



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE
THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: January 9, 2017
Time: 12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the December 15, 2016 meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by January 6, 2017, 12:00 noon. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 2255 N. Ontario Street, Suite 220, Burbank, California 91504, attention: Jessica Craven Goldstein. Only written comments received by January 6, 2017, 12:00 noon will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-7)

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

An update and report on ITAC will be provided; this will include the activities of the workstreams.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 3

Review of ITAC Annual Agenda (Action Required)

Review of the annual agenda for ITAC.

Presenter: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Item 4

Update on Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

An update and report on the work related to the Sustain Justice Edition case management system.

Presenter: Mr. Richard Feldstein, JCTC member

Item 5

Update on the Placer Court Hosting Center

An update and report on the Placer Court Hosting Center (PCHC) project, a consortium project supported by branch-level funding. Once complete, the PCHC will host six courts that previously received hosting services from the Judicial Council via the Technology Center.

Presenter: Mr. Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer, Placer Court Superior Court

Item 6

Update on V3 Case Management System

An update and report on the work to date related to V3 since receiving the funding for civil case management system replacement.

Presenter: Ms. Kathy Fink, Manager, Judicial Council Information Technology

Item 7

Approval of Revised Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases (Action Required)


The Traffic Advisory Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council's Technology Committee (JCTC) approve revised Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases, updating the guidelines originally adopted by JCTC in 2013. The revisions to the guidelines are necessary to reflect the amendments to rule 4.220, on remote video proceedings in traffic infraction cases, that became effective on September 1, 2015.

Presenter: Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Managing Attorney, Judicial Council Legal Services

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn

Judicial Council Technology Committee Open Meeting

The seal of the Judicial Council of Pennsylvania is visible in the background. It features a central figure holding a scale of justice, surrounded by various symbols of law and order. The text "JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF PENNSYLVANIA" is written around the perimeter, and the year "1926" is at the bottom.

January 9, 2017

Call to Order and Roll Call

- Welcome
- Open Meeting Script
- Approve minutes

*Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Judicial Council Technology
Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Chair Report

Hon. Marsha G. Slough



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

*Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology
Advisory Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Review of ITAC Annual Agenda

*Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair, Information Technology Advisory
Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, JCTC member



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Placer Court Hosting Center

*Mr. Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer, Placer Superior
Court*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: V3 Case Management System

*Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Principal Manager, Judicial Council
Information Technology*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Approval of Revised Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases

Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Managing Attorney, Judicial Council Legal Services



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Adjourn Open Session

All



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 15, 2016

1:30 - 2:30 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Hon. Ming W. Chin; David E. Gunn; Hon. Gary Nadler; Mr. Jake Chatters; Mr. Rick Feldstein; Ms. Audra Ibarra; and Ms. Debra Elaine Pole

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Others Present: Mr. John Wordlaw; Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Mr. David Koon; and Ms. Jamel Jones

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the November 14, 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Update: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Vice-Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending on behalf of Justice Slough, Chair of the JCTC. Judge Buckley reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which he and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities.

Item 2

Update/Report on Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

Update: Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair of ITAC, provided an update and report on the activities of the advisory committee, its subcommittees, and its workstreams.

Action: The committee discussed the activities of ITAC and received the report.

Item 3

Approval to Circulate for Comment Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018

Update: Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer/Director, Judicial Council Information Technology, reported on the progress for updating the Tactical Plan for Technology and requested the committee to approve publishing the Tactical Plan for Technology 2017-2018 for public comment.

Action: The committee received the report and unanimously approved that it be circulated for public comment.

Item 4

Update on Sustain Justice Edition Case Management System

Update: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein provided an update and report on the work related to the Sustain Justice Edition case management system replacement including the budget change proposal and next steps.

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 5

Update on the Placer Court Hosting Center

Update: Mr. Jake Chatters provided an update and report on the work related to the Placer Court Hosting Center (PCHC) project, a consortium project supported by branch-level funding. Once complete, the PCHC will host six courts that previously received hosting services from the Judicial Council via the California Court Technology Center (CCTC).

Action: The committee received the report.

Item 6

Update on V3 Case Management System

Update: Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, a Principal Manager in Judicial Council Information Technology, provided an update and report on the work of the V3 courts and Judicial Council staff since receiving the funding for the civil case management system replacement.

Action: The committee received the report.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the open meeting was adjourned.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

MEMORANDUM

Date

December 20, 2016

To

Judicial Council Technology Committee
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair

From

Traffic Advisory Committee
Hon. Gail Dekreon, Chair

and

Information Technology Advisory Committee
Hon. Sheila H. Hanson, Chair

Subject

Revise the Guidelines for Semiannual Reports
to the Judicial Council on Remote Video
Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases

Action Requested

Approve Revisions to the Guidelines for
Reports on Remote Video Proceedings

Deadline

January 9, 2017

Contact

Patrick O'Donnell, 415-865-7665,
patrick.o'donnell@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Traffic Advisory Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council's Technology Committee (JCTC) approve revised *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases*, updating the guidelines originally adopted by JCTC in 2013. The revisions to the guidelines are necessary to reflect the amendments to rule 4.220, on remote video proceedings in traffic infraction cases, that became effective on September 1, 2015.

Recommendation

The Traffic Advisory Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the JCTC approve revised *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases (Guidelines)*, effective immediately.

A copy of the revised *Guidelines* is attached as Attachment 2.

Rationale for Recommendation

California Rules of Court, rule 4.220,¹ which authorizes superior courts to establish remote video proceedings (RVP) in traffic infraction cases, was adopted in 2013.² Initially, the RVP project was established on a pilot basis. Also, under the original rule, courts were required to request approval to establish remote video proceedings in traffic. Pilot courts were required to provide semiannual reports to the council that would be of assistance in evaluating RVP pilot projects and developing additional RVP programs in the courts. To assist the pilot courts in preparing their semiannual reports, the JCTC adopted guidelines entitled *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Pilot Projects for Remote Video Proceedings*, effective January 28, 2013. (A copy of the original guidelines is included as attachment 1 to this memorandum.)

Last year, the rule was amended in several significant respects.³ The authorization for RVP in traffic infraction cases was made permanent and all references in the rule to pilot projects were eliminated. In addition, under the amended rule, courts are no longer required to seek Judicial Council approval to establish remote video proceedings in traffic. However, courts are still required to prepare provide semiannual reports on their RVP programs to the Judicial Council that include an assessment of the costs and benefits of remote video proceedings at the court. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).) Accordingly, the guidelines need to be revised to reflect the recent amendments to rule 4.220.

For this purpose, revised guidelines entitled *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases* have been prepared. (A copy of the revised guidelines is included as attachment 2.) The guidelines have been modified to reflect the recent changes in rule 4.220. First, all references to pilot projects have been eliminated. Second, a comment about courts being required to request approval to establish RVP programs has been removed. Third, the revised guidelines provide a more practical and realistic timeline for submitting semiannual

¹ The link to the rule is: [Rule 4.220. Remote video proceedings in traffic infraction cases.](#)

² The Judicial Council report on the adoption of rule 4.220 in 2013 is available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130117-itemG.pdf>.

³ The Judicial Council report on the 2015 amendments to rule 4.220 is available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150821-itemA2.pdf>.

reports. Finally, although most of the specific guidelines regarding the required contents and desirable information to be included in the semiannual reports have been retained, the description has been slightly modified to reflect the rule amendments.

The information provided in the semiannual reports will continue to provide basic information about RVP projects as they are established, as well as information about the costs and benefits of these programs. This information will be useful to the Judicial Council in developing rules and policies, and to trial courts planning to establish their own RVP programs.

The revised *Guidelines* were reviewed by the Information Technology Committee on October 14, 2016 and by the Traffic Advisory Committee on November 8, 2016. Both committees support the revised *Guidelines* attached to this memorandum.

Attachments

1. *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Pilot Projects for Remote Video Proceedings* (the original guidelines adopted effective January 28, 2013)

2. *Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases* (the revised guidelines to be approved in 2017)

Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Pilot Projects for Remote Video Proceedings

Introduction

The authorization to establish a pilot project for remote video proceedings (RVP) is in California Rules of Court, rule 4.220, adopted effective February 1, 2013. With the approval of the Judicial Council, a superior court may, by local rule, establish a pilot project to permit arraignments, trials, and other related proceedings to be conducted by remote two-way video in traffic infraction cases. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(a), (b).) Any court that is approved and establishes a pilot project for RVP must provide semiannual reports on the project to the Judicial Council. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).) These guidelines are intended to assist courts in preparing and submitting reports.

Time of Submission

Reports are due semiannually and should be submitted July 1 and January 1 of each year. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).)

Place of Submission

The reports should be submitted by e-mail to the Judicial Council's Technology Committee at: rvp@jud.ca.gov

Contents of reports

The reports must contain, at a minimum, the following information:

- The number and types of RVP conducted for arraignments, trials, and other proceedings;
- The locations and facilities used to conduct RVP;
- Details on the type of technology used to conduct RVP;
- The number of appeals from RVP and the outcome of the appeals; and
- The number of cases where the law enforcement officer appeared at court instead of at the remote location with the defendant.

In addition, the semiannual reports should contain any other information that is relevant to evaluating the pilot project and determining whether the pilot project should be continued beyond December 31, 2015, or expanded to other types of cases. This might include:

- How well the existing procedures and forms for RVP have worked and whether any changes are needed in these procedures and forms;
- How the court handled evidence and exhibits at RVP;
- The court's experience with clerk activities at the remote location for RVP;
- Any specific issues relating to the use of non-court facilities to conduct RVP; and
- Any other experiences or issues, such as use of interpreters, encountered by the courts that may be relevant to evaluating the pilot project.

Adopted by the Technology Committee of the Judicial Council of California on January 28, 2013.

Guidelines for Semiannual Reports on Remote Video Proceedings in Traffic Infraction Cases

Introduction

California Rules of Court, rule 4.220 authorizes superior courts, by local rule, to permit arraignments, trials, and other related proceedings to be conducted by remote two-way video in traffic infraction cases. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(a), (b).) Each court that adopts a local rule authorizing remote video proceedings (RVP) for traffic infraction cases must notify the Judicial Council, institute procedures for collecting and evaluating information about that court's RVP program, and provide semiannual reports on the program to the Judicial Council that include an assessment of the costs and benefits of remote video proceedings at the court. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).) These guidelines are intended to assist courts in preparing and submitting reports.

Time of Submission

Reports are due semiannually and should be submitted August 1 (for January – June) and February 1 (for July – December) of each year. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.220(p).)

Place of Submission

The reports should be submitted by e-mail to the Information Technology Committee at: rvp@jud.ca.gov

Contents of reports

The reports must contain, at a minimum, the following information:

- The number and types of RVP conducted for arraignments, trials, and other proceedings;
- The locations and facilities used to conduct RVP;
- Details on the type of technology used to conduct RVP;
- The number of appeals from RVP and the outcome of the appeals; and
- The number of cases where the law enforcement officer appeared at court instead of at the remote location with the defendant.

In addition, the semiannual reports should contain any other information relevant to evaluating the effectiveness of the court's RVP traffic program and determining whether the use of RVP should be expanded to other types of cases. This might include:

- How well the existing procedures and forms for RVP have worked and whether any changes are needed in these procedures and forms;
- How the court handled evidence and exhibits at RVP;
- The court's experience with clerk activities at the remote location for RVP;
- Any specific issues relating to the use of non-court facilities to conduct RVP; and
- Any other experiences or issues, such as use of interpreters, encountered by the courts that may be relevant to evaluating the RVP program.