

JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes
November 22, 2021

Meeting conducted through Webex

9:00 a.m. – 1:12 p.m.

Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrant, Presiding

Members:

Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrant, Chair
Hon. Todd Shaughnessy, Vice Chair
Hon. Keith Barnes
Hon. Samuel Chiara
Hon. Augustus Chin
Hon. David Connors
Hon. Ryan Evershed
Hon. Paul Farr
Hon. Michelle Heward
Hon. Mark May
Hon. David Mortensen
Justice Paige Petersen
Hon. Kara Pettit
Margaret Plane, esq.
Hon. Derek Pullan
Hon. Brook Sessions

Excused:

Neira Siaperas

Guests:

Pamela Beatse, Access to Justice Director
Hon. Danalee O'Donnal, Moab Justice Court
Justice Christine Durham (former)
Hon. Dennis Fuchs, Senior Judge
Hon. Clint Gilmore, West Valley Justice Court
Hon. Ryan Harris, Court of Appeals

AOC Staff:

Ron Gordon
Cathy Dupont
Michael Drechsel
Lauren Andersen
Shane Bahr
Paul Barron
Suzette Deans
Stacy Haacke
Alisha Johnson
Tania Mashburn
Meredith Mannebach
Jordan Murray
Bart Olsen
Jim Peters
Nathanael Player
Jon Puente
Nick Stiles
Karl Sweeney
Melissa Taitano
Keisa Williams
Jeni Wood

Guests Cont.:

Ruth Shapiro, Attorney
Amy Sorenson, Attorney
Nancy Sylvester, Utah State Bar
Hon. Don Torgerson, Seventh District Court

1. WELCOME AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrant)

Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrant welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Council held their meeting through Webex.

Motion: Judge David Connors moved to approve the October 25, 2021 Judicial Council meeting minutes, as amended to correct item 4 to Judge Connors thanked the group that made a presentation to the ABA Judges, item 9 from \$17,000 to \$11,000, and add “administrative” to item 10 law judges. Judge Brook Sessions seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

2. OATH OF OFFICE AND SELECTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR JUSTICE PAIGE PETERSEN AND JUDGE KEITH BARNES: (Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrant)

Chief Justice Durrant administered the Oath of Office to Justice Paige Petersen and Judge Keith Barnes. The Management Committee approved the executive committee memberships as shown in the table below.

Management	Policy & Planning	Liaison	Budget & Fiscal Management
Chief Justice Durrant, Chair	Judge Pullan, Chair	Judge Pettit, Chair	Judge May, Chair
Judge Shaughnessy, Vice Chair	Judge Chiara	Judge Evershed	Judge Barnes (new)
Judge Farr	Judge Chin (new)	Justice Petersen (new)	Justice Petersen (new)
Judge May	Judge Connors	Judge Sessions	Judge Pettit
Judge Mortensen	Judge Heward		Margaret Plane (new)

3. CHAIR’S REPORT: (Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrant)

Chief Justice Durrant mentioned his gratitude for the extraordinary job Ron Gordon is doing as the State Court Administrator in the short amount of time he has been on the job.

4. STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT: (Ron Gordon)

Mr. Gordon continues to serve on the JRI Listening Tour. There have been 9 public forums addressing both criminal justice policy and juvenile justice policy across the state that Mr. Gordon or Cathy Dupont attended.

- The most commonly cited concern was that JRI was not appropriately funded.
- There were concerns that JRI had some initial investment but that investment did not keep pace with the demand. This made implementation in the adult system difficult.
- Some believe the law prohibits some individuals from being held accountable.
- There was concern that the law does not allow intervention early enough.
- Most of the concerns with juvenile justice reform dealt with the interaction of schools, youth, and the courts.

Mr. Gordon explained that the Listening Tour participants do not respond to the feedback received. The next step is for a workgroup to evaluate and discuss policy amendments.

Mr. Gordon visited the Second District Juvenile Court and was impressed by the high caliber of staff within the Judiciary and thought the courts were fortunate.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) issued an emergency order that employers with 100 or more employees require a COVID vaccine or weekly COVID testing. This resulted in numerous law suits. The Utah legislature passed a law stating that if an employer implements a vaccine mandate, they have to allow exemptions for medical, religious, and/or deeply held personal belief. An employer cannot require an employee to pay for weekly testing.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Management Committee Report:

The work of this committee is reflected in the minutes.

Budget & Fiscal Management Committee Report:

The committee met last week, additional information will be discussed later in the meeting.

Liaison Committee Report:

Judge Kara Pettit stated the committee met recently with new member, Justice Petersen, attending. Michael Drechsel continues his work on proposed bills and with legislators. HB2003. Pretrial Amendments recently passed in the Legislative 2nd Special Session and is effective immediately. The biggest change is that bail commissioners are now able to impose bail, per statute, at the jail level. There are some justice court bills, specifically capping justice court revenue at 25%, that may be presented at the next session. A reminder will be sent to judges and employees closer to the session about the courts “one voice” approach.

Policy and Planning Committee Report:

Judge Derek Pullan noted the committee completed their review on the Office of Fairness and Accountability Committee, reviewed CJA Rules 6-501 and 6-507, and are working on the rule on uniform custody evaluations.

Bar Commission Report:

Margaret Plane said the Bar received a clean audit with no findings. The Bar appreciated Justice Petersen’s presentation on the Wellbeing Committee.

6. COURT COMMISSIONER CONDUCT COMMITTEE REPORT: (Judge Ryan Harris and Keisa Williams)

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Judge Ryan Harris and Keisa Williams. Over the past two years, the committee had 10 complaints that were dismissed by the Chair; 1 complaint that was dismissed by the committee; one complaint that had a hearing; and one complaint that had a hearing and findings.

Judge Harris thought the website did not adequately identify who to file a complaint with. Complaints are filed from the following: referral from JPEC; referral from JCC; or complainants must go to CJA Rule 3-201.02 to find the committee composition, then go to the Boards and Committees website to identify the contact person. Some complaints are received through Ms.

Williams. The committee hasn't identified a common issue in the various complaints that could be addressed through training. Judge Harris noted the Judiciary has high-quality commissioners.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Judge Harris and Ms. Williams.

7. FORMS COMMITTEE REPORT: (Professor Randy Dryer and Nathanael Player)

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Nathanael Player. The committee continues to meet virtually. They are working with Amy Hernandez on the translation of protective order forms to Spanish and creating a list of what forms need to be translated. The committee is working to expand access to justice through forms. Some of the member positions have changed on the committee.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Mr. Player.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF FIREARM RESTRICTION: (Nathanael Player)

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Nathanael Player. The Forms Committee prepared an Acknowledgement of Firearm Restriction form in response to HB101 Prohibited Persons Amendments, which became effective May 5, 2021. The Council approved the form for statewide use and it was distributed to all affected courts. After feedback from a number of judges, the committee revised the form and attempted to balance legal specificity with plain language. There were concerns from some members of the bench that the form is not sufficiently specific and that the form should be drafted assuming that lawyers will review this form with criminal defendants in each case.

Judge Pullan explained there is a need for greater clarity about the impact of a plea on a person's ability to possess a firearm. Mr. Player will contact Judge Jennifer Brown for further discussion. Justice Petersen thought the section addressing additional criminal charges and penalties was confusing. Judge Connors said the form did not identify whether someone was a category one or category two restricted person. The Third District Court does not use a stand-alone form and instead, lawyers developed language in the plea form, which provides a better percentage of everyone completing a form. Determining the consequences for when someone is a restricted person can be a subtle distinction and depends on the nature of the offense, among other things. Lawyers must inform defendants what the consequences will be. Judge Shaughnessy did not approve of a separate form. Judge Pettit believed the form contemplates an attorney is assisting with reviewing the form. The committee will confer with the judges who raised issues about the stand-alone form and will report back to the Council.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Mr. Player.

9. MODEL UTAH CIVIL JURY INSTRUCTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT: (Stacy Haacke)

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Stacy Haacke. The committee is comprised of district judges, civil practitioners from both sides of the aisle, and a linguist. Some of the positions are currently in transition or renewing, including the chairmanship. CJA Rule 3-418 provides the

\$130,000

One-time funds

Develop enhancements to MyCase so that when users create a new account they are prompted to:

- opt-in to survey requests for JPEC (Judicial Performance Evaluation Commission);
- provide race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation demographic information.

Asking court users to provide this information will help JPEC improve judicial performance evaluation and will help the Office of Fairness and Accountability to gather information that can be used to understand whether there are disparities in outcomes based on the above-listed demographics. Judge Shaughnessy asked if this would delay MyCase. Mr. Player said this was an enhancement to what is already in place and would not cause a delay.

Motion: Judge May moved to approve the MyCase Account Enhancements one-time funds request of \$130,000, as presented. Judge Session seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Grant Moratorium and CJA Rule 3-411

The Council established a grant moratorium in September 2020 pending the hiring and successful retention of a grant coordinator for the Utah Courts and the provision and acceptance of enhanced grant governance policies (guardrails) as ratified in CJA Rule 3-411. Mr. Murray has capably served as the Grant Coordinator for the courts over the past year.

Motion: Judge May moved to approve lifting the grant moratorium, as presented. Judge Sessions seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

CJA Rule 3-411 received no public comments. Mr. Murray sought final approval of CJA Rule 3-411.

Motion: Judge David Mortensen moved to approve CJA Rule 3-411 for final action with an effective date of November 22, 2021 as presented. Judge Shaughnessy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Sweeney readdressed charging credit card transaction fees. The Finance Department has responsibility for monitoring the difference between the interest the courts earn on trust accounts and earned surpluses retained inside the trust account and the credit card and other fees the courts pay from the interest received. Historically, the courts either generated a cash surplus, or in years where there were general funds that were going to lapse to the legislature, they moved general funds into the trust account to have on hand to cover future years expenses. Except for cash, each type of payment the court takes in has a cost associated with it. Payments by check and ACH have a nominal fee. Payments by credit card are the highest as there is both a per transaction fee of .15 cents and a fixed percentage charged on the payment amount. The total transaction fee is 2.95%. The courts had a total of 256,542 district, juvenile and appellate payment transactions in FY21, of which, 92% were made by credit card. The total funds collected through district, juvenile and appellate courts in FY21 was \$46,972,161, of which 66%

were credit card payments. Civil cases totaled approximately 73% of credit card receipts and criminal cases totaled approximately 27%. As society transitions to a cashless system, Finance anticipates an increase in credit card fees due to both increases in the rate charged by credit card companies and the volume as more court patrons shun cash in favor of credit cards.

Through the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) combined with additional outreach made by Finance, state courts throughout the country were surveyed to identify if they charge a transaction fee for the use of credit cards and if they did what was the methodology. The Utah courts provider, Heartland, charges a transaction fee of 2.95% for the use of credit cards. The survey results showed from the 40 courts that responded, 29 courts charge a transaction fee for the majority or all of their credit card payments.

Effective July 1, 2021, the Council has the authority to add transaction fees to criminal cases, per H.B. 260 – incorporated into Utah Code § 77-32b-103 (2)(c) Establishment of a criminal accounts receivable -- Responsibility -- Payment schedule -- Delinquency or default:

For a criminal accounts receivable that a court retains responsibility for receiving, processing, and distributing payments under Subsection (2)(b)(i), the Judicial Council may establish rules to require a defendant to pay the cost, or a portion of the cost, that is charged by a financial institution for the use of a credit or debit card by the defendant to make payments towards the criminal accounts receivable.

There is no current statute that authorizes the charging of transaction fees to civil cases. This is an important gap to address as civil cases credit card charges make up approximately 70% of total credit card transaction fees. Before a transaction fee would be implemented, IT would be able to add an ACH payment option to Epay/Online. Adding ACH to Epay/Online would provide a “no transaction fee” option to users of Epay/Online who previously could only pay with a credit card. “At the Counter” patrons who desired to make an ACH payment (in addition to cash and check options they have today) would also be directed to the online payment app to make an ACH payment.

Judge Connors opposed adding a transaction fee, especially since most payments to the courts are involuntary, noting that this would also essentially add to the filing fees. Judge Shaughnessy didn't feel the courts are imposing the fee because users have alternative options. Judge Pettit questioned if the proposal was to start collecting fees prior to the implementation of ACH. Mr. Sweeney said they would be implemented simultaneously and clarified that ACH requires a user to have a bank account. Judge Pullan asked how this process was done in the executive branch, such as with the DMV. Judge Pullan was concerned that people would not have another option, but since they do have other options, he agreed with Judge Shaughnessy. Mr. Sweeney isn't aware if people are charged credit card fees in the executive branch.

Alisha Johnson said users are required to pay a transaction fee for the Utah Tax Commission, according to the Utah Tax Commission website. Judge Sessions stated justice courts use a variety of credit card companies and include a transaction fee. Judge Shaughnessy

said the difference between the courts and businesses is that businesses keep the money they collect whereas funds received in the courts are sent to the legislature.

\$284,000	\$284,000	ACH (CORIS/e-filing/online + cont.)
\$200,000		Option A
	\$70,000	Option B
\$484,000	\$354,000	Total cost to implement

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Judge May, Mr. Sweeney, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Anderson, and Mr. Player. For clarification, option A, includes legislative approval for civil cases because the Council already has authority to charge these on criminal cases, and is run through the courts so the user will only see one transaction on the credit card, understanding this includes a higher cost.

Motion: Judge Shaughnessy moved to approve option A, up to \$484,000, as presented. Judge Augustus Chin seconded the motion, and it passed with Judge Connors voting no.

11. PROBLEM-SOLVING COURTS RECERTIFICATIONS: (Judge Dennis Fuchs and Judge Clint Gilmore)

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Judge Dennis Fuchs and Judge Clint Gilmore.

The Council at a prior meeting earlier this year, voted to table Judge Gilmore’s Adult Mental Health Court in West Valley Justice Court (AMHC3SaltLake) because it did not meet several criteria.

- Required # 3: High Risk Participants (Class B misdemeanor)
- Required # 10: Medically Assisted Treatment (Class B misdemeanor)
- Required # 44: Excluded if no Residence
- Presumed # 2: Monitor Incentives and Sanctions
- Presumed # 11: Test Results Available Within 48 Hours
- Presumed # 12: Deliver Test Specimen Within 8 Hours
- Presumed # 29: Measures to Prevent an Overdose (most are not drug users)
- Presumed # 35: More than 15 Participants
- Presumed # 37: New Arrests and Convictions Followed

Judge Fuchs stated the mental health court meets most of the criteria, with the exception of drug testing and number of participants – both of which are pandemic-related. Judge Gilmore said there are transient people who participate in the program. Participants are required to reside in Salt Lake County. Judge Gilmore allows for high and moderate risk cases but does not accept low risk individuals.

Judge Fuchs explained mental health and drug courts follow the guidelines to not over treat participants. Judge Fuchs said not everyone in mental health courts are at risk for an overdose. Judge Pullan wanted to ensure that all mental health participants are being informed about overdosing. Judge Fuchs said Judge Gilmore has the only justice court mental health court in the state and complimented his efforts.

Judge Pullan said the current rule that is in place does not allow the Council to waive requirements such as only allowing for admission of high-risk individuals. He reminded the Council there are three required criteria that are not met and approving this court for recertification would make a significant departure from the rules. Judge Chin sided with approving the recertification. Judge Fuchs said as long as the high risk and moderate risk individuals are separated, the recertification should be approved. Justice Petersen asked if the Council made an exception for another court that didn't meet the required criteria. Judge Fuchs said that court has continually been certified because the need exists, as recently as within the past one to two years. The exception was given because of the need and nature of the court. Judge Pettit mentioned if the Council waives the criteria, then they need to revise the rule to permit the Council to waive requirements.

The criteria was based on the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP). If the NADCP allows for high risk and moderate participants to participate as long as they are separated then the Council could consider this court. Judge Fuchs said he has attended multiple NADCP conferences and they fully believe in including high and moderate participants, while maintaining separation.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Judge Fuchs and Judge Gilmore, stating that the work Judge Gilmore does is very important. Judge Gilmore understood that the decision was deferred so the court may maintain operations.

Motion: Judge Chin moved to recertify Judge Gilmore's problem-solving court, as presented. Justice Petersen seconded the motion.

Motion: Judge Pettit moved to vacate the previous vote, defer and reserve the recertification ruling, and refer the issue to Policy & Planning for the purpose of revising the requirements. Judge Pullan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

12. GREEN PHASE/ACCESS TO JUSTICE: (Judge Don Torgerson, Meredith Mannebach, Justice Christine Durham, Amy Sorenson, Pamela Beatse, and Nancy Sylvester)

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Judge Don Torgerson, Meredith Mannebach, Justice Christine Durham, Amy Sorenson, Pamela Beatse, and Nancy Sylvester.

Green Phase Proposal

Judge Torgerson reported on the recommendations of the workgroup that has been evaluating which parts of the remote proceedings adopted by district courts during the pandemic should continue after the pandemic. As the pandemic abates, district court judges should be permitted to continue to have the option to use both virtual and in-person court proceedings to effectively accomplish the mission of the courts. In aid of that, the courts should make significant technology investments to accommodate better virtual hearings, facilitate hybrid hearings, and improve the evidence-presentation process for in-person hearings.

Maintaining judicial discretion is paramount. Given the unique characteristics of each court, court location, and case, district court judges should be given individual discretion to

determine which type of hearing will best promote the open, fair, and efficient administration of justice in each proceeding.

Each type of proceeding offers benefits and efficiencies – though not to the same extent in each hearing – so judges will need discretion, considering all appropriate factors, including the following (in no particular order):

- Does an existing rule or principle of law require an in-person hearing? Can it be waived?
- Do all parties have sufficient access to technology for virtual hearings?
- What is the substantive or procedural importance of the hearing?
- Which type of hearing best promotes access to justice for the parties?
- Are the parties more comfortable with a virtual hearing? (e.g., high-conflict domestic cases, protective order and civil stalking injunction hearings);
- Does a virtual hearing allow the parties to have access to counsel of their choice?
- Are the parties or their counsel traveling long distances for an in-person hearing?
- Is there a significant cost to a party for an in-person hearing? (i.e. money, time, lost work, child care, etc.);
- Do the parties have a stated preference?
- Is the judge able to manage a remote courtroom effectively?
- Does the hearing make efficient use of judicial resources, facilities, and court personnel?
- Will a party experience an identifiable prejudice by a virtual or in-person hearing?
- Will the hearing unreasonably delay the progress of the case, increase expense, or complicate resolution of any issue?
- Will the hearing unreasonably limit the court’s ability to assess credibility, voluntariness, or comprehension?
- Is there a fairness concern because one party has easier access to the courthouse, or greater facility with technology, and is seeking a strategic advantage?

Judge Pullan said the Council should carefully consider the confrontation clause and sentencing of serious felony offenses. Judge Pullan observed that the policy decision can’t allow everyone to do what they want because there are multiple stakeholders. He felt the Council would have to come to a decision, maybe after conducting a survey of the Bar and communicating with stakeholders. Judge Samuel Chiara wanted to know financial information before making a decision, noting that the prison might have saved a considerable amount of money in not transporting inmates, they may want to continue the savings. Judge Chiara wanted to know how much the prison/jails have saved by not transporting inmates to the courts. Judge Michelle Heward spoke with Weber County Jail, in an attempt to get parents to shelter hearings. The jail informed her that due to bandwidth and technology issues, it was easier for them to transport a person to the courthouse than to hold a virtual hearing.

Judge Torgerson said San Juan County is the largest geographic county in the state but only has one judge, leaving people to travel a considerable distance. If they were required to hold all hearings in person, this would eliminate the benefit of counsel from outside the county. Judge Pullan thought the Council has traditionally selected a study item and suggested that this issue be the Council’s study item for 2022 with a high priority. He understood this may take a year and recommended a subcommittee to work on this. Chief Justice Durrant thought this was a really good suggestion. Judge Chiara spoke with some of the judges who were hesitant to continue with

Webex, in-part due to the lack of human interactions, in-part due to seeing people do and say things on social media that they may not do in person. The judges have observed people smoking and some individuals not dressed appropriately.

Access to Justice Proposal

Justice Durham requested the Council permit a National Center for State Courts (NCSC) survey to be distributed to district courts statewide. The NCSC conducted a survey of judges to understand the effectiveness of remote hearings. There were 80 responses from Utah patrons and attorneys. To conduct a statewide survey, the Access to Justice Commission will initially provide the Utah specific survey link to all district court judges and commissioners throughout the state.

Participation in the survey would be voluntary. For one month, the judicial officer's team would send an email to each party after their hearing asking them to participate in the survey. The email would include a link and QR code to the survey. The judicial officer's team would also post the invitation and link in the Webex "chat" during virtual hearings. The Commission would use this data to prepare a report evaluating the use of virtual hearings for court patrons.

Next, the Commission will ask the Utah State Bar to send a separate practitioner survey to each Bar licensee. This practitioner-specific survey would ask whether they have appeared in court during the past month, and if so, would ask about their experiences, particularly with virtual hearings. It would also ask them to compare how they have experienced in-person appearances versus virtual. Finally, the Commission will ask each of the participating judicial officers to share their experiences and observations through a judicial officer-specific survey. Judicial officers would have the opportunity to provide information on how virtual hearings have impacted their ability to hear motions, trials, and other actions. Justice Durham requested the Council approve allowing Access to Justice to work with court personnel. In Utah, about 85% of people do not have access to basic legal services.

Judge Pettit was concerned about the impact on judicial assistants and the IT Department. Judge Pettit supported an automated format rather than task court personnel who are already overworked. Judge Pettit wanted to collect the right information and supported the request with understanding the costs on the staff. Justice Durham is having someone research these issues. She recommended a small workgroup to gather additional information. Ms. Beatse said the NCSC is conducting a different survey for lawyers. Judge Shaughnessy thought that this was an important step. The NCSC will evaluate the courts data once received.

Ms. Sorenson said one possibility would be to send a survey to those appearing by computer, accessing a link in the chat. The survey may be skewed if it is only applied to those who are already accessing the court. Judge Pullan thought the courts have yet to see a Webex record on appeal. Justice Durham requested the Council create a workgroup with individuals from the district and juvenile court and IT Department to get the survey produced

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Judge Torgerson, Ms. Mannebach, Justice Durham, Ms. Sorenson, Ms. Beatse, and Ms. Sylvester.

Motion: Judge Pettit moved to move forward for a collaboration with the committee as to how the survey would be created to identify the resources that will be needed and review a final survey. Judge Pullan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Chief Justice Durrant thought this was a big issue for the Council and needed to be a priority, and recommended having Mr. Gordon and Ms. Dupont create a proposal of a workgroup including members and a time-table. Judge Shaughnessy proposed making this a short study item because decisions will need to be made sooner. Judge David Mortensen wondered if the study item could include ongoing decisions from the Council.

13. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Justice Petersen said the Wellbeing Committee has been a joint project of the Supreme Court and the Bar. The committee has been approached by the Hazleton Betty Ford Foundation to do a joint project that they would fund through their fundraising arm. Their project would develop curriculum for Utah to test how effective promoting wellbeing, especially targeted at new lawyers and law students.

14. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion: Judge Shaughnessy moved to go into an executive session to discuss the character, competence, or physical or mental health of an individual and legal advice. Judge Pullan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Judge Shaughnessy moved to revise his original motion to go into an executive session to discuss issues related to prospective litigation, and advice of legal counsel. Judge Pullan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

15. CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

a) Committee Appointments. Appointment of Stacy Haacke and the reappointment of Judge Jill Pohlman to the Outreach Committee. Reappointment of Judge Randy Birch and Commissioner Russell Minas to the Forms Committee. Reappointment of Judge Trent Nelson to the Ethics Advisory Committee. Approved without comment.

b) Forms Committee Forms.

16. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned.