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to make technical changes as necessary; and
4. Defer the court-appointed counsel BCP request for possible resubmission in the spring if adequate funds do not exist.

Discussion

Justice Epstein stated that he believes there is no conflict of interest as a result of his authorship of legal texts, but he recused himself from any discussion or vote on this item because he thought it was appropriate to do so.

It was stated that although the state budget has not passed, state employees continue to be paid while outside vendors are not. It was asked whether, since the court-appointed counsel function in both the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal is constitutionally mandated, court-appointed counsel should be paid notwithstanding the failure to pass the budget.

Staff indicated that they were not aware that circumstances like that are occurring in the executive branch but offered to find out whether there are such instances or if consideration can be given for court-appointed counsel.

It was pointed out that staff are working on legislation to get a continuing appropriation that would give the AOC the authority to have those items paid.

It was noted that the costs of books and subscriptions have risen 5 percent and 18 percent respectively, and it was suggested that staff to start investigate online libraries and alternative ways of securing publications. In addition, the costs of maintaining libraries include shelving, additional space, and structural changes. It was pointed out that the Space Mitigation Task Force on Court Facilities addressed these issues in its report. Staff was asked to research these issues and report back to the Judicial Council. The council will ask staff to do further study if it is warranted.

A motion was made that the Judicial Council approve recommendations in Tab 6 as they relate to Priority 1 allocations only.

It was pointed out that the AOC is to provide direct services to the trial courts and take over some of the services they have previously sought from the counties and other sources. Because many of the trial courts are understaffed and have hiring freezes, the council is asking for 45 new positions. It therefore is important to communicate to the trial courts that new positions are related to direct services to the trial courts and not intended for new programs or to expand AOC staff.

Council action:

The Judicial Council approved the following recommendations for the Supreme Court and California Judicial Center Library Budget:

1. Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) falling within Priority 1 (Critical Mandated) as described within the reports.
2. Direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to notify the Governor of the need for the BCPs in all priority categories and the deferred item, but only to submit formal BCPs on the Priority 1 (Critical Mandated) category at this time.
3. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to make technical changes to the budget as necessary.

Special Comments

Chief Justice Ronald M. George announced that Mr. William C. Vickrey had achieved the milestone of serving for 10 years as the Administrative Director of the Courts. Chief Justice George acknowledged the many difficult situations Mr. Vickrey has faced during his tenure, including two budget crises, state trial court funding, and trial court unification. The Chief Justice commended Mr. Vickrey for his vision and energy in helping to maintain the state's judiciary as an independent and accountable branch of government. The Chief expressed his personal appreciation and presented Mr. Vickrey with an award in honor of the occasion.

Chief Justice Ronald M. George acknowledged and welcomed Ms. Yvette Rincon of the Legislative Analysts Office, who was present for the meeting.

Item 7 Special Fund Allocations for Fiscal Year 2002–2003

It was announced that Ms. Malissa Hathaway McKeith, a former member of the State Bar Board of Governors and a current member of the Bench-Bar Coalition, was present. Ms. McKeith has been volunteering her time on the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee's Self-Represented Litigants Fillable Forms Project. The project provides assistance to persons who have visual impairments in accessing and filling out Judicial Council forms on line.

Mr. Stephen Nash, Assistant Director of the Finance Division, presented the. This report recommends approval of proposed allocations of the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Modernization Fund) and the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF). In January 2002, the council approved special fund guidelines containing policies and procedures for allocating funds from the Modernization Fund and the TCIF. The Modernization Fund was established to promote improved access, efficiency, and effectiveness in trial courts and is appropriated annually. The TCIF fund was created to improve management efficiency, case processing, and speedy trials. This fund is continuously appropriated and, as such does not require legislative authorization in the annual budget act.

Discussion

Clarification was requested on whether the \$42 million normally funded from the Trial Court Trust Fund, and now funded from the TCIF, reflects an offset of potential budget cuts from the trial courts' budget.

Staff indicated that some of the reductions were offset by the TCIF so the trial courts' budget did not have to be cut. In addition some one-time costs were subtracted because the intent was to present the Governor with ongoing costs. The result is that one-time cost items are being funded out of the TCIF on a one-time only basis.

Finance staff clarified that the money they would have spent on the grants this year may be used for emergency funding. The hope is that in future fiscal years the money will be used on the grant programs.

A motion was made to approve the allocations.

A question was asked regarding the Center for Court Research, Innovation, and Planning and its purpose. Also requested was an explanation of the three projects referenced in the recommendation.

Staff explained that an internal AOC reorganization and consolidation created the Executive Office Programs Division (EOP) and also expanded the role of the Research and Planning Unit to include Innovation and Effective Practices. In the past the Modernization Fund has provided Innovation Grants to the trial courts, which have totaled \$1.6 million dollars annually. This grant program will be suspended for FY 02-03. The \$108,000 allocation will be used to assemble a panel to work with AOC staff to identify critical areas for court innovation and evaluation. AOC staff will then develop a new Modernization Fund Innovation grant program that will fund projects in these two or three areas using a FY 03-04 Modernization Fund allocation of \$1.6 million.

Council action:

The Judicial Council approved the following:

1. Allocate \$1,248,000 of Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Funds as follows for fiscal year 2002–2003:
 - Statewide Education Programs (net adjustments) (\$80,000)
 - Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute (\$50,000)
 - Orientation and Education for Judicial Council Advisory Committee Chairs (\$5,000)
 - Reporting of the Record Task Force (\$220,000)
 - Presiding Judges and Court Executives Meetings (\$200,000)
 - Kleps Award Program (\$80,000)
 - Trial Court Grant Management Training (\$35,000)
 - Jury Management–Model Summons (\$200,000)
 - California Judicial Branch Human Resources Conference (\$90,000)
 - Statewide Survey of Court Interpreters (\$80,000)
 - Test Development and Validation Focus Group (\$60,000)
 - Case-Flow Management Training (\$40,000)
 - Center for Court Research, Innovation, and Planning (\$108,000)
 - Emergency Funding Reserve (\$1,492,000)
2. Allocate \$10,122,759 of Trial Court Improvement Funds for thirteen proposed special projects comprised of:
 - Workers' Compensation Program Implementation Reserve (\$2,000,000)
 - Trial Courts Benefits Program (\$254,000)
 - Succession Planning for the California Courts (\$300,000)
 - Statewide Interpreter Conference (\$50,000)
 - Strategic Planning, Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (\$15,000)
 - Shared Administrative Services Pilot Project (\$1,250,000)
 - CJP Defense Insurance Premium Increase (\$270,375)
 - Uniform Model Family Court Projects (\$2,250,000)
 - Facility Organization and Real Estate Transfer Consultants (\$1,015,000)
 - Facilities Seismic Evaluation (\$1,000,000)
 - Self-Represented Litigants Fillable Forms (\$514,000)
 - Self-Represented Litigants Agreement Template (\$30,000)

- Family Law Self-Help Center (\$1,174,384)
3. Allocate \$42,094,859 from the Trial Court Improvement Fund for fiscal year 2002–2003 for seven items, six of which are typically funded from the Trial Court Trust Fund but are being funded from TCIF to offset one-time TCTF reductions:
- Security (\$627,414)
 - Records Management (\$4,901,455)
 - Information Technology Infrastructure Asset Replacement (\$4,422,000)
 - Information Technology Infrastructure—Telecommunications (\$13,244,000)
 - Information Technology Infrastructure Asset Management (\$7,400,000)
 - Operating Expenses and Equipment Costs (\$10,000,000)
 - Audit Contract (\$1,500,000)

The motion passed. For multi-year, limited-term projects the amount approved may vary from year-to-year.

Item 8 Trial Court Administration: Trial Court Shared Administration Services Pilot Program

Ms. Christine Patton, Regional Administrative Director, Bay Area/Northern Coastal Region, and Mike Roddy, Regional Administrative Director, Northern/Central Region, presented the report.

The proposal is for a three-year pilot program to create shared administration systems between two or more counties, to provide local court management of fiscal, human resources, technology, and other court administrative services that were formerly provided by the counties. Shared administration will assist small courts that cannot justify having full-time staff perform human resources, finance, and technical functions.

The models generated by the pilot -project will form the basis for future collaborations in other courts. The Request for Proposals (RFP) is currently a draft document. The council is being asked to authorize staff to issue the draft RFP for comment, review the comments submitted, finalize the RFP, and then send it out to all of the courts.

Previous direction from the council to staff was as follows:

- Implement a statewide infrastructure to promote efficiency, effectiveness (e.g., reliability, consistency), and accountability as well as to provide the necessary support for local court operations.
- Support, in a manner that facilitates coordination with the statewide administrative infrastructure, the development of administrative capacity with trial court for those functions which are best done locally.
- Explore options to provide necessary comprehensive administrative support for smaller jurisdictions in a manner that is efficient, and that will enhance their ability to manage day-to-day operations and to coordinate with the statewide administrative support systems.

It was clarified that the measure is before the council for two reasons. First, conducting the pilot program over three years and the evaluation will help the council to provide direction to the project. The project is a deviation from prior direction the council has given the AOC about how to approach administrative support in smaller jurisdictions. Individual pilot projects and the program outline normally would not be brought to the council. However, because the project deviates from prior direction and owing to the changing environment of the courts as it relates to administrative services, the RFP contains assumptions about the relationship of the current statewide administrative infrastructure to the local capacity that ought to be built into each court. The pilot program, although it slows the decision-making process, allows the smaller jurisdictions to develop models that might provide comprehensive but efficient administrative support services while staff implements the statewide infrastructure

Discussion

An inquiry was made regarding how the AOC would encourage courts to apply for this the pilot project.

It was indicated that some counties, aware of the AOC's concerns with the growth of administrative support positions in the trial courts, have already approached the AOC with interest in developing a model for shared administrative services. However there has been no clear direction from the Judicial Council/AOC on how such services should be provided, nor were there any incentives. It is hoped that the funding from the modernization fund may serve as some incentive.

Concern was raised regarding the goal (number 3 on page 3) of developing recommendations for transitioning to comprehensive administrative management by a single court executive over two or more courts.

Staff responded that from the beginning of the process it must be determined how decisions will be made given that several court executives will be involved. The governance referred to on page 5 is for the transition period and asks that the courts involved in the pilot project determine how, at the end of the process, the transition to a single court executive can be made.

Further clarification was requested regarding whether smaller counties could participate in the pilot without, at the outset, committing to moving toward a single court executive for two or more counties.

It was indicated that the expectation is that the courts would come up with ideas to preserve the individual court executive officers in individual jurisdictions if they can provide a point of contact and a line of accountability. As a result it may be appropriate to adjust the RFP to allow for some alternative plans.

Previous conversations have been at the conceptual level and staff is trying to provide a clear and explicit direction so everyone understands the objectives and meaningful discussions can take place. Historically, operating with a committee of court executives on court coordination in the effort to consolidate administration resulted in council direction to come up with a different approach and to move to one presiding judge because of the difficulty of providing accountability. In the current situation, if AOC staff is taking direction from three different court executives and calling multiple counties dealing with the same staff, the result would be the AOC staff trying to mediate the differences in terms of direction that individuals are given at the local level. To prevent this, the guideline here suggests quite clearly that the long-term objective, whether by attrition or other means, is to move to a single court executive as a single contact point and authority for all involved courts.

The experience over 10 years with coordination provided a great deal of information about how those systems work. In virtually every case the feedback from court executives and presiding judges and from the council advisory committee overseeing coordination was that they would end up with a lot of confusion, miscommunication, and an inability to be responsive to local or statewide needs.

This is an attempt to respond to the discussions in the rural judges forum of being direct and up front with the courts and judges so that if there are concerns they can be discussed.

It was asked if the concept is that if county A wants to share administrative services it has to find one other county to share all areas or can county A share finance with county B and human resources with county C?

In response to a clarification question Mr. Vickrey said the goal is that counties would find another county or counties with which to share the administrative resources and develop an organizational relationship with courts in other counties. The plan thus would provide comprehensive administrative support services that will serve a number of jurisdictions. Judges in those jurisdictions would have the flexibility to set priorities for their own funding and general day-to-day management direction, but they would be jointly supported by a team providing day-to-day administrative support, pure administration, human resources, finance, and technology.

It was pointed out that the report proposes to give the Administrative Director of the Courts both the direction and the discretion to deviate from the general policy of providing a systematic state infrastructure, recognizing that that may not even be desirable or possible with the smaller courts, and to allow experimentation, dialog, and discussion on best methods.

A motion was made to approve the recommendation with the understanding that the council is directing the Administrative Director of the Courts to deviate from previously

stated policies regarding statewide infrastructure to the extent that the smaller jurisdictions develop models for consolidating administrative services.

Council action:

The Judicial Council approved a budget request of up to \$1.25 million per year from the Trial Court Improvement Fund to establish and evaluate two to three pilot programs for a three-year duration to promote collaborative efforts between courts in developing and sharing comprehensive administrative support systems to meet local needs and to effectively coordinate with state-level systems.

The motion passed.

**Item 9 Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group Report: Staff
Recommendations for Implementation**

Justice William R. McGuiness, chair of the Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group, presented the report. Judges Robert A. Dukes, C. Robert Jameson, and William A. McKinstry assisted in the presentation. The council established the Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group and charged it with making recommendations on policy issues concerning the service of commissioners and referees in the courts. The major part of the working group's task was a review of subordinate judicial officer (SJO) duties and titles

To carry out that aspect of its charge, the working group was divided into three subject groups, criminal, family and juvenile, and civil. The subject groups reviewed SJO duties in their respective areas and developed preliminary recommendations and a range of alternatives for review by the full working group.

The task of distinguishing between the duties of SJOs and judges required legal distinctions concerning the structure of the court system and the distribution of its duties but not the quality of work performed by SJOs or by judges. The group emphasized that its recommendations do not address the role that SJOs perform as temporary judges. SJOs routinely act as temporary judges in every case type and fill a critical need for judges in many courts. The working group's charge was to define subordinate judicial duties, i.e., those duties that SJOs have authority to perform without a stipulation that they may sit as temporary judges. Another issue that pervades every case type is the need for a cohesive statutory structure providing for the duties and titles of SJOs. There are currently nine types of SJOs, each with a different scope of authority. Their duties are described in at least 35 statutes dispersed among six codes. The resulting statutory structure is complex and frequently overlapping; thus, the group recommends that the statutes be reorganized and consolidated.

Judge Dukes stated that the working group was composed of presiding judges, judges, and executive officers as well as representatives from the State Bar. The difficulties they

addressed ranged from operational concerns, to public accountability, to the proper duties of SJOs, which in some cases serve as nonelected judges.

The working group reached consensus on the core principle that the power to imprison should be given only to judges who are accountable to the electorate. The group recommends that, in criminal cases, the definition of SJO duties distinguish clearly between matters that can result in imprisonment and loss of freedom and those that cannot, and delegate only the latter to SJOs. Applying that principle in criminal matters does not substantially change the scope of subordinate judicial duties from its current statutory definition. The group generally recommends preserving the status quo and that SJOs retain their current authority in the following criminal matters:

- Infractions;
- Traffic misdemeanors;
- Arraignments;
- Penal Code section 1269c bail determinations;
- Bench warrants; and
- Discovery motions.

The group did agree on a few exceptions to the principle that judges should hear all matters that could result in imprisonment. The primary exception is the recommendation that SJOs retain their current authority to issue bench warrants for failures to appear. Although bench warrants can result in imprisonment, the recommendation is intended to insure that SJOs have the necessary tools to manage their calendars and control their courtrooms.

The group also recommends an extension of SJO authority in the area of contempt, extending contempt power to SJOs in cases that are otherwise within their authority, such as infractions. This authority would not extend to matters that SJOs hear as temporary judges unless stipulated and agreed to in advance by the parties.

The group discussed several alternative approaches to defining subordinate judicial duties in criminal cases, and rejected expansion of SJO duties in areas such as magistrate duties, acceptance of guilty pleas, and imposition of stipulated sentences. It was pointed out that this does not in any way prohibit the parties, by stipulation, from allowing an SJO to act as a judge and impose sentence.

Judge Jameson addressed the areas of family law and juvenile law. The working group concluded that almost all family and juvenile matters should be handled by a judge and not by an SJO. A judge should handle cases involving dissolution of a marriage, custody support matters, dependency, removal of a child from the home, and termination of parental rights. As in the criminal area, a juvenile should not be subject to incarceration by an SJO.

The dilemma is that Commissioners hear 43 percent of all family law matters in the state. SJOs hear 32 percent of all dependency matters and 31 percent of all delinquency matters. The working group recommends replacing those SJOs with judges and that the child support commissioners retain authority to hear child support matters as outlined in Family Code section 4251. The group also recommends retaining SJO authority in the areas of truancy and noncustodial juvenile delinquency matters.

Judge William A. McKinstry addressed the working group's recommendations with respect to civil cases. The group concluded that adjudication of contested civil matters involving serious, complex, and diverse factual and legal issues should be performed by judges and not delegated to SJOs. The group recommends that subordinate judicial duties in civil cases be limited to the following:

- Small claims, including small claims appeals;
- Uncontested matters;
- Discovery matters;
- Other pretrial motions;
- Settlement conferences/mediation; and
- Uncontested post-judgment remedies.

This recommended list of duties in civil matters does not include some in which SJOs presently have authority, namely:

- Issuance of temporary restraining orders;
- Mental health hearings;
- Hearing of court trials; and
- Hearing of unlawful detainers.

The council has already decided that no SJO will lose his or her job on account of the SJO conversion legislation. Accordingly, these recommendations will be implemented over time as SJOs retire or have their positions converted to judgeships. Across all case types the working group favored defining SJO duties so that the judicial branch could secure significant numbers of judges to begin performing the judicial duties now being performed by SJOs. Hence, the recommendations should serve as long-term objectives.

Discussion

It was asked if there were concerns in light of the outcome of the SJO conversion legislation.

It was indicated that the legislation will be reintroduced and hopefully with a better budget climate it would receive a better reception at that time. It should not be assumed that the proposal has been abandoned or will not be pursued.

The working group asked that the council receive the report and refer it to staff, with the request that they consider issues of implementation and legislation and return to the council or the Executive and Planning Committee in December for further review and discussion.

A motion was made to approve the recommendations with the addition that if the council approves the motion it is thereby reaffirming the position advanced by the PCLC's legislative efforts to pursue the conversion legislation that the council previously endorsed.

It was asked whether the stipulation of the parties would affect the authority of a subordinate judicial officer to act in cases, such as divorces, that are traditionally heard by judges.

It was indicated that the recommendations of the working group were confined to the general issue of the duties an SJO ought to perform. The group did not address, nor did the group expect to implicate, the ability of courts to assign SJOs as temporary judges by virtue of stipulation.

Concern was raised regarding the workload transfer from SJOs to judges. Specifically, whether a premise of the report is that if current SJO positions are converted to judgeships the report's recommendations will not increase workload for existing judges who already have full calendars.

Justice McGuinness responded that that was a fair statement.

A question was asked regarding the genesis of the recommendation to enable courts to delegate to clerks the authority to convert fines to community service and whether courts were now following that practice.

It was indicated that some courts delegated that function to the clerk's office and that other courts take a strong position that it is a sentencing function and should remain with a judicial officer, whether or not he or she is a subordinate judicial officer. The recommendation is that those functions should be clearly defined as clearly delegable to the clerk's office so that other judicial functions will not be interrupted by routine requests to convert fines to community service.

It was pointed out that the most difficult part of family and juvenile law is the problem of retention. People can always be assigned, but the economic structure of the family law bar is such that they are not attracted to the bench. For a variety of other reasons juvenile practitioners are not appointed to the bench. A substantively strong specialty cannot be created when people do not remain in it, and it takes time to learn to perform this function well. It was suggested that staff think about the transition.

It was stated that this was a subject the working group discussed. The commissioners often remain in this assignment for 10 to 20 years and develop considerable expertise. Relegating them to small claims would not be advantageous,, so conversion is all the more important.

It was asked whether this issue would be subject to further public comment.

It was explained that staff would present proposals to the Executive and Planning Committee for review. Any proposed legislation would be considered by the PCLC, and any proposed rules by RUPRO. There would be time for public comment as well as more discussion within the council.

Council action:

The Judicial Council directed staff to prepare an implementation plan for the recommendations in the *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Duties and Titles* report prepared by the Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group.

The motion passed.

Circulating and Appointment Orders Approved

Circulating Orders:

No circulating orders were approved since the last meeting.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Reporting of the Record Task Force

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Judicial Branch Budget Advisory Committee

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointments to the Court Executives Advisory Committee

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Probation Services Task Force

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Waiver allowing an appointee to complete his term on the Judicial Council through September 14, 2003

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Judicial Council

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Waiver allowing an appointee to commence his term on the Judicial Council while serving as Presiding Judge

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Judicial Council

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Court Technology Advisory Committee

For information only; no action necessary.

Appointment Orders: Appointment to the Probation Services Task Force

For information only; no action necessary.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William C. Vickrey
Secretary