

Court Security Advisory Committee

As of January 24, 2018

Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo
Chair

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Ms. Linda Romero-Soles

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Merced

Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian,
Vice-Chair

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Sixth Appellate District

Hon. Jaime R. Román

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Hon. Jeffrey G. Bennett

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Ventura

CJER GOVERNING COMMITTEE **LIAISON**

Hon. Darrell S. Mavis

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta

TRIAL COURT PRESIDING JUDGES **ADVISORY COMMITTEE LIAISON**

Hon. Patricia L. Kelly

Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara

Hon. Gary G. Gibson

Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta

Mr. Justin Mammen

Emergency and Security Services Manager
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS LIAISON

Mr. Cory Jaspersen

Director, Governmental Affairs
Judicial Council of California

Ms. Deborah Norrie

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Plumas

LEGAL SERVICES LIAISON

Ms. Dawn Payne

Attorney, Legal Services
Judicial Council of California

Mr. Daniel Potter

Clerk/Executive Officer
Court of Appeal
Sixth Appellate District

FACILITIES SERVICES LIAISON

Mr. Mike Courtney

Director, Facilities Services
Judicial Council of California

Court Security Advisory Committee

As of January 24, 2018

JUDICIAL COUNCIL LEAD STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Edward Ellestad

Supervisor, Security Operations
Facilities Services
Judicial Council of California

Ms. Lisa Gotch

Analyst, Security Operations
Facilities Services
Judicial Council of California



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

COURT SECURITY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

COURT SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

September 8, 2017

12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

877-820-7831, passcode 2856918 (listen only)

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

Hon. Jeffrey G. Bennett, Judge, Superior Court of Ventura County

Ms. Diana Herbert, Clerk/Administrator, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District

Hon. Thomas M. Maddock (Ret.), Judge, Superior Court of Contra Costa County

Mr. Justin Mammen, Emergency Response and Security Services Manager, Superior Court of Orange County

Hon. Charlene F. Olmedo, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County

Mr. Darrel E. Parker, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County

Advisory Body Members Absent: Ms. Deborah Norrie, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Plumas County

Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Diego County

Hon. Jaime Román, Judge, Superior Court of Sacramento County

Others Present: Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Facilities Services, Operations and Programs Division, Judicial Council of California

Ms. Lisa Gotch, Analyst, Security Operations, Facilities Services, Operations and Programs Division, Judicial Council of California

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:18 p.m., and staff took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the January 11, 2017, Court Security Advisory Committee meeting. It also approved minutes of action by e-mail for the following: March 14, 2016; February 2, 2017; April 25, 2017; and May 25, 2017.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

Member and Staff Update

Information was shared about upcoming membership changes and staff-related changes.

- Judge Gary Gibson is the committee's Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC) liaison.
- On September 15, Judge Olmedo becomes Chair and these member changes will occur: Judge Patricia Kelly replaces Judge Thomas Maddock, Melissa Fowler-Bradley replaces Darrel Parker, and Linda Romero-Soles replaces Michael Roddy. Ms. Fowler-Bradley fills the need for a member who is also a member of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) and is from a court that uses a marshal, and Ms. Romero-Soles fills the need for a member who is also a member of the Trial Court Facilities Advisory Committee (TCFMAC).
- The Judicial Council's Real Estate and Facilities Management office was merged with its Capital Program office and renamed to Facilities Services. Staff's Security Operations unit is under that umbrella. Its director, Mike Courtney, will serve as a liaison and provide support for Budget Change Proposals (BCPs).

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:29 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

COURT SECURITY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

COURT SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 30, 2017

12:15 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.

877-820-7831, passcode 2856918 (listen only)

-
- Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District
Hon. Jeffrey G. Bennett, Judge, Superior Court of Ventura County
Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County
Mr. Justin Mammen, Emergency Response and Security Services Manager, Superior Court of Orange County
Ms. Deborah W. Norrie, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Plumas County
Ms. Linda Romero-Soles, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Merced County
- Advisory Body Members Absent:** Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Shasta County
Ms. Diana Herbert, Clerk/Administrator, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
Hon. Jaime R. Román, Judge, Superior Court of Sacramento County
- Others Present:** Ms. Dawn Payne, Attorney, Legal Services, Judicial Council of California
Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Facilities Services, Operations and Programs Division, Judicial Council of California
Ms. Lisa Gotch, Analyst, Security Operations, Facilities Services, Operations and Programs Division, Judicial Council of California

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m., and took roll call.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Item 1

Member Update

Information was shared about member Diana Herbert's retirement at the end of December. An out-of-cycle solicitation for nominations started November 15, to fill the appellate court administrator position on the committee. The deadline for submissions is December 1.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-1)

Item 1

2018 Annual Agenda

Discussion was held about the draft annual agenda prepared by staff and provided in materials. The draft used a new template, and included most information from the prior Annual Agendas. The template required fiscal information; thus, the draft grouped projects by funding sources. Members discussed priority levels and funding options for the five ongoing projects listed. The committee approved the draft annual agenda language by unanimous voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:37 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

Court Security Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda¹—2018
Approved by E&P: [Date]

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Charlaine F. Olmedo, Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Lead Staff:	Mr. Edward Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations, Facilities Services
Committee's Charge/Membership: Rule 10.61(a) of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Court Security Advisory Committee, which is to make recommendations to the council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning. Rule 10.61(b) sets forth the membership position categories of the committee. The Court Security Advisory Committee currently has 10 members. The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page.	
Subcommittees/Working Groups²: None.	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources.

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
1.	Project Title: Emergency- and Security-Related Concerns for the Branch	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Consider new and continuing emergency- and security-related concerns for the branch, and make additional recommendations as needed. The <u>origin</u> of this project is the committee’s charge under rule 10.61. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council’s Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be reports to Judicial Council, which may include recommendations that the council direct its facilities and budget advisory committees on specific or urgent priorities.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Recommendations that may have a fiscal impact will be discussed with appropriate Judicial Council staff and advisory bodies first. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit of the Facilities Services office.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Depending on recommendations, stakeholders could include Judicial Council offices (Governmental Affairs, Budget Services, Appellate Court Services, Center for Judicial Education & Research, Court Operations Services, Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, and Legal Services). External stakeholders include the trial courts and appellate courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Depending on recommendations, collaborators could include the Court Executives Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, Court Facilities Advisory Committee, Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee, and the Governing Committee of Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER).</p>		

³ All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

⁴ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

⁵ A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
2.	Project Title: Trial Courts' Screening Equipment Replacement	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Screening Equipment Replacement Program for trial courts, which replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function, and a lack of sufficient funding to support and improve the program. This project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related Budget Change Proposals (BCPs), for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project #2 has a budget of \$2.286 million funded annually through the Trial Court Trust Fund, and as the budget has not increased with costs, there is a shortfall that has resulted in a shift of some costs to the courts. Funding/cost changes could necessitate additional costs to courts. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts (primary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time.</p>		
3.	Project Title: Trial Courts' Security Equipment and Systems	Priority 1⁴
<p>Project Summary⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Trial Court Security Grant Program for trial courts, which provides and maintains systems such as access, camera, duress, etc. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function, and a lack of dedicated funding to support and improve the program. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related BCPs, for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p>		

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
	<p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project #3 had a budget of \$1.2 million funded through the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. One-time limited funding has been provided for maintenance and repairs each year, starting in FY 2015–16. Without a dedicated funding source, trial court needs for new equipment and systems may go unmet, and existing equipment and systems may age out, become unsupported by the manufacturers, and ultimately fail completely. Dedicated funding to maintain existing programs is preferable to making purchases and maintenance an additional court cost that may not be viable. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts (primary users).</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None anticipated at this time. The Judicial Branch Budget Committee reviews BCPs.</p>	
4.	Project Title: Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning	Priority 1⁴
	<p>Project Summary⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit’s Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning Program, which provides and maintains online planning system and trainings. The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this program as a necessary and appropriate function, and a lack of dedicated funding to support and improve the program. The project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council’s Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related BCPs, for the Judicial Council’s facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: The program in project #4, and related module in project #5, were originally funded through budget from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. Limited funding for maintenance of the online planning system has since been paid by the General Fund budget of the Security Operations unit. While system training and exercises were originally provided, a lack of sufficient funding shifted that cost to the courts. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Trial courts (primary users) and Judicial Council/appellate courts (secondary users).</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ³	
	<i>AC Collaboration:</i> None anticipated at this time.	
5.	<i>Project Title:</i> Trial Courts' Court Security Plans	<i>Priority 1</i> ⁴
<p><i>Project Summary</i>⁵: Make recommendations to Judicial Council to support Security Operations unit's Court Security Plan services—specifically, through a module included in the online planning system mentioned in Project #4, and annual review of summary data by this committee under rule 10.172(e). The <u>origin</u> of this project is our July 2015 report to the Judicial Council, which identifies this service as a necessary and appropriate function, and rule 10.172 on Court Security Plans. This project supports a key <u>objective</u> to advise on, and advocate for funding to support, existing emergency- and security-related programs. It <u>aligns</u> with the Judicial Council's Goal III Objective 3 to improve safety, security, and disaster preparedness—e.g., through emergency preparedness/continuity of operations plans—as well as Goal VI Part A (facilities infrastructure) and Part B (technology infrastructure) via safety and security guidelines, practices, operations, projects, and technologies. The <u>outcome</u> would be information about costs associated with this goal and related BCPs, for the Judicial Council's facilities and budget advisory committees and decision-makers.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> Ongoing.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> The program in project #4, and related module in project #5, were originally funded through budget from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, but that was redirected. Limited funding for maintenance of the online planning system has since been paid by the General Fund budget of the Security Operations unit. A lack of sufficient funding has prevented staff from requesting changes to the module that would streamline work. This project will use current Judicial Council staffing and resources from the Security Operations unit.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> Trial courts (primary users of module).</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None at this time.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Met objectives to make recommendations on the necessary emergency response and security functions for the branch, and to advocate for funding to support those functions/existing emergency- and security-related programs. For <i>ongoing</i> projects summarized as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial Courts’ Screening Equipment Replacement <p>The related program has a budget of \$2.286 million funded annually through the <u>Trial Court Trust Fund</u>. However, the program budget has not increased since its inception in 2006, while costs for equipment and service have increased, which resulted in a shortfall, a delay in equipment replacement cycles, and an ongoing shift of the cost for service agreements to the courts starting in FY 2015–16. Committee actions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 2017: Included information about program status, and trial court needs and priorities, in a letter (described in item 2, below).
2.	<p>For <i>ongoing</i> projects summarized as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial Courts’ Security Equipment and Systems • Emergency and Continuity of Operations Planning • Trial Courts’ Court Security Plans <p>Related programs had a budget from the <u>State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund</u>. However, the Trial Court Security Grant Program was eliminated when its \$1.2 million budget was redirected effective FY 2015–16. Staff attempted to regain dedicated funding for trial court security system installation, maintenance, and replacement through the BCP process, but their BCPs for FY 2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18 were not successful. A limited amount of operations and maintenance funding was made available on a one-time basis to address minimum maintenance and repairs, but funding to continue limited service was not identified. As systems age, components become obsolete and cannot be repaired, and costs increase. Committee actions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 2017: Provided input to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee regarding an Initial Funding Request (IFR). A \$3 million request was included in the Judicial Council’s FY 2018–19 BCP request to the State Department of Finance. • May 2017: Wrote and consulted with the chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee, with a copy to chairs of the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Judicial Branch Budget Committee, to share information gathered from trial courts about their security needs and priorities for the next year. The committee focused on security equipment and systems (such as x-ray machines, magnetometers, video surveillance, access control, and duress alarm systems) that were affected by the underfunding of the Screening Equipment Replacement Program and elimination of funding for the Trial Court Security Grant Program. The information included statistics on the status of security equipment and systems, and presented an undeniable need for assistance—e.g., through support for established Judicial Council programs. • September 2017: Reviewed summary data on trial courts’ Court Security Plan submissions and notifications under rule 10.172(e).