



CA -
JUDICIAL CRIMINAL
JUSTICE PLANNING
COMMITTEE

34170

DECEMBER 1978

JUDICIAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE
PLANNING COMMITTEE —

1975
ANNUAL REPORT
TO THE
GOVERNOR AND THE LEGISLATURE

December 31, 1975
Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee
333 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The preparation of these materials was financially aided through a federal grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. The opinions, findings and conclusions in this publication are those of the author and are not necessarily those of CCCJ or LEAA. CCCJ reserves a royalty-free, non-exclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish and use these materials, and to authorize others to do so.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee	i
1. Introduction	1
2. Guidelines	2
3. Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee Activities During 1975	4
a. Revision of the 1975 Plan	4
b. Implementation of the 1975 Plan	11
 Attachment A: Projects reviewed by Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee	

JUDICIAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Hon. Winslow Christian*
Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
4154 State Building
San Francisco, California 94102

Hon. Melvin E. Cohn**
Judge of the Superior Court
San Mateo County
Hall of Justice and Records
Redwood City, California 94063

Hon. Arthur L. Alarcon
Judge of the Superior Court
Los Angeles County
Courthouse
Los Angeles, California 90012

Hon. Harry F. Brauer
Judge of the Superior Court
Santa Cruz County
P. O. Box 644
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Hon. James L. Focht
Judge of the Superior Court
San Diego County
220 West Broadway
San Diego, California 92101

Hon. Joan Dempsey Klein
Judge of the Superior Court
Los Angeles County
Courthouse
Los Angeles, California 90012

Hon. Harry W. Low
Judge of the Superior Court
San Francisco County
Hall of Justice
San Francisco, California 94103

Hon. James L. Smith
Judge of the Municipal Court
West Orange County Municipal Court District
8144 Westminster Avenue
Westminster, California 92683

STAFF

William E. Davis, Project Manager***
Administrative Office of the Courts
Judicial Council of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

Jon David Pevna, Project Manager****
Administrative Office of the Courts
Judicial Council of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

*Resigned as Chairman, July, 1975

**Appointed as Chairman by Chief Justice Donald R. Wright, August, 1975

***Resigned as Project Manager, December, 1975 to become Director,
Office of Judicial Planning, State of Kentucky

****Appointed, December, 1975

JUDICIAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee was established in the 1973 California legislative session by Stats. 1973, Chap. 1047. This legislation reorganized the California Council on Criminal Justice, established the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, authorized the establishment of local criminal justice planning districts and boards, and created the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee. The Penal Code provision creating the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee is as follows:

TITLE 6 CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

- Chap. 1. General Provisions and Definitions. §§ 13800, 13801.
- Chap. 2. California Council on Criminal Justice. §§ 13810-13813.
- Chap. 3. Office of Criminal Justice Planning. §§ 13820-13824.
- Chap. 4. Criminal Justice Planning Committee for State Judicial System.
§§ 13830-13834.

CHAPTER 4 CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR STATE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

- Membership appointed by Judicial Council-Legislature's findings. § 13830.
- Advice and assistance to Council on Criminal Justice. § 13831.
- Advice and assistance to Office of Criminal Justice Planning-Review of federal fund grants. § 13832.
- Payment of expenses. § 13833.
- Annual report to Governor and Legislature. § 13834.

§ 13830. Membership Appointed by Judicial Council-Legislature's Findings.

There is hereby created in state government a Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee of seven members. The Judicial Council shall appoint the members of the committee who shall hold office at its pleasure. In this respect the Legislature finds as follows:

(a) The California court system has a constitutionally established independence under the judicial and separation of power clauses of the State Constitution.

(b) The California court system has a statewide structure created under the Constitution, state statutes and state court rules, and the Judicial Council of California is the constitutionally established state agency having responsibility for the operation of that structure.

(c) The California court system will be directly affected by the criminal justice planning that will be done under this title and by the federal grants that will be made to implement that planning.

(d) For effective planning and implementation of court projects it is essential that the executive Office of Criminal Justice Planning have the advice and assistance of a state judicial system planning committee.

§13831. Advice and Assistance to Council on Criminal Justice.

The California Council on Criminal Justice may request the advice and assistance of the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee in carrying out its functions under Chapter 2 of this title.

§13832. Advice and Assistance to Office of Criminal Justice Planning-Review of Federal Fund Grants.

The Office of Criminal Justice Planning shall consult with, and shall seek the advice of, the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee in carrying out its functions under Chapter 3 of this title insofar as they affect the California court system.

In addition, any grant of federal funds made or approved by the office which is to be implemented in the California court system shall be submitted to the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee for its review and recommendations before being presented to the California Council on Criminal Justice for its action.

§ 13833. Payment of Expenses.

The expenses necessarily incurred by the members of the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee in the performance of their duties under this title shall be paid by the Judicial Council, but it shall be reimbursed by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning to the extent that federal funds can be made available for that purpose. Staff support for the committee's activities shall be provided by the Judicial Council, but the cost of that staff support shall be reimbursed by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning to the extent that federal funds can be made available for that purpose.

§13834. Annual Report to Governor and Legislature.

The committee shall report annually, on or before December 31 of each year, to the Governor and to the Legislature on items affecting judicial system improvements.

1. INTRODUCTION

This 1975 Annual Report of the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee to the Governor and Legislature describes the activities of the Committee in cooperation with the Office of Criminal Justice Planning and the California Council on Criminal Justice. It contains the recommendations of the Committee to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning on all judicial grant applications submitted for its review. It also describes the Committee's efforts to improve regional court planning for 1976 LEAA funding.

The Committee met almost every month to review judicial grant applications from trial courts. The results of this review process were transmitted to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. In the spirit of Penal Code section 13800, et seq., the Committee attempted to identify those areas where effective planning and implementation of court projects would result from its recommendations to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning and the California Council on Criminal Justice.

Funding for the Committee was provided by a planning grant to the Judicial Council from the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. The Office of Criminal Justice Planning also supplied valuable assistance to the Committee. In addition, pursuant to Penal Code section 13833, the Committee received staff support from the Judicial Council.

2. GUIDELINES FOR ACTION BY JUDICIAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING COMMITTEE (Adopted 1974)

These guidelines have been developed for the purpose of enabling the Committee to fulfill its statutory responsibilities of reviewing and evaluating judicial projects submitted to it and of recommending court plans, insofar as United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration programs are concerned. These guidelines provide points of reference for developing projects that have either a statewide impact or a local impact.

There are two fundamental goals for the judiciary according to the recently adopted American Bar Association Commission on Standards of Judicial Administration relating to Court Organization. They are: rendering impartial, uniformly applied judicial decisions and providing justice which is timely. All projects undertaken within the court system should contribute to the prompt disposition of criminal cases and this goal will be given primary emphasis when the Committee prepares any state or local plans or when it reviews any grant proposals. Additionally, the Committee will use the following guidelines for federal funding in evaluating court projects and proposing court plans:

- I. Since federal funding constitutes a limited supplement for an existing system, it should concentrate on the improvement of court operations in coordination with efforts already in process.
- II. Federally funded projects to be implemented in the court system should promote uniformity within the statewide judicial system rather than diversity, with consideration given to the geographical and workload volume differences among the courts.
- III. Federally funded projects should improve the management and administration of the courts by:
 - (a) providing adequate administrative support for judges to assure that maximum time is available for judicial decision making;
 - (b) applying modern technology to increase and improve the management capacity of the court system;
 - (c) improving management techniques and standards for judicial administration.
- IV. Federally funded projects should support procedures for the special disposition of routine matters to conserve court time.

- V. Federally funded projects should contribute to the timely rendering of justice by providing continuing programs in judicial education and research.
- VI. Federally funded diversion/probation projects should provide alternative methods of disposing of criminally charged individuals. Such projects should specifically provide for the court to receive current information on the status of the project and the progress of the individuals diverted to the project.

**3. JUDICIAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING
COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES DURING 1975**

Revision of the 1975 Plan

This report covers the calendar year 1975 from the point of view of the state judicial system, a year during which the 1975 CCCJ Plan was implemented and the 1976 CCCJ Plan was formulated. The committee's priorities for the judicial system were stated in its 1974 Annual Report as follows:

1. Improve management techniques, standards and staff support in courts.
2. Improve judicial information systems.
3. Create procedures and programs for diversion of selected groups of criminally charged individuals from the court system.
4. Create procedures for summary disposition of routine matters in order to concentrate judicial resources on the more difficult matters.

As approved by CCCJ in December 1974, the 1975 Plan for the judicial system^{1/} included:

- 1) a state-level grant program for courts of about \$1.4 million that included 14 projects:
 - a. Center for Judicial Education and Research \$253,000
 - b. Fourth Appellate District Defenders 167,612
 - c. Third District Appellate Defenders 150,000
 - d. Calendar Management Technical Assistance Team 124,644
 - e. Judicial Impact Analysis Team 103,500
 - f. Court Automation/Information Coordinator 39,658
 - g. Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee 61,725
 - h. Management Conferences 54,000
 - i. National Center for State Courts Western Regional Office 100,000
 - j. Videotape Experimentation 181,901

^{1/}The use of the term "judicial system" here refers only to the courts, not including prosecution, defense and legal services.

- k. Personnel Specialist \$ 26,964
- l. Trial Court Criminal Justice Coordinator 29,299
- m. Study of Unpublished Opinions of Appellate Courts 29,986
- n. Regional Legal Research Staff for Cow County Superior Courts 41,400

- 2) a regional level grant program for courts of about \$4.3 million that included 19 regions and 46 projects;
- 3) a proposed planning conference for February 1975 to be participated in by the committee, by regional directors and by trial court judges and administrators;
- 4) an effort to translate the LEAA Standards and Goals recommendations into California goals for the judicial system; and
- 5) an increased share of CCCJ regional funds to be allocated to improving the trial court system.^{2/}

These plans were seriously disrupted early in 1975 by the advent of a new administration. Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. ordered a virtual suspension of activity by CCCJ and OCJP for a period lasting from January through May. Intensive audits and examinations of the entire LEAA program in California on behalf of Governor Brown led to fundamental changes in policy that have had serious consequences for judicial planning in the use of 1975 and 1976 federal grant funds. The committee responded by joining with the Judicial Council in adopting the following joint resolution:

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA AND
JUDICIAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Joint Resolution on LEAA Funding for Court
Improvement Projects**

WHEREAS, the Judicial Council of California has the responsibility for recommending improvements in the administration of the California court system under Article VI of the Constitution, and the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee has the responsibility for recommending plans and projects for the use of federal funds that have been provided to the state for court improvement under Sections 13830-13834 of the Penal Code; and

WHEREAS, experience since 1969 has indicated that the judicial branch of California's state and local government has received a relatively small proportion of the funding made available for improvements in the criminal justice system, a proportion that normally is below 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, at both state and national levels there have been continuing efforts by the Judicial Council of California and by such national organizations as the Conference of State Chief Justices to improve both the proportion of money made available for court improvement and the ability of responsible judicial leadership to direct the application of such funds; and

WHEREAS, California has an adopted 1975 Comprehensive Plan for the utilization of LEAA funds that contains provisions for such outstanding programs for judicial improvement as the California Center for Judicial Education and Research, the Fourth Appellate District Defender project, and the Calendar Management Technical Assistance Team;

^{2/}At the Committee's recommendation, CCCJ has adopted the policy that court, prosecutor and defender projects (LEAA's "judicial process" category) should be allocated at least 15% of California's Part C action funds.

NOW THEREFORE, the Judicial Council of California and the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee do hereby express their concern over the failure of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning to implement California's approved 1975 LEAA grant program. Its inability or unwillingness to provide the necessary documentation to enable these and other exemplary projects to be carried out in accordance with the judiciary's advance planning over the past several years has created a fiscal emergency. Both agencies request that the Legislature provide for state funding of as many of these successful judicial projects as the budget resources of the state will permit if the federal funds that have been allocated for them continue to be withheld.

Dated: May 17, 1975

Judicial Council of California

Dated: May 19, 1975

Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee

Ultimately, the results of the Governor's re-evaluation of the federal grant program on judicial planning were:

1. elimination by OCJP of the planning conference between state and regional levels that was to have created a coordinated judicial effort for 1976;
2. elimination of California's entire "standards and goals" program, with the consequent termination of its judicial component; and
3. the establishment of new guidelines in June 1975 that led to a complete re-examination of the approved 1975 Plan and the termination of a number of previously approved judicial projects.

The guidelines adopted by a new CCCJ in June 1975 concentrated on "victims, offenders and the opportunities to commit crime,"^{3/} and eliminated by a roll call vote the idea that LEAA funds should be allocated in California for "system improvement." The effect of this guideline change in California, so far as state-level judicial planning is concerned was to eliminate the following previously approved projects:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Judicial Impact Analysis Team | \$103,500 |
| 2. Personnel Specialist | 26,964 |
| 3. Regional Legal Research Assistance | 41,400 |
| 4. Third Appellate District Defender | 150,000 |

In dollar terms the judicial allocation was reduced from \$1.4 million to \$1 million or about 8 percent of the available state level funds.

^{3/}The new guidelines state: "The primary purpose of California's efforts under the federal Crime Control Act during the 1976 fiscal period is the control and prevention of crime. Available resources should be used in programs which will help to prevent and reduce crime by directly affecting offenders, victims and opportunities for illegal acts; and special attention should be given to preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency."

At the local level, although no rewriting of the 1975 Plan was required, about 40 projects, totalling \$3.7 million, were finally included for judicial projects. This amounts to about 10 percent of the regional funds available.^{4/}

At the state level, the following program was presented for the 1976 Plan:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| (a) Calendar Management Team 3rd year | \$148,478* |
| (b) Appellate Defender, Fourth District to 6/30/75 - 4th year | 120,000 ^{5/} |
| (c) Judicial Council EDP Coordinator to 6-30-75 - 3rd year | 22,457 |
| (d) Court Management Workshops - 2nd year | 45,000 |
| (e) Language Needs in the Courts - 2nd year | 89,000* |
| (f) Juvenile Court Rules Revision - 2nd year | 65,107* |
| (g) National Center for State Courts - 4th year | 86,000 ^{6/} |
| (h) Appellate Monitoring Staff | 55,858 |
| (i) Judicial Management Team | 13,850 |
| (j) Court Organization Analysis Team | 135,000 |
| (k) New Trial Judge Orientation | 67,500* |
| (l) Backup Recording Equipment | 135,000 |

As CCCJ finally approved the 1976 Plan only the projects marked with an asterisk were funded under the new guidelines, a total of \$525,909, or about 4.1 percent of the state share of 1976 LEAA action funds made available to California.

At the local level, the 1976 Plan as approved provided for 25 court projects in 13 regions, representing \$1,963,678. This then made the courts' component of the local action funds 4.7 percent of the total regional allocation.^{7/}

Implementation of the 1975 Plan

The Committee worked closely with the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) in fulfilling its responsibilities as set forth in Penal Code section 13832.

OCJP submitted most of the 1975 grant applications for projects to be implemented within the California court system before taking any funding action on the grant application. However, there were a number of instances where applications were referred to the Committee at a point in time where the project had already commenced the initial stages of operation. The Committee continued to insist upon the need for more adequate coordination of effort by the OCJP staff so that the committee could perform its statutory responsibilities.

^{4/}Since the LEAA program commenced in California the portion of California's block grants for action programs in the courts has been: 1970 - \$708,767 or 5%; 1971 - \$1,528,885 or 4.6%; 1972 - \$2,393,036 or 5%; 1973 - \$2,947,847 or 6%; 1974 - \$1,501,201 or 3%; 1975 - \$3,700,000 or 10%.

^{5/}Approved for \$109,824.

^{6/}Approved for 6 months only at \$85,000.

^{7/}1976 - \$41,410,202.

The Committee also undertook to review those grant proposals affecting the California court system that are funded by LEAA discretionary grants. Two projects in this category were submitted to the Committee for review: the State Judicial Information System project and the Witness Utilization Program in the Los Angeles Municipal Court. An informational copy of the Judicial Pilot Program in Santa Clara County was reviewed by the Committee but no action was taken.

The Committee applied its general guidelines for reviewing the projects to be implemented in the California court system (see above). A summary of the Committee's review and recommendations on all California judicial grant applications is found in Attachment A.

Other Committee activities included assigning staff to identify those regions in the state with the greatest potential for developing meaningful court components in their regional plans. The staff then visited those regions interested in developing court projects and worked with regional and court staffs towards this end. In October, the Committee met with the new Director of OCJP for several hours to familiarize the Director with its past activities and to reach an understanding of the Committee's role in the future.

Although the Committee has yet to achieve some of its major goals, such as long-range planning for federally funded court projects, the Committee anticipates that many of these objectives will be attained with the advent of a new permanent staff at OCJP.

PROJECTS REVIEWED BY THE JUDICIAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Level Projects^{1/}

April, 1975

- A. Office of Criminal Justice Planning – Court Planning Conference \$ 5,400

This project should be funded.

September, 1975

- A. Judicial Council 1976 State Agency Plan

LIST OF PROJECTS^{2/}

- 1. Calendar Management Team – to 6/30/77, then state budget (3rd yr.) . . . 150,000
- 2. Appellate Defender, 4th District – to 6/30/76, then state budget (8 mos.) . . 112,000
- 3. Judicial Council EDP Coordinator to 6/30/75 (6 mos.) 21,000
- 4. Court Management Workshops (2nd yr.) 50,000
- 5. Language Needs in the Courts (2nd yr.) 100,000
- 6. Juvenile Court Rules Revision (2nd yr.) 50,000
- 7. National Center for State Courts (4th yr.) 100,000
- 8. Appellate Monitoring Staff 62,064
- 9. Judicial Management Team 13,850
- 10. Court Organization Analysis Team 150,000
- 11. New Trial Judge Orientation 75,000
- 12. Backup Recording Equipment 150,000
- 13. State Judicial Information System 222,222

\$1,252,140

This plan should be funded.

^{1/}Dollar amounts represent federal funds only.

^{2/}This list assumes that the Center for Judicial Education and Research will be included in the Judicial Council's 1976-77 state budget. If not, it would be restored to the top priority for LEAA funding. This list also assumes that the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee and the Trial Court Criminal Justice Coordinator will be funded from Part B Planning Funds.

B. Attorney Exchange Program (California D.A. and P.D. Ass'n.) \$29,981

The Committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

C. Prosecutor Coordinator Project (California D.A.'s Ass'n.) \$211,500

The Committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

D. Research Applied to Public Interest Litigation in Criminal Justice (Criminological Research Ass'n.) . . \$43,080

The Committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

E. Physical Evidence and the Judiciary (CCTRF) \$250,000

The Committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

Regional Projects

January, 1975

A. Criminal Justice Agency of Contra Costa County - Automated Calendaring System (Region G) . . . \$62,550

This project meets Guideline III(b) by applying modern technology to improve the courts. The project should be funded.

B. Orange County Public Defender--Criminal Jury Communications Feedback Project - (Region I) . . . \$23,181

This project was referred to the Judicial Council for review and policy direction, given Committee concerns over the project's impact on jurors.

February, 1975

A. North Orange County Municipal Court - Court Investigator (Region T) \$55,223

This project meets Guideline V by providing research information to the court. This project should be funded.

B. County of Ventura-Ventura County Court Management Seminar (Region Q) \$14,000

This project meets Guideline III (b) by improving management techniques in the courts. The project should be funded.

March, 1975

A. Santa Clara County-Superior Court Integrated Criminal/Civil Calendaring System (Region J) \$110,600

This project meets Guideline III (b) by applying modern technology to increase and improve the management capacity of the court system. The project should be funded.

B. Alameda County (Charles Houston Law Club) - Defender Profile Project (Region I) \$70,000

Action on this project was deferred pending the receipt of more information.

April, 1975

A. San Diego County Law and Justice Agency-Municipal Court Judicial Training Project (Region U) . . . \$5,100

This project should not be funded to avoid duplication of a statewide judicial training plan.

B. Calaveras County-Court Recorder (Region L) \$1,023

This project meets Guideline III (b) by applying modern technology to increase and improve the management capacity of the court system. This project should be funded.

C. Los Angeles County-Juvenile Justice Center (Region R) \$33,834

This project meets Guideline V by contributing to the rendering of timely justice by providing continuing programs in judicial education and research. This project should be funded.

D. Ventura County Municipal Court-Records Retrieval System (Region Q) \$40,450

This project meets Guideline III (b) by applying modern technology to increase and improve the management capacity of the court system. This project should be funded.

E. County of San Bernardino-San Bernardino Superior Court Recorded Phone Messages for Jurors (Region S) \$1,005

The project meets Guideline III (b) by applying modern technology to increase and improve the management capacity of the court system. The project should be funded subject to the conditions that the criteria for evaluation of the project be set forth in an amended grant application and there be a written final report for distribution to this Committee and OCJP.

F. County of Riverside-Corona Municipal Court Jury Education (Region S) \$1,125

This project meets Guideline III (c) by improving management techniques and standards for judicial administration. The project should be funded with an expanded evaluation to include the areas recommend above.

G. County of Orange Sheriff/Coroner's Department - Superior/Central Court Video Security System (Region T) \$16,765

The Committee took no action on this project because it was a law enforcement project.

H. County of San Francisco Department of Probation-San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (Region F) \$100,000

This project generally meets Guideline VI. The project should be funded upon the satisfaction of the following conditions:

1. Inclusion of a court representative on the Advisory Board.
2. Inclusion in the periodic reports current information on the status of the project and progress of individuals diverted to the project.
3. Design an evaluation component on the successes and failures of the project.

I. Orange County Department of Mental Health-Pretrial Intervention and Diversion (Region T) \$50,121

The project should not be funded until the following things have been done:

1. Consultation with the courts and District Attorney's offices to obtain support for the project.
2. Define exactly the proposed services to be given.
3. Indicate that research has been done on other similar projects and how this project will differ from similar projects and why success can be expected from this project.
4. Reassess the proposed evaluation system and compare the proposed system with other studies to determine if this is the best possible method of evaluation.

J. San Francisco Bar Association-Regional Conference on Court Modernization (Region F) \$18,094

This project should be funded.

May, 1975

A. County of Alameda-Criminal Court Statistician

This project meets Guideline III (a). It would provide special administrative support for judges to assure that maximum time is available for judicial decision making. This project should be funded — subject to the exclusion of an evaluation of the project.

B. Fresno County Superior Court-Superior Court Administrative Officer (Region N) \$22,920

This project meets Guideline III (a) by providing adequate administrative support for judges to assure that maximum time is available for judicial decision making. The project should be funded.

C. San Francisco County Superior Court-Assistant to Master Calendar Judge (Region F) \$22,234

This project meets Guideline III (a) by providing adequate administrative support for judges to assure that maximum time is available for judicial decision making. This project should be funded.

D. San Francisco Superior and Municipal Courts-Education and Training of Court Personnel (Region F) \$20,700

The project meets Guideline V. The project should be funded subject to the following conditions:

1. Definition of the goals of the project in specific terms.
2. Specify the subject matter to be taught.
3. Define the methodology to be used in the training program; i.e., lectures, videotapes, etc., the methods of testing comprehension and retention of material presented in the project.
4. Define the qualifications for the training officer position.
5. Indicate how this training program will enhance or in any way provide incentive to court employees to attend the program.
6. Indicate what criteria and methodology will be used in evaluating the program.

E. Presiding Judges of the San Francisco Superior and Municipal Courts-Jury Selection and Utilization (Region F) \$41,000

This project does not meet any guideline. The project should be funded because the need for such facilities has been demonstrated and it would improve the jury management system.

F. Municipal Courts-County Los Angeles-Los Angeles Municipal Courts Planning and Research Unit (Region R) \$295,200

This project meets Planning Guideline III (a) by providing adequate administrative support for judges to assure that maximum time is available for decision making and III (c) by improving management techniques and standards of Judicial Administration. The project should be funded.

June, 1975

A. Orange County Superior Court-Orange County Justice Information System (Region T) \$274,193

This project meets Guideline III (b) by applying modern technology to increase and improve the management capacity of the court system. The project should be funded subject to the inclusion of specific measurable objectives in the application to facilitate the evaluation of the project's progress, or including such objectives in a workplan with specific delivery dates, to be submitted to OCJP within 90 days of grant notice.

B. County of Alameda-Defender Profile Project (Region I) \$70,000

1. Funding for the project should be delayed until the following conditions have occurred:
 - a. Alameda Superior Court has been informed of the project and consented to participate;
 - b. the methodology more clearly defined;
 - c. the grant application rewritten to reflect a defined organization structure for the project, i.e., who will do what, how they will do it, who are consultants and how they will be selected;
 - d. the evaluation section rewritten setting forth criteria that can be measured by other than subjective means.

July, 1975

No projects were submitted to the Committee for review during this month.

August, 1975

A. County of Alameda-Defender Profile Project (Region I) \$70,000

This project should not be funded because it presumes discriminatory sentencing practices without substantiation.

September, 1975

A. Oakland-Piedmont Municipal Court — Training for Alameda County Municipal Court Personnel (Region I) \$78,915

This project meets Guideline V by providing training to administrative personnel. The project should be funded after there is an indication that more preliminary research and background data has been gathered.

October, 1975

No projects were submitted to the Committee for review during this month.

November, 1975

No projects were submitted to the Committee for review during this month.

December, 1975

- A. Economic Impact Analysis -- Shasta County Court Reorganization (Region B) \$11,750

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- B. Superior Court Records System -- Humboldt County (Region A) \$35,730

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- C. Alternative Sentencing Procedures -- Sacramento County (Region D) \$66,026

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- D. Narcotics Prosecution Program -- Sacramento County (Region D) \$42,366

The committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

- E. Automated Criminal Records Retrieval System -- Yuba County (Region D) \$9,938

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- F. Court Referral Program - Sonoma County (Region E) \$27,054

The committee recommended that the project should be funded provided: (1) the project meets the CCCJ requirement of sponsorship by a public agency; and (2) the project is supervised by the courts in the local jurisdiction.

- G. Marin Volunteer Work Program -- Marin County (Region E) \$31,444

The committee recommended that the project should be funded provided (1) the project meets the CCCJ requirement of sponsorship by a public agency; and (2) the project is supervised by the courts in the local jurisdiction.

- H. Project 20 -- San Francisco City and County (Region F) \$22,000

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- I. Salvation Army Diversion Program -- San Francisco City and County (Region F) \$33,832

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- J. Pretrial Diversion Project -- Alameda County (Region I) \$71,226

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- K. Inmate Legal Services -- Santa Clara County (Region J) \$52,768

The committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

- L. Sentencing Alternatives Program -- Santa Clara County (Region J) \$135,407

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- M. Trial Court Delay -- Legal Research Assistant -- San Joaquin County (Region K) \$38,697

The committee recommended that the project should be funded and that the project staff be directed to explore other similar efforts in other counties (e.g., San Francisco and San Mateo) to determine how legal research assistance can best be utilized.

- N. Municipal Court Administrator -- Stanislaus County (Region K) \$34,728

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- O. Court Systems Improvement -- San Joaquin County (Region K) \$149,541

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- P. Drug Offender Court Diversion Program -- Kern County (Region N) \$50,475

The committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

- Q. Conflict of Interest Program -- Tulare County (Region N) \$27,150

The committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

- R. Administrative Services, Lower Courts -- Tulare County Executive Office (Region N) \$25,215

The committee recommended that the project should be funded so long as it is supervised by a judge of the Municipal Court.

- S. District Attorney Pretrial Specialist -- Tulare County District Attorney (Region N) \$34,680

The committee concluded that this project is not a court project requiring committee action and therefore returned it without action.

- T. Orange County Justice Information System-Superior Court (Region T) \$225,000

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- U. Court Referral Program -- Orange County Harbor Municipal Court (Region T) \$44,981

The committee recommended that the project should be funded.

- V. Training for Alameda County Municipal Courts (Region I) \$78,915

Action on this project should be deferred until the applicant submits a detailed work schedule and timetable and some evidence that it has secured information on other work done in this area.

- W. Combined Superior and Municipal Court Administrative Offices -- Sonoma County (Region E) \$NA

In response to a letter from Mr. Ray Grady, Executive Director of the North Bay Regional Criminal Justice Board the Committee agreed to approve the proposal as currently stated even though a specific grant application has not been drafted and no determination has been made as to what CCCJ funding source would be used.

END

7. 11/25/1941