



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

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director

August 16, 2021

Hon. Gavin Newsom
Governor of California
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Toni G. Atkins
Senate President pro Tempore
State Capitol, Room 205
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Anthony Rendon
Speaker of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 219
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Thomas J. Umberg, Chair
Senate Judiciary Committee
State Capitol, Room 5094
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Mark Stone, Chair
Assembly Judiciary Committee
State Capitol, Room 3146
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Governor Newsom, President pro Tempore Atkins, Speaker Rendon, Senator Umberg, and Assembly Member Stone:

In March of this year, I convened a Judicial Council workgroup to examine successful court practices adopted during the pandemic and recommend those that demonstrate the most promise to increase access to justice, modernize services, and promote consistency and uniformity throughout the state. The workgroup has issued its first interim report focused on remote access to courts,

August 16, 2021

Page 2

which, unsurprisingly, has emerged as a central issue with strong support for maintaining extensive remote access to court proceedings. The report, outlining considerations for addressing both judicial proceedings and court operations, is attached. (Additional recommendations building on other court practices and procedures developed during the pandemic will be forthcoming as the workgroup continues its efforts.)

This interim report on remote access was informed by meetings held with court users representing 46 different groups—including civil and criminal attorneys, law enforcement, legal aid attorneys, dependency counsel, and court staff—who presented their input on changes to court processes instituted due to the pandemic, including their experiences with remote hearings.

The workgroup recommends that California expand and maximize remote access on a permanent basis for most court proceedings and should not roll back the increased access to the courts made possible by remote technology to pre-pandemic levels of in-person operations. It further recommends that the Judicial Council encourage and support courts in substantially expanding remote access, while adopting policies that ensure consistency and fairness statewide with the flexibility to meet local needs.

Remote technology increases equity and fairness in our court system by allowing court users more ways to access court services and participate in court proceedings. Recognizing that remote technology should not replace all in-person court hearings, Californians should have the freedom of choice to conduct their business remotely whenever appropriate. I welcome the support of the Administration and the Legislature in accomplishing these changes to benefit the public we serve.

Sincerely,



Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
Chief Justice of California

TCS/tc

Attachment

cc: Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair, Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives
Mr. Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director, Judicial Council
Ms. Shelley Curran, Director, Criminal Justice Services, Judicial Council
Mr. Cory Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



Interim Report: Remote Access to Courts

WORKGROUP ON POST-PANDEMIC INITIATIVES
AUGUST 16, 2021

REMOTE ACCESS TO COURTS

Overcoming bureaucracy, updating the museum pieces of governance, revealing the real people who make up our government, restoring trust: technology can help us do all of these crucial things, if we allow ourselves to embrace it.

Governor Gavin Newsom, *Citizenville*

We need to reinvest in justice. We need that reinvestment to institute what I call "Access 3D," three-dimensional access. Access should be physical, remote, and equal.

Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye, 2013

CHIEF JUSTICE'S AD HOC WORKGROUP ON POST-PANDEMIC INITIATIVES

In March 2021, Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye appointed the Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives (Workgroup). The purpose of the Workgroup is to identify, refine, and enhance successful court practices that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic to increase access to justice, modernize services, and promote uniformity and consistency in these practices going forward.

To date, the Workgroup has heard from 76 individuals representing 46 entities. Those who presented to the group represented court users in all case types, judicial officers, court staff, criminal and civil attorneys, and legal aid attorneys representing low-income litigants. A full list of the presenters and the organizations they represent can be found in Attachment A.

The Workgroup asked presenters to comment on practices adopted by courts during the pandemic to provide continued access to justice while maintaining the health and safety of court users, judicial officers, and staff. Remote access to the courts was chosen as the subject for this first interim report because it was the central issue raised in nearly every presentation to the Workgroup. This report summarizes the many and varied considerations for remote access to the courts in both judicial proceedings and court operations touched on by those presenters who addressed the topic. With few exceptions, presenters spoke of the value in continuing to provide court users with remote access in all case types. Future reports will cover other topics under consideration by the Workgroup.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The COVID 19 pandemic highlighted many access to justice issues especially for low-income individuals, communities of color, children, the elderly, victims of crime, and other vulnerable populations. Remote access to the courts can increase equity, fairness, and transparency for both the public and the media.

The majority of judicial branch users and stakeholders who presented to the Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives expressed strong support for the expansion of remote access to court proceedings during the pandemic, and for maintaining extensive remote access going forward. This input confirmed that remote proceedings allow individuals who face barriers in accessing the courts (such as having to travel long distances to court or take time off work) to efficiently resolve their court matters, and that providing access to the courts through the use of remote technology is an access to justice issue.

Expanding the use of remote technology also addresses many other important public policy concerns. Approximately 40 million individuals entered California courts in person annually before the pandemic, often traveling significant distances in private vehicles and on public transportation to appear at hearings or to otherwise conduct their court business. During the pandemic, with the use of remote technology for handling cases, the number of individuals who entered courthouses in person dropped to 12 million. When provided the option for remote access to court services, 75 percent of self-help visitors chose to obtain services remotely. This reduction in the number of individuals who had to travel to courthouses reduced traffic and air pollution and will continue to have a positive climate impact going forward. Remote proceedings allowed pro bono attorneys and legal aid providers to serve more clients with greater efficiency, and increased transparency and access to court proceedings for the public and the media. The need for remote access to the courts is likely to increase significantly in the coming months as California pursues more equity and inclusion initiatives and works to manage the anticipated rise in evictions.

Given the importance of addressing the use of remote technology as an access to justice issue, the Workgroup makes the following interim recommendations:

- California courts should expand and maximize remote access on a permanent basis for most proceedings and should not default to pre-pandemic levels of in-person operations.
- The Judicial Council should encourage and support courts to substantially expand remote access through all available technology and should work to promote consistency in remote access throughout the state to ensure that Californians have equal access to the courts while providing flexibility to meet local needs.

This interim report provides a condensed, selective summary of comments the Workgroup received from a wide variety of judicial branch stakeholders on the use of remote technology to provide access to the courts. It includes the benefits identified, areas of concerns, and considerations that will need to be addressed in making remote access to court processes fair, consistent, and permanent.

BACKGROUND

On March 28, 2020, at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council directed superior courts to make use of available technology to conduct judicial proceedings and court operations remotely, when possible, in order to protect the health and safety of the public, court personnel, judicial officers, litigants, and witnesses. On March 30, Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye issued an order, consistent with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-38-20, suspending the California Rules of Court to the extent that any rule prevented a court from using technology to conduct judicial proceedings and court operations remotely.

On April 6, 2020, the Judicial Council of California adopted emergency rule 3 of the California Rules of Court, which generally provides that courts may require judicial proceedings and court operations to be conducted remotely. Emergency rule 3 will remain in effect until 90 days after the Governor declares the state of emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic lifted, or until the rule is amended or repealed by the Judicial Council.

Emergency rule 3 provides courts with broad authority to conduct essential court functions—including arraignments, preliminary hearings, restraining orders, juvenile proceedings, and general civil and mental health hearings—remotely to implement the social-distancing measures necessary to limit the spread of COVID-19. For criminal proceedings, courts must receive the consent of the defendant to conduct the proceeding remotely.

The rule provides that courts may conduct proceedings remotely, which includes:


- Video, audio, and telephonic means for remote appearances;
- Electronic exchange and authentication of documentary evidence;
- E-filing and e-service; and
- Remote interpreting, remote court reporting, and electronic recording of court proceedings to make the official record.

In June 2020, a Judicial Council working group published the *Pandemic Continuity of Operations Resource Guide*. The guide includes considerations and approaches to help the state’s trial courts with their pandemic continuity of operations while providing a safe environment for court users, staff, and justice partners. By December 2020, almost all courts were providing remote proceedings in at least one case type and 38 courts made remote proceedings available in all case types. In February 2021, the *Pandemic Continuity of Operations Resource Guide* was updated to include promising practices from the courts regarding their experiences with remote proceedings.

The use of technology for remote proceedings has been instrumental in enabling courts to continue to serve the public and provide access to justice during the pandemic. The courts have been successful in these efforts, as indicated by the rate of case dispositions to case filings. Typically, court case filings exceed case dispositions. Before the pandemic, court clearance rates, defined as dispositions as a percentage of filings, averaged 86 percent. During the early part of the pandemic, March–August 2020, the clearance rate dropped to 73 percent.

However, in case types where courts were able to increase the use of technology during the pandemic, the case clearance rate simultaneously increased. In juvenile cases, which have transitioned almost entirely to video remote proceedings, clearance rates have exceeded 100 percent as courts have been able to address both current and backlogged cases; child support matters had an approximately 10 percent increase in clearance rates. In criminal cases and other case types where remote technology and practices have not been implemented as broadly, clearance rates have decreased by approximately 20 percent. (See Figure 1, below.)

Figure 1. California Courts Clearance Rates



BENEFITS

Most individuals and organizations that presented to the Workgroup voiced strong support for maintaining extensive remote access to court proceedings.

Remote Technology Promotes Greater Access for Court Users

Many presenters provided examples of how technology increased access to the courts in all case types and noted that remote access has been particularly positive in the following areas:

- Family law
- General Civil matters
- Restraining orders, both domestic violence and other civil
- Small claims
- Juvenile law
- Probate (conservatorships and guardianships)
- Collaborative courts (both adult and juvenile)
- Child support

Offering remote options provides court users with access to the courts they otherwise would not have. Existing access divides were made more apparent by the pandemic and were addressed by remote proceedings. Before the expansion of remote access, individuals faced significant barriers to participation in court proceedings because of job constraints, childcare needs, transportation issues, traffic congestion in urban areas, and length of travel for rural communities. Remote technology can increase access and save on travel time and costs by allowing a court user to attend a hearing while on a

break at work rather than lose a full day of work (and pay) to appear in person. This is especially true for self-represented litigants, who constitute a large portion of court users, particularly in family law, restraining order proceedings, traffic, and small claims cases.

In collaborative courts, providing remote appearances has allowed participants to receive better continuity of treatment (drug treatment, medical, etc.) without having to interrupt these important services to attend a hearing. For some collaborative court participants, including those with mental health or substance use disorders, the experience of coming to court can be overwhelming, so participants can be better served by allowing them to appear remotely from their own home or treatment setting. To accomplish these remote appearances effectively, the base technological support must be in place.

In the family court arena, online mediation tools have worked well for those in the military and out of state. These tools have enabled people to participate by video conference rather than just by phone, which has allowed the court and other participants to communicate on important family law issues more easily. In dependency, delinquency, and family law cases, remote appearance options have led to increased participation, and generally outcomes are much better when the family is engaged.

In juvenile law cases, remote options have been positive for those with nontraditional work schedules, for incarcerated parents, and for youth who are able to participate without taking time from school. (In one jurisdiction, it is a 176-mile drive over a mountain pass to get to court, so safety is a concern whenever youth must be driven to court.)

Victims often prefer to have the option of attending or appearing in remote proceedings

Remote arraignments that do not require defendants to be brought into the courthouse are a safer model for victims and other court users. Remote options also reduce transportation barriers and the amount of time necessary for victims to appear in court.

Court staff have received from vulnerable victims (such as the elderly and those who have experienced domestic violence) feedback that they appreciated the remote options and reports of decreased anxiety and stress from knowing that they would not have to appear in the same physical space as the person who abused them.

Availability of expert and other witness testimony is increased through remote options

Counsel in both civil and criminal proceedings have reported that experts and other witnesses have had greater interest and willingness to testify because they do not need to set aside a whole day to travel and appear in court, which makes scheduling of contested hearings much easier. For traffic and criminal cases, some law enforcement offices have created a “Zoom Room”—a dedicated room for remote testimony by law enforcement personnel. This approach has been extremely helpful in addressing and avoiding technology issues and has allowed officers to use their time more efficiently while waiting to testify. Historically, officers could wait in court for two to three hours before being called to testify. Remote appearances allow them to be available as needed and to complete paperwork and other work while waiting to be called.

Providing a virtual visitation option promotes improved relationships and increased participation

Many families involved in family law and dependency court proceedings also face housing issues and tend to change residences during the life of their cases, which can make it difficult to appear in court

and to maintain in-person visitation. Some parents who live out of state and previously had been unable to participate in proceedings or visitation are now able to do so remotely. Those working with families have been able to utilize technology to improve connections between youth and their family members or other adults in their lives.

In the dependency arena, offering an option for virtual visitation promotes relationships between birth parents and foster parents and helps children to stay in touch with parents and other supportive adults in their lives. Research on parents deployed in the military shows that children can have meaningful contact via virtual visits. In addition to a weekly in-person visit, the option for children to touch base with parents more regularly via technology is important.

Remote options increase participation and promote efficiency in all case types

For child support matters involving the Department of Child Support Services, it would not be uncommon to have 17 matters calendared and have both parties in attendance at only 10 of the matters. With remote hearings, it's more common that both parties are in attendance in 16 out of 17 matters.

Hon. Danielle K. Douglas, Superior Court of Contra Costa County

In the criminal arena, remote appearances for arraignments are more efficient overall for counsel, court staff, and correctional staff who are not required to transport defendants and manage their presence in public areas of courthouses and in courtrooms. Defense counsel noted that remote arraignments and preliminary hearings are efficient, emphasizing the importance of ensuring access to materials in advance and of defense counsel's ability to communicate confidentially with the client before and during the arraignment. Arraignment calendars have been handled more efficiently in jurisdictions that have used this approach. However, there is currently no consistency in the way these proceedings are handled from county to county and court to court.

Before the pandemic, pretrial conferences in both civil and criminal cases took a great deal of time for judges and attorneys. Providing remote options and allowing for client appearances to be waived for date setting or progress report hearings has been beneficial; the same is true for stipulated continuances. Although support is strong for the use of remote technology, there is agreement that it can be beneficial and efficient to conduct more substantive parts of both criminal and civil cases in person.

Many jails have instituted a remote meeting process for criminal defense counsel to have access to their in-custody clients, and this process has generally demonstrated a significant benefit. In many counties, the jail is a 30-minute drive from the court and counsel offices, and it can take a long time for counsel to get processed for entering the jail. After meeting with clients in person a few times to establish trust, it is possible and more efficient for counsel to conduct Zoom meetings with their clients.

The ability to conduct hearings remotely has reduced default or failure-to-appear rates in many courts, and at the same time courts have seen efficiencies in work for staff, with less down time in courtrooms. Courts were initially concerned that holding remote hearings could hinder access to justice, but some courts have seen participation increase by 20–30 percent.

In the juvenile arena, courts saw increased participation from youth who had previously been AWOL (absent without leave) but were more willing to participate in remote hearings. Failures to appear have dropped in juvenile matters because youth do not fear that they will immediately be taken into custody

if they appear remotely. For youth in custody, remote appearances have improved the efficiency of service delivery in the institutions. Programming and other responsibilities take up most of their day, every day, so for youth to attend court remotely and then seamlessly return to their programs is beneficial and efficient.

Court users expect and want courts to provide remote options

We learned that the pace of change can be much quicker than we thought; we now know that we can work faster than we thought we could.

Cecilia Rivas, Youth Law Center

Throughout the pandemic, and even before it, courts received criticism for requiring people to appear in person for something that could have easily been handled remotely. Increasingly, court users expect that if the courts can serve people equally or better remotely, the courts should have those options available. Some court users, including litigants in civil matters, have indicated that going back to in-person appearances, at least for short cause matters, would be very problematic and decrease access to justice because of the inconvenience and costs—considerations that are especially important to low-income court users. Some jurors have indicated they preferred remote trials because of the convenience factor, especially in places where transportation issues make travel to and from court difficult and because parking at the courthouse is limited and expensive.

Youth are generally quite comfortable with being online, so in the family and juvenile arenas participating virtually in court proceedings may be easier for them because it is familiar, is a bit more distanced, and feels safer. At the same time, courts should be thoughtful about the best approach to use with each child or youth, based on developmental considerations.

CONCERNS

In addition to the benefits identified by the individuals who presented to the Workgroup, several concerns were noted. These concerns generally relate to implementation challenges and include the digital divide and other technology issues, challenges in setting an appropriate virtual courtroom environment, and the effect of remote proceedings on the ability of all participants to responsibly perform their roles. Most of these issues can be resolved with adequate funding, infrastructure, and education to provide all court users with the necessary support for ensuring adequate access to the courts.

The Digital Divide

Problems for clients in rural areas are exacerbated because they are in remote areas and often do not have access to technology. They are distant from any location where they may have access to technology, particularly for farmworkers, who work long hours.

Ilene J. Jacobs, CA Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.

Although the expansion of the use of remote technology increased access to justice in many areas as outlined above, those who presented to the Workgroup identified some specific concerns related to the digital divide that must be addressed as remote access to the courts is expanded.

Internet bandwidth is a concern, particularly in rural counties and counties that have experienced fires in recent years. The lack of equity is apparent: 83 percent of Californians have access to broadband, but

only 52 percent have broadband with more than a minimal connection speed, and 28 percent of tribal lands have no broadband network at all. In addition to individual tribal members' lack of access to broadband, some tribes as a whole lack access to broadband, preventing them from participating in state court hearings remotely. Some tribes may not have the infrastructure, finances, or IT support to navigate online virtual hearings.

During the pandemic, the issue of affordability surfaced, as well; the digital divide is not just about connectivity but also about the ability to *afford* connectivity. In addition, not all court users can navigate the technology needed for remote appearances. These are genuine concerns about the increasing digital divide between various court users and its impact on access to justice.

In some areas, the impact of the digital divide on limited-English-proficient (LEP) individuals was not considered, and at times LEP individuals could not fully participate or get access to their lawyers. This circumstance resulted in remotely conducted matters that were inappropriate for virtual remote interpreting. With virtual hearings in dependency cases, LEP parents faced with losing custody rights had the extra stress of being unsure about how much of the remote proceeding they would be able to hear and understand.

Rural areas also have some special issues that tend to be overlooked because of a more common focus on urban low-income populations. Residents in both rural and urban areas may not have access to an attorney or legal services, as well as lacking internet access.

Court reporters stated that technology problems can result in less accurate court records

Individuals representing court reporters expressed concerns that use of video conferencing can make the court record less accurate because of problems with dropped calls or parties running out of minutes on their phones, particularly on government-funded phones with limited minutes. They noted that the record will be substandard if it includes comments such as "you're on mute" and half sentences where people talk over each other due to technology glitches.

Court reporter representatives also stated that when two attorneys with masks on are in the same frame, it is difficult for court reporters to tell who is speaking. They noted that court reporters are required to provide a full, complete court record, and at times, because of technology glitches and other difficult issues, preparing the required record of a remote hearing is a challenge for them.

Challenges in creating a virtual courtroom

At the start of the pandemic, some courts were not as technologically advanced as others. During the first several months of COVID, court users were scrambling to find a point person at some of the courts for assistance with technology troubleshooting. Courts also reported issues with court participants, parents or caregivers, and others recording remote proceedings in violation of the law or court directives.

Court users in remote proceedings sometimes speak out of turn and it is more difficult for the court to control the courtroom or for their attorney to assist in the same way they would at an in-person hearing. In some remote proceedings, the lack of courtroom decorum was a significant concern.

There were instances in remote proceedings where witnesses turned off their cameras so the judge could not ensure that the witness was paying attention or determine whether the witness was looking

at documents or checking notes when they were not supposed to be. There were also concerns that, in some cases, there was someone else in the room who was potentially coaching the witness. For children, testifying from home can have a chilling effect, even if they are safe there, because they may not have a completely private space available.

Concerns specific to criminal matters

There are concerns about remote proceedings in criminal cases. Some people have the perspective that remote proceedings are not constitutionally permissible for critical stages.

Throughout the pandemic, figuring out how in-custody defendants can participate in interviews with their attorneys has been a challenge, as jails have also been trying to cope with the impact of COVID on their institutions. These issues related to access to counsel have been one of the biggest obstacles with remote hearings in criminal cases.

One presenter expressed concerns that providing for defendant consent to remote appearance opens the door to claims of ineffective assistance of counsel. The concern is that the reduction in court time for remote appearances could provide an economic incentive for attorneys to take on more clients and proceedings than they can reasonably handle, so there may be a need to account for potentially unethical attorneys who provide ineffective assistance.

In-person interaction has benefits that may outweigh efficiency

Some have noted that, in many types of proceedings, to have the judge in the same room as the person who will be affected by the judge's decision is helpful. Although many proceedings can be done remotely, there is reason to be thoughtful about moving away completely from the humanity of in-person proceedings for the sake of efficiency.

The value of remote juvenile proceedings has limits. For example, addressing questions that arise midstream from youth in remote proceedings can be challenging.

In dependency and family court matters, it is important to have children present for hearings so they can have a sense of the court, who the participants are, and who makes the decisions. That context is challenging to accomplish with remote proceedings. In court, counsel can be right next to the child and help them understand, which informs the child about the process and strengthens their bond with counsel. In remote proceedings, counsel may not be able to be physically present with their client, and even when they are, they may have more difficulty explaining the various roles given that each person appears in a nearly identical Zoom box rather than in various spaces around the courtroom.

One benefit of in-person dependency and other hearings is that they provide people with the opportunity to make the choice to go into treatment as they leave the courthouse after the judge has stated in court that it would be beneficial for their case; that immediate enrollment in treatment is not possible with virtual hearings. This quick entry into treatment is a critical benefit that can follow from in-person hearings when the next steps the person takes will have an impact on the outcome of their case, such as whether they regain custody of their children.

CONCLUSION

Given the importance of addressing the use of remote technology as an access to justice issue, the Workgroup makes the following interim recommendations:

- California courts should expand and maximize remote access on a permanent basis for most proceedings and should not default to pre-pandemic levels of in-person operations.
- The Judicial Council should encourage and support courts in substantially expanding remote access through all available technology and should promote fairness by adopting balanced policies and encouraging consistency in remote access throughout the state to ensure that Californians have equal access to the courts while providing flexibility to meet local needs.

Individuals and organizations that presented to the Workgroup identified policy and implementation questions that must be considered to improve remote access as it is made permanent. Effective partnerships between the three branches of government at the state and local levels; coordination among the courts and justice partners; and adoption of rules, practices, and procedures—together with education and training for judges, court staff, and court users—will address many of the concerns.

Attachment A: Ad Hoc Workgroup on Post-Pandemic Initiatives Presenters

April 19, 2021

Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC)

- Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Superior Court of Humboldt County, TCPJAC Chair
- Hon. Tara M. Desautels, Superior Court of Alameda County, TCPJAC Vice-Chair

Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)

- Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt, Superior Court of Orange County, CEAC Chair
- Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Superior Court of Tehama County, CEAC Vice-Chair

May 3, 2021

American Board of Trial Advocates, California Chapter

- Walter M. Yoka, Yoka & Smith, LLP, President

California Defense Counsel

- Christopher E. Faenza, Yoka & Smith, LLP, President
- Michael D. Belote, Legislative Advocate

California Lawyers Association

- Emilio Varanini, President
- Ona Dosunmu, Executive Director

Conference of California Bar Associations

- Oliver Q. Dunlap, Chair

Consumer Attorneys of California

- Deborah Chang, Athea Trial Lawyers LLP, President
- Nancy Drabble, Chief Executive Officer

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

- Christoph Mair, Legislative Advocate
- Cole Querry, Political Action Representative

California Court Reporters Association

- Sandy Walden, Chair of Legislative Committee and Immediate Past President

California Federation of Interpreters (CFI)

- Michael Ferreira, President, CFI Local 39000

Service Employees International Union

- Brigitte Jackson, Court Clerk Representative
- Michelle Caldwell, Court Reporter Representative
- Libby Sanchez, Government Relations Advocate

May 17, 2021

Bay Area Legal Aid

- Genevieve Richardson, Executive Director
- Hilda Chan, Supervising Attorney

Bet Tzedek Legal Services

- Diego Cartagena, Esq, President & CEO

California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.

- Ilene J. Jacobs, Director of Litigation, Advocacy and Training

Central California Legal Services

- Brandi M. Snow, Housing Team Lead Attorney

Disability Rights California

- Christian Abasto, Legal Advocacy Unit Director

Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

- Juliana Lee, Staff Attorney

Legal Aid Society of San Diego

- Joanne Franciscus, Managing Attorney

OneJustice

- Amy Kaizuka, Senior Staff Attorney, Pro Bono Justice Program

Western Center on Law & Poverty

- Madeline Howard, Senior Attorney
- Tina Rosales, Policy Advocate

California Apartment Association

- Heidi Palutke, Policy, Compliance, Education, and Legal Counsel
- Susan E. Greek, CAA Member and Partner, Kimball, Tirey & St. John, LLP

May 28, 2021

Association of Certified Family Law Specialists

- David Lederman, Director of Technology
- Justin O'Connell, Associate Director of Legislation

Dependency Legal Services

- Julia Hanagan, Staff Attorney
- Mikaela West, Attorney

Children's Law Center of California

- Leslie Starr Heimov, Executive Director
- Cassandra Hammon, Attorney

County Welfare Directors Association of California

- Diana Boyer, Director of Policy for Child Welfare and Older Adult Services

Indian Child and Family Preservation Program

- Liz Elgin DeRouen, Executive Director

Youth Law Center

- Cecilia Rivas, Implementation Manager, National Quality Parenting Initiative

June 14, 2021**California District Attorneys Association**

- Ryan Couzens, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Yolo County
- Tracy Prior, Chief Deputy District Attorney, San Diego

California Public Defenders Association

- Matthew Sotorosen, Deputy Public Defender, San Francisco County
- Maureen Pacheco, Juvenile Division, Alternate Public Defenders Office, Los Angeles County

California Attorneys for Criminal Justice

- Anthony P. Capozzi, Attorney, Law Offices of Anthony Capozzi
- Marketa Sims, Writs and Appeals Attorney, Independent Juvenile Defender Program, Los Angeles County Bar Association

California Judges Association

- Hon. Danielle K. Douglas, Superior Court of Contra Costa County
- Hon. Anita L. Santos, Superior Court of Contra Costa County
- Hon. Brad Seligman, Superior Court of Alameda County

California Highway Patrol (CHP)

- Assistant Chief Mike Alvarez, CHP Legislative Director

California Police Chiefs Association

- Chief Abdul Prigden, President, Seaside Police Department

Peace Officers Research Association of California

- Deputy Sheriff Joe Dutra, Lake County Sheriff's Office

California State Sheriffs' Association

- Captain Rustin Banks, Solano County Sheriff's Office

Chief Probation Officers of California

- Chief Brian J. Richart, Chief Probation Officer, El Dorado Probation Department
- Chief John Keene, Chief Probation Officer, San Mateo Probation Department

June 28, 2021**State Digital Divide**

- Amy Tong, Director and State Chief Information Officer, California Department of Technology

Judicial Council of California Technology

- Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Heather L. Pettit, Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council

The Legal Aid Association of California

- Alison Corn, Esq., Technology and Legal Design Fellow

Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County

- Ana Maria Garcia, Vice President of Access to Justice Programs

Superior Court of Santa Clara County, Self Help Center/Family Law Facilitator's Office

- Fariba R. Soroosh, Supervising Attorney

Court Commissioners

- Hon. Glenn Mondo, Superior Court of Orange County (Civil Harassment Restraining Orders)
- Hon. Laura Cohen, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
- Hon. Jonathan Fattarsi, Superior Court of San Joaquin County (Traffic)
- Hon. Leslie Kraut, Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County (Family and Traffic)
- Hon. Jennifer Lee, Superior Court of Contra Costa County (Various Calendars)
- Hon. Myrlys Stockdale Coleman, Superior Court of Sacramento County (Family and Traffic)
- Hon. Julia A. Snyder, Superior Court of Ventura County (Unlawful Detainers)

California Tribal Families Coalition

- Mica Llerandi, Staff Attorney

California Indian Legal Services

- Dorothy Alther, Executive Director

California Partnership to End Domestic Violence

- Krista Niemczyk, Public Policy Director

July 6, 2021

Superior Court of San Francisco County—Jury Program

- Hon. Christopher C. Hite, Judge
- Hon. Vedica Puri, Judge
- Mr. T. Michael Yuen, Court Executive Officer

Superior Court of San Diego County—Jury Program

- Hon. Michael S. Groch, Assistant Supervising Judge, Criminal