



The Capitol Connection

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS • OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

In this Issue

Judicial Branch Budget 1

Foster Care Takes Center Stage ... 1

Judicial Council-Sponsored
Legislation..... 2

Legislative Review 3

State of the Judiciary and BBC
Day in Sacramento 4

OGA Advocates Greet
New Legislators..... 8

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET: \$246 MILLION IN CUTS AND LOSS OF JUDGESHIP FUNDING

On February 20, 2009, the Governor took unprecedented action by signing legislation to amend California’s budget for fiscal year 2008-2009 (SBX3 2) and enacting a state budget for fiscal year 2009-2010 (SBX3 1) (see sidebar, Page 5). The eighteen-month budget solution concluded a long, and, at times, volatile debate surrounding the entirety of the state’s fiscal condition, during which time the state Controller withheld billions of dollars in state payments and the state Treasurer discontinued funding for hundreds of state construction projects.

vetoed by the Governor, had included a \$35 million reduction in CPI growth funding.

However, for fiscal year 2009-2010, the budget package cut \$375 million from judicial branch operations and programs and made funding for new judgeships and one-time unallocated reductions subject to the state’s receipt of funding under the federal economic stimulus package. Specifically, the package departs from the current framework of one-time reductions and instead includes the following cuts:

- Permanent Unallocated Reduction \$146M
- Continued Delay of the Conservatorship Program Funding \$17M
- State Court Facilities Construction Fund Transfer to the General Fund \$40M
- One-time Unallocated Reduction, subject to federal stimulus “trigger” \$100M

(Continued on Page 5)

Legislative Calendar

June 8

Delayed release of Administration budget proposal (“May Revise”)

June 15

Budget bill must be signed by midnight

As anticipated, the enacted budget package will present tremendous challenges for the judicial branch. In the current fiscal year (2008-2009), the branch did not suffer any further reductions allowing the trial courts to maintain the entirety of the provided consumer price index (CPI) growth funding (\$70.1 million). Legislation passed in December, which was subsequently

FOSTER CARE REFORM TAKES CENTER STAGE

The Judicial Council has made implementation of the recommendations of the California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care (BRC) one of its key legislative priorities this year. The council is sponsoring three bills to implement BRC recommendations: AB 12 (Beall and Bass), AB 131 (Evans), and AB 938 (Judiciary Committee) (see page 2 for more information). The BRC is chaired by Associate Justice Carlos Moreno of the California Supreme Court, who was in Sacramento on March 9 to participate in a press briefing on AB 12, which would extend foster care services for youth from age 18 to 21. Justice Moreno was joined by Assembly Speaker Karen Bass, Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg, Assembly Members Jim Beall, Danny Gilmore, and Nathan Fletcher, former Senate President pro Tempore John Burton, and California Department of Social Services Director John Wagner.

In addition to these speakers, the event featured Mr. Kevin West, a former foster youth who described his experience with homelessness after he was forced to leave his foster care placement at age 18, and Professor Mark Courtney from the University of Washington, who presented a cost-benefit analysis of AB 12. Professor Courtney’s report, which is available at www.cafosteringconnections.org, documents the improved outcomes that result when these youth are able to obtain



OGA Attorney Tracy Kenny presenting on foster care reform initiatives to members of the Bench-Bar Coalition at “Day in Sacramento.”

(Continued on page 6)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

In 2009-2010, the Judicial Council has identified the following legislative priorities for the judicial branch:

CIVIL & SMALL CLAIMS

Assembly Bill 5 (Evans), as introduced. Civil discovery: Electronic Discovery Act.

This bill, co-sponsored by the Judicial Council, the Consumer Attorneys of California, and the California Defense Counsel, enacts the Electronic Discovery Act of 2009. The bill adds definitions of “electronic” and “electronically stored information” to the Civil Discovery Act and authorizes the discovery of electronically stored information. In addition, the bill allows a party to specify the form in which electronically stored information is to be produced, and if no form is specified, the responding party must produce the information in the form in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a form that is reasonably usable. The bill further establishes procedures for motions to compel and motions for protective orders relating to the discovery of electronically stored information, as well as a procedure for handling disputes over the production of electronically stored information. **Status:** Senate Rules Committee. For more information contact Daniel Pone at daniel.pone@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

COURT FACILITIES

Senate Bill 12, Second Extraordinary Session (Steinberg)—Court facilities continuous appropriation.

Senate Bill 1407 (2008, Perata) set the framework for the issuance of \$5 billion in revenue (non-General Fund) bonds to support the con-

struction and renovation of 41 seriously deficient courthouses throughout the state. However, the bill did not contain an appropriation. On February 20, 2009, the Governor signed SBX2 12 providing a continuous appropriation to allow the Judicial Council to expend funds accrued under SB 1407 for site acquisition and preliminary design plans for all 41 projects. The council estimates that the continuous spending authorization will yield \$250 million in savings over the life of the projects by avoiding costly construction delays; will put Californians back to work by creating 105,000 jobs; and will bring \$11 billion in goods and services to California.

Status: The legislation takes effect on May 21, 2009. For more information, contact Curtis Child at curtis.child@jud.ca.gov or 916-323-3121.

COURT OPERATIONS

AB 663 (Jones), as introduced.

Legal aid: court interpreters: appearances by telephone.

Creates a working group to identify and develop best practices to maximize existing resources to increase the number of court interpreters participating in civil actions and proceedings. Creates a pilot project to implement the recommendations of the working group in a small number of courts. Requires the Judicial Council to enter into one or more master agreements with providers of telephonic phone appearance services. Requires a telephonic appearance vendor to pay the state \$15 per appearance to support the civil interpreter pilot program. Revises and standardizes the court data collection and reporting requirements. **Status:** Assembly Judiciary Committee. For more information

contact Daniel Pone at daniel.pone@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

Senate Bill 556 (Committee on Judiciary), as introduced. Courts.

Clarifies that a court is authorized to charge the same fees for post-judgment motions related to the enforcement of a small claims judgment as a court charges for the enforcement of other civil judgments. Clarifies that a court is authorized to submit unpaid bail amounts to the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt Collection program. **Status:** Passed out of Senate Judiciary Committee (5-0); in Senate Appropriations. For more information contact Daniel Pone at daniel.pone@jud.ca.gov or Janus Norman at janus.norman@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

COURT SECURITY

Several years ago, the Judicial Council adopted funding standards to direct security funding to the courts. However, sufficient funding has not yet been provided by the Legislature and the Governor to meet those standards. Of the state’s 58 trial courts, 48 courts receive less than they should under the funding standard. For the past few years, the Judicial Council has identified one-time funding to meet base funding shortfalls – not to bring courts up to standard, but to maintain the existing security service levels. One-time funding is no longer available. With the loss of this one-time funding and other budget reductions suffered by the courts, there will be a shortfall in the court security budget that may reach as much as \$68 million. Failure to fund this will

(Continued on page 6)

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

The following is an update of the first year of the 2009 - 2010 legislative session on selected bills of interest to the courts as of April 14, 2009.

CIVIL & SMALL CLAIMS

SB 209 (Corbett and Harman), as introduced. Civil actions: disabled access.

Provides necessary cleanup to the provisions in Senate Bill 1608 of 2008 ([Corbett et al.] Stats. 2008, ch. 549) regarding sealing of records and protective orders. SB 1608 currently provides that a Certified Access Specialist program (CASp) report shall be subject to a protective court order if the defendant has satisfied certain requirements relating to inspection of the site at issue. SB 209 would instead require the CASp inspection report to remain confidential and would allow disclosure only to the parties to the action, the parties' attorneys, and others necessary to the settlement of the case. SB 209 would also require the report to remain confidential throughout the stay and until the conclusion of the claim, unless there is a showing of good cause by any party.

Status: Passed Senate Floor (36-0); to Assembly

JC position: Support.

CRIMINAL

AB 250 (Miller), as introduced. Criminal procedure: trials: timing.

Requires a defendant's withdrawal of the waiver of his or her speedy trial time limits to be done in open court.

Status: Assembly Public Safety Committee

JC Position: Support.

AB 447 (Nestande), as introduced.

Criminal procedure: trial counsel: defendant: inability to pay.

Makes mandatory on the court and defendant several provisions relating to the court's determination of a defendant's ability to pay for counsel: in every case in which a defendant appears at arraignment without counsel; in every case in which a court determines that a defendant cannot employ his or her own counsel; in every case in which public counsel is appointed; and in every case in which a juvenile is represented by public counsel.

Status: Assembly Public Safety Committee

JC Position: Oppose.

AB 674 (Salas), as introduced.

Criminal procedure: veterans.

Establishes a deferred entry of judgment program and a preconviction drug diversion program for veterans who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury and who commit specified offenses.

Status: Assembly Public Safety Committee

JC Position: No position.

AB 1123 (Davis), as introduced.

Professions and vocations: process servers: registration.

Requires the superior court rather than an administrative law judge to determine whether to revoke or suspend a process server's certificate of registration because of injury to any person caused by failure of the process server to comply with the law.

Status: Assembly Business and Professions Committee

JC Position: No position.

AB 1516 (Lieu), as introduced.

Criminal procedure: discovery.

Grants the prosecution access to a criminal defendant for the purposes of having a prosecution expert conduct a mental health examination whenever a defendant places his or her mental state at the time of the crime in issue by plea or by giving notice of his or her intention to call a mental health expert at trial. Makes the defendant's or his or her counsel's refusal to do so admissible as evidence at trial.

Status: Assembly Public Safety Committee

JC Position: No position.

FAMILY LAW

AB 375 (Nielsen), as amended March 23, 2009. Child custody: child sexual abuse.

Limits the use of ex parte proceedings to modify child custody orders when there is evidence that the person seeking custody has committed recent acts of child sexual abuse.

Status: Passed Assembly Judiciary Committee (10-0); to Assembly Floor

JC Position: No position.

AB 612 (Beall), as introduced. Custody and visitation: nonscientific theories.

Prohibits family courts from considering or entering into evidence child custody evaluation reports that contain non-scientific evidence as defined, which includes "alienation theory."

Status: Assembly Judiciary Committee

JC Position: Oppose. ■

STATE OF THE JUDICIARY AND BBC DAY IN SACRAMENTO LAUNCH 2009 LEGISLATIVE, BUDGET PRIORITIES

The judicial branch budget, court security, and the continuing need for new judgeships were among the key topics of the 2009 State of the Judiciary address delivered by Chief Justice Ronald M. George to a joint session of the Legislature on Tuesday, March 10, 2009, at 5:00 p.m. at the State Capitol.



Chief Justice Ronald M. George addressed judicial branch legislative and budget priorities in the State of Judiciary address as Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg looks on. (Photo: John Swentowsky)

In all, more than 120 judicial branch, bar association, and legal services organization leaders, including members of the Judicial Council, attended the two days of Bench-Bar Coalition (BBC) activities held in conjunction with the State of the Judiciary address.



A packed gallery of BBC members and other guests overlook the Assembly Chamber floor as legislators listen to the 2009 State of the Judiciary address. (Photo: John Swentowsky)

Earlier on Tuesday, over 70 BBC members attended a training session on the development and adoption of the judicial branch budget. The course was designed to help BBC members

- understand the general components, timeline, language, and process;

- understand the basic differences and similarities between the judicial branch's budget process and the legislative budget process; and
- more effectively communicate the judicial branch's budget priorities and local court needs to legislators and key staff.

Administrative Office of the Courts Finance Division Assistant Director Marcia Carlton and Office of Governmental Affairs (OGA) Senior Governmental Affairs Analyst Janus Norman served as faculty for the course which awarded minimum continuing legal education credits (MCLE) to eligible bar and legal services participants.



BBC Cochair Thomas J. Warwick, Jr., introduces Administrative Director of the Courts William C. Vickrey at the pre-address briefing. (Photo: John Swentowsky)

On Tuesday afternoon, two briefing sessions were held on judicial branch legislative and budget priorities in preparation for the BBC's first 2009 Day in Sacramento legislative visits, which were held on Wednesday, March 11. The first briefing, presented by OGA attorney Tracy Kenny, provided an overview of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care's recommendations and of legislation designed to implement key foster care reforms (see "Foster Care Reform Takes Center Stage" in this issue).

OGA Director Curtis Child and Assistant Director Donna Hershkowitz conducted the second briefing on the latest developments with the judicial branch budget, and included discussion of SB 377 (Corbett) — legislation seeking the third set of 50 new judgeships — efforts to secure funding for court security and judgeships, and efforts to reform the judicial retirement system. Mike Herald, legislative advocate for the Western

(Continued on page 7)

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET: \$246 MILLION IN CUTS AND LOSS OF JUDGESHIP FUNDING

(Continued from page 1)

- Delayed Implementation of New Judgeships, subject to federal stimulus “trigger” \$71M

Federal Stimulus Trigger

As part of the budget package, the Legislature enacted Government Code section 99030 requiring the State Treasurer and the Director of Finance to determine by April 1, 2009, whether \$10 billion in federal funds will be received by June 30, 2010, and will create an equivalent amount in General Fund relief. Upon written notification that this \$10 billion threshold will be met (“trigger”), a number of specified program reductions would be restored including the one-time \$100 million unallocated reduction to the trial courts and the \$71 million for new judgeships – and a 1.25 percent income tax surcharge will not go into effect.

On March 27, 2009, the state Treasurer issued a determination on behalf of himself and the Director of Finance finding no basis to dispute the state Department of Finance’s estimate that available federal funds would provide California with \$8.2 billion in General Fund offsets, short of the \$10 billion threshold.

The Treasurer also noted that the Legislature will likely need to re-open the enacted 2009-2010 budget to add revenue and/or make deeper programmatic reductions in light of the further deterioration of the state and national economy.

Unallocated Reductions

The enacted budget for fiscal year 2009-2010 heavily relied on the framework of the Governor’s Budget released in December of 2008. The Administration structured the budget year cuts as unallocated reductions in order to provide the Judicial Council and the courts with discretion to determine the prioritization of appropriated funds.

The 2009 Budget Act includes \$246 million in unallocated reductions spread across two portions of the branch’s budget: state operations and trial court funding. The current scheduling of the unallocated reductions is summarized as follows:

State Operations	\$21.3 million	Permanent
Supports the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Judicial Council (AOC), Judicial Branch Facility Program, and California Habeas Corpus Resource Center		

Trial Court Funding	\$124.7 million	Permanent
Supports Superior Court Operations, Superior Court Judges Compensation, Assigned Judges Program, Court Interpreters Program, Court Appointed Special Advocate Program, Model Self-Help Program, Equal Access Fund, Family Law Information Centers, and Civil Case Coordination		
Trial Court Funding	\$100 million	Subject to the “trigger”
Total Unallocated Reduction	\$246 million	

It is expected that there will be upcoming budget subcommittee hearings to examine the allocation of these reductions to specific programs. The subcommittee process began in early April. *The Capitol Connection* will report on further developments with the judicial branch budget in the next issue. ■

FY 2009-10 Budget Tackles \$42 Billion Shortfall

In December of 2008, the Governor released his proposed budget for fiscal year 2009-2010, which identified a \$41.7 billion gap (assuming a \$2 billion General Fund reserve) between revenue collections and anticipated expenditures by June 30, 2010. The enacted budget included a combination of spending cuts, revenue increases, and federal stimulus funds. With the inclusion of line-item vetoes, the \$42 billion General Fund shortfall was primarily closed by significantly reducing state expenditures and increasing state revenue, which provided thirty-six percent (36%) and thirty percent (30%) of the budget solution, respectively.

The budget package consisted of thirty-seven bills and contained solutions to close a \$42 billion General Fund shortfall, as detailed below:

Program and Spending Reductions	\$14.90B
Revenue Increases	\$12.50B
Federal Stimulus Funds	\$7.90B
Borrowing	\$5.50B
Governor Vetoes	\$1.00B
Reduced Targeted Reserve	-\$4.9B
Total	\$41.6B

FOSTER CARE REFORM TAKES CENTER STAGE

(Continued from page 1)

transitional support up to age 21; increases in educational attainment; and decreases in homelessness, teen pregnancy, and criminal justice involvement.

Justice Moreno articulated the support of the BRC and the judicial branch for AB 12, and emphasized the state's parental obligation to these children. "No responsible parent would cut their child off at age 18 or 19, and say to them 'You are an adult now, you can no longer return home, rely on my support, or turn to me for guidance.' But that is exactly what California does to its foster youth,"

Moreno said. The briefing resulted in extensive media coverage of AB 12, including a story in *Newsweek* magazine; articles in the *Sacramento Bee*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and the *San Jose Mercury News*; and an editorial in support of AB 12 in the *Los Angeles Times*. On March 10, the Chief Justice provided further momentum to this effort, highlighting the importance of AB 12 and the other BRC implementation bills in his State of the Judiciary address to a joint session of the California Legislature. For more information on AB 12 and the other foster care related bills, contact Tracy Kenny at tracy.kenny@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121. ■

JUDICIAL COUNCIL-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

(Continued from page 2)

mean existing security levels cannot be maintained. The Governor's fiscal year 2009-10 budget proposal included a seven dollar (\$7) increase to the existing court security fee necessary to maintain - not increase - the existing levels of security within courthouses. **Status:** Although this fee increase was not included in the 2009-10 budget that was enacted on February 20, 2009, it will be under consideration in the budget subcommittee process. For more information, contact Donna Hershkowitz at donna.hershkowitz@jud.ca.gov or 916-323-3121.

JUDICIAL BENEFITS

Senate Bill 11, Second Extraordinary Session (Steinberg)—Judicial benefits.

A recent Court of Appeal decision (*Sturgeon v. Los Angeles*) held that 1997 trial court funding legislation authorizing county-paid supplemental judicial benefits was inconsistent with state constitutional requirements and invalidated the judicial benefits being paid by Los Angeles County to superior court judges in that county. SBX2 11, authored by Senator Darrell Steinberg, was passed authorizing counties and courts that have been providing local judicial benefits to continue to provide those benefits on the same terms and conditions as provided on July 1, 2008. The AOC is also required to provide to the Legislature on or before December 31, 2009, a report analyzing the statewide benefits inconsistencies. This approach is intended to provide more time to consider an appropriate statewide solution. **Status:** The legislation becomes effective May 21, 2009. For more information, contact Curtis Child at curtis.child@jud.ca.gov or 916-323-3121.

JURIES

Senate Bill 319 (Harman), as amended April 2, 2009. Jury service.

Eliminates the sunset and reporting requirement on provisions allowing courts to impose monetary sanctions for failure to appear in response to a jury summons. Decreases the amount of time that must elapse before a compliance action may be initiated. Allows sanctions to be deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund without designation for a specific purpose. **Status:** Senate Rules. For more information contact June Clark at june.clark@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

JUVENILE DEPENDENCY

Blue Ribbon Commission Foster Care Reform

The California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care (BRC), chaired by Justice Carlos Moreno, issued its final recommendations to the Judicial Council in August 2008. Three bills are sponsored or co-sponsored by the council this year to implement those recommendations:

Assembly Bill 12 (Beall and Bass), as amended March 23, 2009. Juvenile dependency.

Extends foster care support for youth who are pursuing educational or vocational goals to the age of 21 to ensure that they can make a transition to adulthood. It would also revise California's existing kinship guardianship program (Kin-GAP) to allow the state to obtain federal funding to support this successful program. **Status:** Assembly Human Services Committee. For more information contact Tracy Kenny at tracy.kenny@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

(Continued on page 7)

STATE OF THE JUDICIARY AND BBC DAY IN SACRAMENTO LAUNCH 2009 LEGISLATIVE, BUDGET PRIORITIES

(Continued from page 4)

Center on Law and Poverty, was invited to comment on efforts to identify federal stimulus dollars coming in to the state to provide General Fund relief and activate the budget act "trigger," restoring funding for key programs.



Members of California's bench and bar communities receive a briefing from AOC Office of Governmental Affairs subject matter experts before participating in the BBC Day in Sacramento.

staff. Among those visited were the chairs and vice-chairs of

In addition to the briefing sessions and materials distributed at the Capitol, BBC Day in Sacramento participants joined a special conference call on Thursday, February 26, to begin preparations for appointments with nearly 100 key legislators and

the Senate and Assembly appropriations, budget, judiciary, public safety, and retirement committees; new legislators; lawyer legislators; and legislators in caucus leadership positions.

To read the text of the address and see a video report of 2009 State of the Judiciary, visit the California Courts Web site: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/soj031009.htm>

For more information about the Bench-Bar Coalition, contact Dia Poole in the Office of Governmental Affairs at dia.poole@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121. ■



Assembly Judiciary Committee Chair Mike Feuer (D-42) and Chief Justice Ronald M. George immediately following the State of the Judiciary address. (Photo courtesy of John Swentowsky)

JC-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

(Continued from page 6)

Assembly Bill 131 (Evans), as amended March 24, 2009. Juvenile dependency.

Clarifies that courts (rather than counties) can recover the costs of providing counsel to parents and children in dependency cases when the courts are bearing the costs of the services. It would direct the Judicial Council to implement a cost recovery program in these cases and direct that the funds collected be used to reduce caseloads for dependency counsel in those courts with the highest caseloads. **Status:** Passed Assembly Judiciary Committee (10-0); on Assembly Appropriations Suspense File. For more information contact Tracy Kenny at tracy.kenny@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

AB 938 (Judiciary Committee), as amended March 27, 2009. Juvenile dependency.

Requires that relatives of children removed from their parents be notified of the removal immediately and informed of their opportunities to assist in caring for the child. In addition, it seeks to improve the procedural fairness of dependency cases by ensuring that parties have an opportunity to consult with their counsel in advance of court proceedings.

Status: Assembly Judiciary Committee. For more information contact Tracy Kenny at tracy.kenny@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

JUDGESHIPS

Senate Bill 377 (Corbett), as introduced. New judgeships.

Adds the third set of 50 new trial court judgeships to the superior courts, pursuant to the allocation previously approved by the Judicial Council.

For fiscal year 2009-2010, the Governor's proposed budget included the previously delayed funding for the second set of 50 judgeships authorized by legislation in 2007 (AB 159, Jones, Stats. 2007, ch. 722). The funding would also support the first month of the third set of 50 new judgeships if SB 377 is enacted. That funding, totaling \$71 million, was made subject to the federal stimulus trigger, and was to be returned to the branch budget only if the threshold \$10 billion that offsets general fund expenditure was received. A determination was made on March 27, 2009, that the threshold would not be met. **Status:** Senate Judiciary Committee. For more information contact Donna Hershkowitz at donna.hershkowitz@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121. ■



Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Office of Governmental Affairs

770 L Street, Suite 700
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone 916-323-3121
Fax 916-323-4347

Editor-in-Chief

Dia S. Poole

Contributors

Curt Child
June Clark
Donna Hershkowitz
Tracy Kenny
Janus Norman
Daniel Pone
Henry Sepulveda

Story Manager/Layout

Katie Asher

Subscribe Today!

The Capitol Connection is delivered electronically each month to subscribers at no charge. To subscribe, contact **Katie Asher** at 916-323-3121, katie.asher@jud.ca.gov

Archives

Looking for a past issue of *The Capitol Connection*? Find it online at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/aoc/capconn.htm.

OGA ADVOCATES INTRODUCE JUDICIAL BRANCH PRIORITIES TO NEW LEGISLATORS

ASSEMBLY MEMBER MARTY BLOCK (D-SAN DIEGO)

Staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Governmental Affairs visited with Assembly Member Marty Block on February 18, 2009, to introduce judicial branch legislative initiatives that are priorities for the courts in the 2009-2010 legislative session.

Assembly Member Block (D-78), an attorney, was elected to the Legislature in November 2008 and represents San Diego County. Block's priorities include public safety, education, balancing the budget, and ensuring that constituents in the district have access to quality, affordable healthcare.



Assembly Member Marty Block is greeted by Senior Governmental Affairs Analyst Janus Norman and Office of Governmental Affairs Senior Attorney June Clark.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ALYSON HUBER (D-LODI)



Ms. Clark and Mr. Norman discussed the 2009-2010 judicial branch legislative agenda with Assembly Member Alyson Huber who represents portions of El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin Counties and Amador County.

In January, June Clark, senior attorney, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs and Janus Norman, senior governmental affairs analyst, met with Assembly Member Alyson Huber to discuss court operations and court funding issues.

Assembly Member Huber is a former business attorney who specialized in business litigation and intellectual property law. Her priorities include government reform and accountability, education, supporting job creation, and reducing California's high school dropout rate. ■

News from the AOC

In addition to *The Capitol Connection*, the Administrative Office of the Courts publishes several publications reporting on various aspects of court business. Visit these online on the California Courts Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Courts Review is a quarterly magazine by, for, and about the state judicial branch. See the current edition at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/ccr.htm>.

