



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

## TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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 RECORDED

---

**Date:** March 14, 2019  
**Time:** 1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Sequoia Room, Judicial Council Conference Center  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
**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 February 11, 2019 and February 26, 2019 meetings.

---

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

---

##### **Public Comment**

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least 15 minutes prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

##### **Written Comment**

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by March 13, 2018, 1:00 pm. Written comments should be e-mailed to [jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov) or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Rica Abesa. Only written comments received by March 13, 2019, 1:00 pm will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–4)**

---

**Item 1**

**Chair Report**

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

Presenter: Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-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**

**Jury Management System Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 (Action Requested)**

The committee will consider the recommended allocations for the Jury Management System Grant program for fiscal year 2018 – 2019. The budget for the Jury System Grant Program is funded by royalties from selling jury instructions which are deposited in the Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. These funds can only be used for jury-related projects. According to the objectives of the program, the prioritization categories, other considerations, and the funding metrics, funding allocations have been proposed.

Presenter: Ms. Suzanne Schleder, Senior Business Systems Analyst, Judicial Council  
Information Technology

**Item 4**

**Request to use previous Fiscal Year's Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for SAIC hosting in FY 19/20 for Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) California Court Technology Center (CCTC) Hosting (Action Requested)**

Receive an update and request approval from the committee to use the previous fiscal year's IMF funding approved for the Interim Case Management System (ICMS) program for SJE CCTC hosting cost in FY 19/20 as the remaining courts move away from CCTC hosting.

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

---

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**Adjourn Public Session**



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 11, 2019

12:00 - 1:00 PM

Teleconference

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Ms. Nancy Eberhardt; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Ms. Rachel W. Hill

**Liaison Members Present:** Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

**Others Present:** Hon. Samantha P. Jessner; Mr. David Yamasaki; Mr. Rob Oyung; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Mr. Michael Derr; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Mr. David Koon; Ms. Daphne Light; Ms. Jamel Jones; Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Rica Abesa; Ms. Marcela Eggleton; Ms. Laura Speed; Ms. Andrea Jaramillo; Mr. Douglas Denton; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Fati Farmanfarmaian; Ms. Jenny Phu; and Ms. Kristi Morioka

### 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 January 14, 2019 open meeting.

### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

#### Item 1

##### Chair Report

**Update:** Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which she 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. Workstreams with key milestones highlighted included the Digital Evidence, Data Analytics, and Next Generation Hosting.

**Action:** The committee received the report.

**Item 3**

**Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to Amend the Penal Code  
Section 1203.01 (Action Required)**

**Update:** Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney in the Judicial Council Legal Services Office, presented proposed amendments to the Penal Code section 1203.01 of the California Rules of Court. The proposed amendments will provide an alternative to mailing certain statements and reports. The committee was asked to consider circulating these for public comment.

**Action:** The committee discussed the proposed amendments and approved recommending that they be circulated for public comment.

**Item 4**

**Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to Amend the Code of Civil  
Procedure Section 1010.6 (Action Required)**

**Update:** Ms. Andrea Jaramillo presented proposed amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 of the California Rules of Court. The proposed amendments will allow courts to recover actual costs of permissive electronic filing and mandatory electronic filing by court order, just as they can with mandatory electronic filing by local rule, and clarify a provision for signatures made not under penalty of perjury to account for signatures of non-filers. The committee was asked to consider circulating these for public comment.

**Action:** The committee discussed the proposed amendments and approved recommending that they be circulated for public comment.

**Item 5**

**Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to the Electronic Filing and  
Service Rules (Action Required)**

**Update:** Ms. Andrea Jaramillo presented proposed amendments to the electronic filing and services rules. The proposed amendments to rule 2.251 will clarify how notice of electronic service is to be given and provide standardized language for consent. The proposed amendments to rule 2.257 will revise language on signatures of opposing

parties, and make minor revisions consistent with Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6. The committee was asked to consider circulating these for public comment.

**Action:** The committee discussed the proposed amendments and approved recommending that they be circulated for public comment.

#### Item 6

##### **Trial Court Rules and Statutes Revisions: Proposed Amendments to the Rules on Remote Access to Electronic Records (Action Required)**

**Update:** Ms. Andrea Jaramillo, Attorney in the Judicial Council Legal Services Office, presented proposed amendments to the rules on remote access to electronic records for public comment. The proposed amendments to rule 2.540 will add more clarity and additional local government entities. The committee was asked to consider circulating these for public comment.

**Action:** The committee discussed the proposed amendments and approved recommending that they be circulated for public comment.

#### Item 7

##### **Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot Workstream—Status and Final Report (Action Requested)**

**Update:** Hon. Samantha P. Jessner and Mr. David H. Yamasaki, the VRI Workstream Executive Co-Sponsors, reviewed the draft Judicial Council report on the VRI Pilot for the March 2019 Judicial Council meeting, including recommended guidelines for minimum technology requirements. They asked the committee to decide the guidelines' readiness to recommend for acceptance and submission of the report to the Judicial Council.

**Action:** The committee reviewed and discussed the report and the guidelines. The committee approved submitting the report and guidelines to the Judicial Council for its review and consideration.

#### **A D J O U R N M E N T**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 26, 2019  
11:30 AM - 1:30 PM

Teleconference

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair; Hon. Kyle S. Brodie; Hon. Ming W. Chin; Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Hon. Rebecca Wightman; Ms. Nancy Eberhardt; Ms. Rachel W. Hill; and Ms. Andrea K. Rohmann

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair

**Others Present:** Mr. Rob Oyung; Ms. Heather Pettit; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Mr. Michael Derr; Mr. David Koon; Ms. Daphne Light; Ms. Jamel Jones; Ms. Jessica Goldstein; Ms. Rica Abesa; Ms. Kathy Fink; Mr. John Yee; Mr. Richard Blalock; Ms. Camilla Kieliger; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Ms. Laura Speed; and Ms. Marcela Eggleton

---

### 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.

---

### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

---

#### Item 1

##### Chair Report

**Update:** Hon. Marsha Slough, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. Justice Slough reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as well as provided updates on recent meetings in which she and other members represented the JCTC or reported on the JCTC activities.

#### Item 2

##### Technology Budget Change Proposals

**Update:** Ms. Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer for the Judicial Council of California, provided a report and overview on the potential six technology related Initial Funding Requests (IFRs) for Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for funding beginning FY 20/21.

**Actions:** The committee asked questions and discussed the technology related IFRs and potential BCPs including potential criteria to use in ranking the proposals. The committee then took the following actions, voting unanimously on each:

1. Established the following evaluation criteria and then evaluated the six concepts based on these criteria:
  - Was it a prior request or deferred?
  - Was it tied to an active, next phase, or completed workstream from the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)?
  - Was the item previously funded (i.e., to carry forward)?
  - What is the breadth of impact (e.g., branch, justice partners, public)?
  - Did it involve security?
  - What is the viability for the future?
2. Removed one proposal (Digital Evidence in the Court – Pilot) as the committee believed it would benefit from further refinement;
3. Determined the remaining five proposals would be of great benefit to the branch and ranking them in the following order:
  1. Electronic (Intelligent) Judicial Council Forms Solution
  2. Productizing California Court Innovation Grants
  3. Disaster Recovery Consulting Services Solutions – Pilot
  4. Digitizing Documents Phases 2 – 3
  5. Next Generation Data Hosting Consulting Services;
4. Directed Judicial Council Information Technology staff to forward the completed IFRs to the Judicial Council Budget Services staff; and
5. Provided the criteria and ranking of the technology related BCP IFRs to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) so that this committee may consider the JCTC's ranking. (The JBBC would be ranking all judicial branch BCPs at a future meeting.)

## **A D J O U R N M E N T**

There being no further business, the 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**

March 1, 2019

**Action Requested**

Review and approval

**To**

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

**Deadline**

March 14, 2019

**From**

Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer  
Information Technology

**Contact**

David Koon, Manager  
Information Technology  
415-865-4618  
[David.Koon@jud.ca.gov](mailto:David.Koon@jud.ca.gov)

**Subject**

Jury Management System Grant Program FY  
2018-2019: Requests and Proposed Grant  
Allocations

Suzanne Schleder, Senior Business  
Systems Analyst  
Information Technology  
916-643-7038  
[Suzanne.Schleder@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Suzanne.Schleder@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Background**

The budget for the Jury Management System Grant Program is funded by royalties, generated by published Judicial Council developed jury instructions, which are deposited in the Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. These funds can only be used for jury-related projects. The Judicial Council approved \$465,000 in funding for the Jury System Grant Program in FY 2018-2019. Judicial Council Budget Services identified potential additional jury royalty funding of approximately \$252,000 in FY 2018-2019 for the Jury Management System Grant Program. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee will take up the potential use for this additional funding by the Jury Management System Grant Program at their March 21, 2019 meeting. This will be on the agenda for the Judicial Council's consideration at its May 16 and 17, 2019 meeting. For purposes of this memo, the proposed FY 2018-2019 jury grant allocations assume access to the additional \$252,000 funding, bringing the total available funding to \$717,000.

The Judicial Council has funded Jury grants since FY 2000-2001. Initially, the fund allocations were designed to help courts migrate from DOS based systems to Windows based systems. With

the advent of the one day one trial program, these grants evolved into helping courts become more efficient in jury management with Interactive Voice Response (IVR)/Interactive Web Response (IWR) systems, Imaging, check writing and a variety of other modules that reduce court costs and improve jurors' experiences.

The FY 2018-2019 jury management system application process began on September 25, 2018 and concluded on December 10, 2018. At the close of the application deadline, the Judicial Council had received jury management system grant requests from 23 trial courts for 42 projects totaling \$943,986. After an initial review, three of the submitted projects were not within the scope of the jury management grant program which resulted in 39 projects being considered for possible funding as part of the FY 2018-2019 jury management system grant. To assist with developing a proposed allocation of jury management system grant funding, a prioritization framework was developed using the jury program objectives and other considerations. These objectives and other considerations are discussed in more detail below.

### **Program Objectives**

There were several objectives which served as the underlying foundation when reviewing the jury management system grant requests. These goals included:

- Assist those courts with upgrading their jury management system software/infrastructure to keep the systems on supported platforms;
- Fund as many different courts as possible;
- Fund enhancements and modules that reduce the court's costs; and
- Minimize the court resources needed to provide information to jurors and provide jurors with greater access to information as well as improve the jurors' experience.

### **Prioritization Categories**

Listed below are the categories used to assign a priority to jury projects from which a recommendation for funding could be made. These jury projects were submitted by the trial courts after a solicitation was sent by the Judicial Council Technology Committee Chair to all trial court Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers.

1. Jury Management System Version Upgrade: Upgrades the jury management software/infrastructure being used by the court to help keep the systems on supported platforms.
2. Interactive Voice Response (IVR)/Interactive Web Response (IWR) Enhancements/ Modules: These project requests for IVR/IWR enhancements offer cost savings to the court by reducing the court resources needed to provide information to potential jurors while also providing potential jurors with a convenient way to obtain jury information.
3. Self-Check-In: This module offers different levels of functionality depending upon the specific jury grant proposal but in general allows jurors to perform some level of self- check in when reporting to the court.

4. Imaging: Automates court staff responses to paper documents and other correspondence, phone calls for postponement, permanent excuses, and qualification/disqualification.
5. Jury Panel Display Monitor System: Provides display monitors to jurors about their status and where to assemble.
6. Peripheral Hardware: Includes items such as scanners, printers, folder/sealer machines used to assist with mailing jury summons.

### **Other Considerations**

In addition to the prioritization framework identified above, there were other factors considered in determining which projects to fund. They include the following:

1. Ongoing items such as software subscription fees, support and maintenance were removed from the funding requests as ongoing costs are not funded as part of the jury grant program;
2. As part of the review of jury grant requests submitted by the courts, vendor quotations and estimates were reviewed for reasonableness and compliance with the objectives of the jury system grant program. Ultimately, any reimbursement from the jury grant program will only be made for the amount supported by vendor invoices submitted by the court;
3. Limit the amount of allocation for each court to no more than 10 percent of the total funding available. For purposes of this allocation, the limit included potential additional funding which brought the limit to \$71,700 per court.

### **Proposed Jury Grant Funding Metrics**

Using the framework described above, the recommendation is to allocate \$717,000 in jury grant funding to provide some level of funding to all 23 courts and 38 of the 39 jury management system requested projects. Funding requests by the program prioritization category is identified. The table with detail by court is included in the “Staff Recommendation” section of this memo.

Priority #1: JMS Version Upgrade – 14 funded out of 14 requested projects

Priority #2: IVR/IWR – 12 funded out of 12 requested projects

Priority #3: Self Check-In – 9 funded out of 9 requested projects

Priority #4: Imaging – 1 funded out of 1 requested projects

Priority #5: Jury Panel Display System – 0 funded out of 1 requested projects

Priority #6: Peripheral Hardware – 2 funded out of 2 requested projects

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends distributing the funds as indicated in the following table:

Jury Management System Grant Program FY 2018-2019

March 1, 2019

Page 4

#	Court	Description	Requested Allocation (Adj)	Proposed Allocation	JMS Program Priority Category
1	Alameda	Scanners	\$18,000	\$18,000	Imaging (Priority #4)
		Kiosks	\$50,000	\$50,000	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
			<b>\$68,000</b>	<b>\$68,000</b>	
2	Calavares	WebGen	\$23,815	\$23,815	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		WebSolutions (Portal)	\$22,650	\$22,650	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		MS SQL Server license	\$735	\$735	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		Express Check-In Kiosks	\$5,499	\$5,499	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
			<b>\$52,699</b>	<b>\$52,699</b>	
3	Fresno	WebGen	\$30,550	\$30,550	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		Express Check-In Kiosks	\$10,324	\$10,324	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
			<b>\$40,874</b>	<b>\$40,874</b>	
4	Glenn	WebGen	\$17,825	\$17,825	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		WebSolutions (Portal)	\$16,350	\$16,350	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		Express Check-In Kiosks	\$3,324	\$3,324	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
		Servers	\$900	\$900	Peripheral hardware Replacement (#6)
			<b>\$38,399</b>	<b>\$38,399</b>	
5	Imperial	IVR Server hardware	\$18,722	\$18,722	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
		Windows 2019 License for replacement server	\$7,956	\$7,956	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
			<b>\$26,678</b>	<b>\$26,678</b>	
6	Inyo	Jury+ Express Check-In Module	\$4,606	\$4,606	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
			<b>\$4,606</b>	<b>\$4,606</b>	
7	Kern	Jury Voice Solution Migration	\$37,032	\$37,032	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
			<b>\$37,032</b>	<b>\$37,032</b>	
8	Kings	Jury+ WebGen	\$23,100	\$23,100	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
			<b>\$23,100</b>	<b>\$23,100</b>	
9	Madera	Jury+WebSolution	\$22,650	\$22,650	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		Jury+Voice	\$24,225	\$24,225	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
			<b>\$46,875</b>	<b>\$46,875</b>	

Jury Management System Grant Program FY 2018-2019

March 1, 2019

Page 5

#	Court	Description	Requested Allocation (Adj)	Proposed Allocation	JMS Program Priority Category
10	Mendocino	IVR	\$11,729	\$11,729	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
			<b>\$11,729</b>	<b>\$11,729</b>	
11	Napa	Jury+Web	\$26,025	\$26,025	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
		IVR/IWR	\$8,500	\$8,500	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
		Self Check-in Kiosks	\$10,000	\$10,000	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
			<b>\$44,525</b>	<b>\$44,525</b>	
12	Nevada	Express Check-In Kiosks	\$15,837	\$15,837	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
		WebGen	\$20,375	\$20,375	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
			<b>\$36,212</b>	<b>\$36,212</b>	
13	Placer	System Enhancment - Display summons date	\$1,680	\$1,680	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
		Enh - remove zero info	\$4,200	\$4,200	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
		Improve stat reporting	\$8,400	\$8,400	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
			\$14,280	\$14,280	
14	Sacramento	IVR	\$23,080	\$23,080	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
		WebGen	\$43,400	\$43,400	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
			<b>\$66,480</b>	<b>\$66,480</b>	
15	San Benito (5 Court Collaboration)	WebGen	\$42,125	\$42,125	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
			<b>\$42,125</b>	<b>\$42,125</b>	
16	Santa Clara	IVR/Jury+ Voice	\$43,446	\$43,466	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
		Express Check-In/Kiosks	\$39,023	\$27,096	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
		Infax JuryCall and Engage License and hardware	\$136,315	\$0	Jury Panel Display Monitor System (#5)
		Hardware - wands, handhelds	\$1,169	\$1,169	Peripheral hardware Replacement (#6)
			<b>\$219,953</b>	<b>\$71,731</b>	
17	Solano	Self Check-in Kiosks	\$3,400	\$3,400	Self Check-in (Priority #3)
			<b>\$3,400</b>	<b>\$3,400</b>	
18	Stanislaus	Replace IVR	\$32,142	\$32,142	IVR/ IWR Add/ Enh. (Priority #2)
		WebGen	\$48,300	\$39,588	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
			<b>\$80,442</b>	<b>\$71,730</b>	

#	Court	Description	Requested Allocation (Adj)	Proposed Allocation	JMS Program Priority Category
19	Tehama	Jury+ WebGen	\$16,525	\$16,525	JMS version upgrade (Priority #1)
			<b>\$16,525</b>	<b>\$16,525</b>	
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$873,934</b>	<b>\$717,000</b>	

### Next Steps

Present the proposed allocations to the Judicial Council Technology Committee for review and approval. Notify courts of the approved allocation with the assumption that the additional \$252,000 is approved by the Judicial Council, prepare the Intra-Branch Agreements (IBAs) with each court for their jury grant and confirm that the additional funding of \$252,000 is approved by the Judicial Council during the May 2019 meeting.

HP/VSH/dk

The background of the slide features a large, faint, circular seal of the Judicial Branch of California. The seal contains the text "JUDICIAL BRANCH OF CALIFORNIA" around the perimeter and "EUREKA" at the top. In the center is a figure holding a scale of justice, with a ship and a building below. The year "1926" is visible at the bottom of the seal.

# **Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) California Court Technology Center (CCTC) Hosting Costs and Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) Funding**

March 14, 2019

# Background

- In April 2014, the Judicial Council directed the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) to develop a plan to eventually eliminate the statewide funding of the Interim Case Management System (ICMS) program.
- The ICMS Program supports those courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system with technical consulting services to implement legislative updates, production support as well as datacenter services for those courts with SJE hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC).
- Funding sources for SJE hosting is a combination of Schedule C reimbursements from the courts and IMF Funding.
- In April 2016, there were nine courts which had their SJE case management systems hosted at the CCTC.



# SJE CCTC Hosting Update

- In April 2016, the JCTC endorsed a proposal to provide funding for six SJE courts (Lake, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra and Trinity) to move from SJE hosting at the CCTC to SJE hosting at the Placer Court.
- The Placer hosting proposal also included the elimination by June 30, 2019 of IMF funding for SJE hosting at the CCTC and was approved by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee as well as the Judicial Council.
- The six courts included in the Placer hosting proposal completed their migration from CCTC hosting to Placer hosting in January 2018.
- The Imperial Court completed their migration from SJE CCTC hosting to a locally hosted eCourt solution in November 2017.
- The SJE courts remaining at the CCTC are Humboldt and Madera.
  - The Madera Court is targeting leaving CCTC hosting and to go live with a cloud hosted eCourt CMS by May 2019.
  - The Humboldt Court is targeting leaving CCTC hosting and to go live on a locally hosted eCourt CMS by September 30, 2019.



# SJE CCTC Hosting Funding Needs

Continued CCTC Funding is needed:

- Humboldt SJE hosting beyond June 30, 2019 (and potentially Madera hosting if their date slips).
- Decommissioning the SJE environments when Humboldt and Madera have left CCTC hosting.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

# SJE CCTC Hosting Funding Sources

- There is \$801,908 in FY 18/19 ICMS funding available to cover the FY 19/20 SJE hosting costs.
- IMF savings were realized from cost reduction strategies
- Estimated savings from FY 18/19 IMF and Schedule C funding can cover costs through December 2019.
- The Humboldt Court would continue to pay their monthly Schedule C hosting costs until they leave the CCTC in September 2019.
- Estimated SJE hosting cost at CCTC through December 31, 2019

Description	Amt
Estimated CCTC hosting for SJE from 7/1/2019 through 12/31/2019 (6 mths)	\$ 488,998
Less: Schedule C Charges paid by Humboldt from 7/1/2019 through 9/30/2019	46,650
<i>Estimated funded needed for SJE CCTC hosting for 6 mths in FY 19/20</i>	<i>\$ 442,348</i>



# Action Item

- The request for the committee's consideration is to approve the use of the previous year's ICMS program savings to pay for CCTC hosting in FY 19/20 for SJE hosting. This will provide time for the Humboldt Court to complete deployment of eCourt by September 2019 and allow time for the decommissioning of the SJE environments at the CCTC.





## 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**

February 27, 2019

**Action Requested**

Please Review

**To**

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair  
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair  
Judicial Council Technology Committee

**Deadline**

N/A

**From**

Kathleen Fink, Manager,  
Judicial Council Information Technology

**Contact**

Kathleen Fink, Manager  
415-865-4094  
kathleen.fink@jud.ca.gov

**Subject**

Civil Case Management System (V3)  
Replacement Projects: Status January 28 –  
February 25, 2019

---

**Project:** Civil Case Management System (CMS) (V3) Replacement projects for the Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties

**Status:** The monthly Project Status meeting was held on February 25, 2019. The next meeting is scheduled for March 25, 2019.

**Intra Branch Agreements (IBAs):**

The Intra Branch Agreement for FY 2018-19 for Orange Superior Court has been fully executed. Sacramento Superior Court's distribution request for FY 16/17 IBA milestone 2, completed project documents, is submitted for processing.

**Ventura Superior Court** (Journal Technologies - eCourt):

The second mock Go-live for small claims February 19-23 was successful.

Go-live for small claims is on target for March 4, 2019.

A meeting with JTI executives introduced changes in executive management. Ron Beech has retired and MaryJo Rodriguez is the new Principle, with Anthony Rochon continuing as their main contact.

**San Diego Superior Court** (Tyler Odyssey):

Testing of Clerk's edition (analogous to V3 Minute Order Capture System, MOCS) is complete.

The court is beginning testing of Judge's edition (presentation, analogous to San Diego's ELF view of V3).

17 forms are built and of 15 interfaces, 7 are built.

**Sacramento Superior Court** (Thomson Reuters C-Track):

Sacramento and Thomson Reuters are on track to complete planning for civil in 8 weeks, with the contracting phase and development to follow.

**Orange Superior Court** (Update CMS V3 for supportability and reliability):

Migration of Judicial Council forms from Adobe software to DocPath is complete. In the process of resolving an issue with one of the printing vendors.



## 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**

March 1, 2019

**Action Requested**

Please Review

**To**

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair  
Hon. Gary Nadler, Vice-Chair  
Judicial Council Technology Committee

**Deadline**

N/A

**From**

David Koon, Manager,  
Judicial Council Information Technology

**Contact**

David Koon, Manager  
415-865-4618  
david.koon@jud.ca.gov

**Subject**

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement  
Projects: Status February 1 - 28, 2019

---

As requested, this communication provides a written update regarding the progress of the nine courts using the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system which collectively received \$4.1 million in funding for FY 17/18 and \$896,000 in FY 18/19 as a result of submitting a BCP to replace the SJE case management system with a modern CMS platform.

**Project:** Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Replacement project for the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne counties.

**Status:** Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts met on February 20, 2019 for their status meeting. At these meetings, the SJE courts review the status of the deployments of the new case management system. While all courts continue to work on various aspects of their individual deployments, much of the activity remains focused on the Humboldt and Madera courts which are scheduled to be the first two courts to deploy the new case management system. Additionally, Judicial Council staff has sent a draft Intra-Branch Agreement (IBA) to each of the nine SJE courts which incorporates the FY 18/19 BCP funding into their existing IBA for the

March 1, 2019

Page 2

deployment of the new case management system. Once approval of the draft is received from the courts, the draft IBAs will be sent to the Judicial Council's Branch Accounting and Procurement office for processing.

**Next Steps:** Judicial Council staff and the SJE courts will continue to meet monthly to review progress and upcoming milestones.