

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEETING  
Minutes**

**December 20, 2021  
Meeting conducted through Webex**

**9:00 a.m. – 12:30 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  
Hon. Brook Sessions

**Excused:**

Margaret Plane, esq.  
Hon. Derek Pullan

**Guests:**

Hon. James Blanch, Third District Court  
Sue Crismon, Office of Innovation

**AOC Staff:**

Ron Gordon  
Cathy Dupont  
Michael Drechsel  
Heidi Anderson  
Shane Bahr  
Amanda Herman  
Amy Hernandez  
Kara Mann  
Jordan Murray  
Bart Olsen  
Jim Peters  
Jon Puente  
Neira Siaperas  
Nick Stiles  
Karl Sweeney  
Melissa Taitano  
Keisa Williams

**Guests Cont.:**

Hon. Dennis Fuchs, Senior Judge  
Alex Peterson, Judicial Conduct Commission

**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 December 1, 2021 Judicial Council meeting minutes, as amended to correct grammar errors and to approve the November 22, 2021 Judicial Council meeting minutes, as amended to correct grammar errors. Judge Augustus Chin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

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

Chief Justice Durrant reported that he, Ron Gordon, Cathy Dupont, and Michael Drechsel will meet with legislative leadership. Justice Durrant will provide an update at the next Council meeting.

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

Ron Gordon attended the Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA), where cyber security, crisis communications, and mental health services were areas of focus. Mr. Gordon noted that though the COVID cases have decreased; health officials are bracing for a potential surge of the Omicron variant over the holidays. Hospital ICU bed usage remains quite high at 93% capacity. This is particularly important because staff levels are exceeded when the 85% threshold of ICU bed capacity is reached.

Mr. Gordon noted that the 2022 general session begins in January. Mr. Drechsel continues to work closely with the Liaison Committee on reviewing bills. Mr. Gordon thanked the Council for their approval of the quarterly bonus funds to recognize employees of the Judiciary.

**4. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**Management Committee Report:**

The work of this committee is reflected in the minutes.

**Budget & Fiscal Management Committee Report:**

Judge Mark May mentioned the committee will address several items later in the meeting.

**Liaison Committee Report:**

Judge Kara Pettit reported that legislative bills are starting to be numbered. The committee’s weekly meetings will start in January. Judge Pettit will send a reminder to court personnel on the methods of communication on legislation.

**Policy and Planning Committee Report:**

Judge Derek Pullan was unable to attend.

**Bar Commission Report:**

Margaret Plane was unable to attend.

**5. JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSION (JCC): (Alex Peterson)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Alex Peterson. Although it existed previously as a legislative-created body, the JCC was constitutionally established in 1984. The JCC currently has 32 cases in FY22 (80 in FY21, 51 in FY20, 64 in FY19, and 58 in FY18). In FY22 there have been no public dispositions, 1 dismissal with a warning disposition and 2 reconsideration requests. There are no cases pending before the Supreme Court.

Of the 80 FY21 cases, 60 complaints were received about the district court, 10 complaints about the justice courts, 4 complaints about the appellate courts, 4 complaints about the juvenile court, and 2 complaints about active senior judges.

Representative Steve Waldrip joined the JCC. Current members from the court include Judge Shaughnessy and Judge Mortensen, as required by Utah Code § 78A-11-103(e). All meetings of the JCC are being held in person. The JCC continues their work on updating their website.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Mr. Peterson.

**6. REGULATORY REFORM INNOVATION OFFICE REPORT: (Sue Crismon)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Sue Crismon, Executive Director of the Office of Reform Innovation. Ms. Crismon highlighted that the Office currently has 31 operating entities, 8 tabled entities with referral fees, and 2 denied entities. Approximately 97% of the approved entities are offering low to moderate risk services. Of the 8,475 legal services provided, 93% of them involve a lawyer. There have been 3 new complaints since June, 2021, which equates to 1 complaint for every 2,119 services offered. They continue to work with entities seeking approval.

The Office created an outreach plan for 2022 to gather more business and tech interest. Three of the Office members sit on other states' committees, including California, Delaware, North Carolina, and Florida. There is additional interest from Wyoming, Washington, and London.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Ms. Crismon.

**7. MODEL UTAH CRIMINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS COMMITTEE: (Judge James Blanch and Michael Drechsel)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Judge James Blanch and Michael Drechsel. During 2021, the committee met eight times. The committee spent most of its time on formulating instructions regarding mitigation defenses, including imperfect self-defense mitigation, battered person mitigation, mental illness mitigation, and extreme emotional distress mitigation. Instructions on these issues have been the subject of numerous appeals over the years. The committee is committed to providing model instructions that are useful to practitioners and that assist courts to instruct juries appropriately when these defenses are at issue. The primary inquiry has been how to best structure the instructions. One approach is to address the defense(s) in the elements instruction. This approach has proven to be problematic in numerous appeals. Another approach is to rely upon special verdict forms to address the findings necessary to support the jury's verdict. The committee prefers the latter approach and anticipates publishing a set of mitigation defense instructions in the first part of 2022.

Once the mitigation defense and jury unanimity instructions are completed, the committee will continue and finalize its partially completed work on the Driving Under the Influence and Related Traffic instructions.

Judge Blanch stated that his understanding was that the committee used to be under the auspices of the Supreme Court, but are now under the auspices of the Council. He further noted that the committee is proud of their work specifically when instructions are used in appellate cases. There have been a couple of cases over the years where parties have altered jury instructions that resulted in reversals or errors. The appellate courts have encouraged litigants to follow the instructions as written. Judge Pettit thought the committee's work was valuable.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Judge Blanch and Mr. Drechsel.

**8. PROBLEM-SOLVING COURTS CERTIFICATION AND REVISED CHECKLIST: (Judge Dennis Fuchs, Judge Brody Keisel, and Keisa Williams)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Judge Dennis Fuchs, Judge Brody Keisel, and Keisa Williams. The Sixth Juvenile Court requested a new drug court for Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, Wayne, Garfield, and Kane Counties.

Judge Keisel requested renaming his Adult Drug Court to Adult Recovery Court. Judge Fuchs would like to see uniformity in the name of the courts across the states, noting that there are a lot of states calling their drug courts recovery courts. There is a similar request to change the Third District Drug Courts and Mental Health Courts to Treatment Courts. Judge Shaughnessy agreed with having a consistent name across the state.

Judge Fuchs noted that they are planning to have a statewide PSC conference next May. His inclination was to let the judges decide if they would like to change the names of the PSCs. Judge May and Judge Heward reported that about a year ago they changed their PSC court names. The Council agreed to allow Judge Fuchs to hold a discussion with the PSC judges before making a decision on any name changes.

**Motion:** Judge Heward moved to approve the creation of a drug court in the Sixth Juvenile Court, as presented. Judge Chin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The Policy and Planning Committee reviewed possible amendments to the Best Practices standards in the problem-solving courts checklist. Required Best Practice #3 previously stated the program admits only participants who are high-risk, high-need. The proposed new version is amended to allow the program to develop alternative tracks with services that are modified to meet risk and need levels of its participants, if the program is unable to target high-risk, high-need individuals. With the change of the checklist, the Policy and Planning Committee recommended the Council approve Judge Clint Gilmore's Mental Health Court.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Judge Fuchs, Judge Keisel, and Ms. Williams.

**Motion:** Judge Heward moved to approve the proposed amendments to the Best Practices standards, as presented and to certify Judge Gilmore's Mental Health Court. Judge Chin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**9. CJA RULES 1-303, 2-101, 3-303, 3-401, 4-202.02, 4-208, 5-101, 6-101, 6-303, 7-101, AND 9-101 FOR FINAL ACTION: (Keisa Williams)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Keisa Williams. Following a 45-day comment period, the Policy and Planning Committee recommended that the following rules be approved as final. CJA Rules 3-303 and 6-303 are amended to require annual certification of justice court clerks. CJA 1-303 is amended to require the Boards to report to the Council twice a year, rather than quarterly. CJA Rules 2-101, 5-101, 6-101, 7-101, and 9-101 are being revised to remove the requirement to follow Robert's Rules, bringing the Boards and Council inline with current practices. CJA Rule 3-401 defines secretariats to the Council's executive committees. CJA Rule 4-208 is a new rule that governs the expungement process. CJA Rule 4-202.02 is amended to clarify that a minor's name is only public in criminal cases.

**Effective January 1, 2022**

CJA Rule 3-303                      CJA Rule 6-303

**Effective May 1, 2022**

CJA Rule 1-303                      CJA Rule 4-208  
CJA Rule 2-101                      CJA Rule 5-101  
CJA Rule 3-401                      CJA Rule 6-101  
CJA Rule 4-202.02                  CJA Rule 7-101  
CJA Rule 9-101

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Ms. Williams.

**Motion:** Judge Mortensen moved to approve CJA Rules 3-303 and 6-303, with an effective date of January 1, 2022 and approve CJA Rules 1-303, 2-101, 3-401, 4-202.02, 4-208, 5-101, 6-101, 7-101, and 9-101, with an effective date of May 1, 2022, as presented. Judge Connors seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**10. COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL FAIRNESS: (Jon Puente)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Jon Puente. Mr. Puente presented proposed edits to CJA Rule 1-205 Standing and Ad Hoc Committees adding the Committee on Judicial Fairness and Accountability. The new committee would include one judge, three current or former judicial officers, and the General Counsel or designee. The proposal allows for a Council member to serve on the committee.

Mr. Puente next presented proposed new rule, CJA Rule 3-420 Committee on Fairness and Accountability. This rule establishes a committee to provide support and guidance to the Office and Fairness and Accountability. Rule 3-420 has been vetted by the Policy and Planning Committee.

Judge Pettit recalled the plan was to create an ad hoc committee for the development of the strategic plan that included external members; however, the rule presented to the Council has internal workgroups working on the strategic plan. Mr. Puente explained that several Council members had a group in mind that would primarily be outside members who could insulate and support the work, instead of a group that can help with forming a strategic plan. Mr. Puente had

to balance an integrated committee to help the OFA and having a committee that was independent enough that can deliver tough messages to the Judiciary. Ms. Dupont noticed the proposed rule instructs the committee to form workgroups that will develop a strategic plan. Ms. Dupont anticipated that the Council can instruct the OFA to involve outside stakeholders. Judge Pettit clarified that ad hoc committees can involve stakeholders as they deem necessary, whereas, standing committees are composed of only Council members. Ms. Dupont asked if the Council would prefer an ad hoc committee to create a strategic plan and then create a standing committee as advisory to the OFA. Judge Pettit noted an ad hoc committee did not need to be included in the rule.

Judge Shaughnessy agreed with the need to move forward quickly but was not as concerned with the rule defining the role of external stakeholders. Mr. Gordon commented that sometimes external stakeholder groups can be entangled in issues that become less about the Judiciary and more about politics, as seen in other states.

Judge Connors believed the requirement in the rule that states branch efforts in this regard must include ensuring that the courts are free from both bias and the appearance of bias is a standard that cannot be met. While he understood that, in theory, this is the goal, he struggled with the language. Justice Paige Petersen thought the point of the statement in the rule was that everyone should realize their own biases. Judge Connors didn't believe this section was useful. Judge Samuel Chiara said this section got past the Policy and Planning Committee without discussion and thought the language could be amended to include "efforts" or "reduce" or "minimize" bias and the appearance of bias. Judge Chiara said the courts cannot ensure anything, including an elimination of bias. The goal should be to reduce or minimize bias. Judge Shaughnessy proposed replacing the words "include ensuring" with "strive to ensure." Judge Chiara recommended changing the wording to "strive to eliminate."

Judge Pettit suggested changing the wording in the proposed rule on line 151 to "assist the director with monitoring court progress and implementing this strategic plan and developing metrics to measure progress." Judge Connors agreed with the proposed edit.

Judge Connors mentioned that the Policy and Planning Committee addressed but did not favor one direction or another as to adding a Council member to the newly proposed committee. Judge Ryan Evershed noticed that no other committees of the Council include a Council member. Judge Heward explained that the Policy and Planning Committee did not specify which court level judge should be appointed. Judge Chiara asked if a Council member would need to leave a current committee assignment to be on the proposed committee. Mr. Puente suggested that if a Council member serves, the Council member should keep other committee assignments. He said that he has seen judges in other states get labeled as the diversity judge and it is not helpful when that happens. Judge Chiara clarified that the rule doesn't require a Council member, it only allows a Council member to apply to be on the committee if they choose.

Judge Chiara also noticed there are no other committees that include a demonstrated interest and felt a demonstrated interest would limit people who haven't worked in a large law firm or another area where they could have been on a committee to show that they had a demonstrated interest. Judge Chin expressed support for the language that requires a

demonstrated interest. Judge Shaughnessy thought there were many ways someone could show their demonstrated interest and that the language was sufficiently broad.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Mr. Puente.

**Motion:** Judge Chiara moved to approve CJA Rule 3-420, as amended with editing line 28 and 29 to replace the words “include ensuring” with “strive to eliminate bias and the appearance of bias” and changing the remainder of the sentence to be grammatically correct. Judge Shaughnessy seconded the motion, including Judge Pettit’s recommended change on line 151 to “assist the director with monitoring court progress and implementing this strategic plan and developing metrics to measure progress.” Judge Heward suggested the motion include an amendment to CJA Rule 1-205 to correct line 210 and 211 to state that the committee shall include members who are able to demonstrate an interest in the committee. The motion passed with Judge Pettit voting nay.

**11. SENIOR JUDGE CERTIFICATION: (Cathy Dupont)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Cathy Dupont. Justice Michael Wilkins sought initial certification as an inactive senior judge. CJA Rule 11-201 defines the requirements for inactive senior judge status. Justice Wilkins has been retired since 2010 and appears to meet all of the criteria in the rule. Justice Wilkins does not have any outstanding complaints after a finding of reasonable cause with the Judicial Conduct Commission or the Utah Supreme Court.

CJA Rule 11-201 describes the terms. Justice Wilkins term would begin the date that the Supreme Court approves his certification and would expire on “December 31<sup>st</sup> of the second year following appointment.” “A subsequent term of office of an inactive senior judge is for three years.”

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Ms. Dupont.

**Motion:** Judge Mortensen moved to recommend Justice Michael Wilkins’ inactive senior judge status be sent to the Supreme Court for consideration of certification, as presented. Judge May seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**12. CREATING A RECORD AND TRANSCRIPTS: (Nick Stiles)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Nick Stiles. Nick Stiles explained authority for the recording process is found in CJA Rule 4-201, stating “A video or audio recording system shall maintain the verbatim record of all court proceedings.” Now that court proceedings are being recorded in FTR and Webex, there is no clear authority on which recording process is the official record. Because of this ambiguity, court staff are hesitant to deviate from the pre-COVID practice of the FTR recording being the official recording. There are three common recording scenarios.

<b>Recording Scenario</b>	<b>Description of Process</b>
FTR – when all parties are present in a courtroom.	FTR has been used since 2010 and is the best process for creating a recording, rarely resulting in problems.

Webex and FTR – when remote hearings recorded on Webex are transferred to FTR.	This scenario provides the biggest opportunity for technological improvements.
Hybrid hearings – where some parties appear in a courtroom and some appear remotely.	There are no clear policies or practices on how staff should record the hearings in these situations. This scenario provides the biggest opportunity for staff training centered improvements.

The complicating factor is represented in recording scenarios #2 and #3, where there is, or should be, a Webex and an FTR recording. Absent a formal policy on which recording is official, court staff are left to discern for themselves what the appropriate practices are concerning duplicate recordings. Conventional knowledge instructs that if an FTR recording exists, there is no need for a Webex recording. Webex recordings have proven to be a valuable supplement in the transcription process where the FTR recording is lower quality.

### Potential Solutions

**Technology.** Over the last 21 months Webex has made significant improvements. However, the software still doesn't record multiple user inputs on separate channels. Because of this, transcribers are not able to isolate a speaker's audio input. The result is poorer recordings and transcripts. It would be beneficial to work with Cisco in pushing for an upgrade to allow multiple user inputs.

**Formal Policy.** Establish formal policies surrounding recordings. The Transcription Office should have full access to recordings of hearings, including any video recording. Court staff should be instructed to record over both FTR and Webex, when possible. There is not a formal policy that instructs whether the public should have access to FTR or Webex, and whether that access should include video or not.

**Training.** It would be very beneficial for the Transcription Office, in coordination with the Clerks of Court to prepare a training session for court staff and judges to ensure trial courts are creating a record that can be transcribed and understood by the public. The Education Department is able to help prepare the training and offer it in the LMS system.

Mr. Stiles noted that this issue has been presented to the District and Juvenile Court Administrators, Clerk of Court, IT, and the General Counsel's Office. The procedures are currently out to the stakeholders for a second review.

Judge Shaughnessy stated that in the Third District Court, a memorandum was received instructing the JAs to dual record all proceedings on FTR and Webex. He isn't sure how widely aware the judges are of issues that have come up with the appellate records, but believes there is value in making sure judges are aware and in reemphasizing it with the COC as well.

Judge Pettit asked for confirmation that there will be interim guidance until administrative rules can incorporate these policies and get approval through the Policy and Planning Committee. Mr. Stiles confirmed, but stated they are still in the early stages because both the Code of Judicial Administration Rules and appellate rules apply. Judge Pettit stated that there is the need for consistency across the state regarding which version of recordings the transcriptionists for appeal receive. Judge Mortenson stated that getting interim policies in place



is a critical need. At the moment they are aware of at least 100 proceedings with significant transcription issues.

Mr. Stiles requested approval to create long-term policies. Until these are complete, Mr. Stiles will seek approval for interim guidance.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Mr. Stiles.

**Motion:** Judge Shaughnessy moved to have the interim guidelines approved by either the Management Committee or Council as soon as possible, via email, as presented. Judge Pettit seconded the motion noting an email approval through the Management Committee would be more expeditious and to include that the Policy and Planning Committee would assist in developing permanent rules as part of the Code of Judicial Administration, and it passed unanimously.

**13. BUDGET & GRANTS: (Judge Mark May, Karl Sweeney, Shane Bahr, Neira Siaperas, Heidi Anderson, Kara Mann, Jordan Murray, Amy Hernandez, and Melissa Taitano)**

Chief Justice Durrant welcomed Judge Mark May, Karl Sweeney, Shane Bahr, Neira Siaperas, Heidi Anderson, Kara Mann, Jordan Murray, Amy Hernandez, and Melissa Taitano. The Finance Department forecasted a remaining available balance of one-time funds for year-end of \$837,127. The Council has approved \$1,077,148 in one-time year end requests.

**Upgrade of FTR Software**

\$187,000

One-time funds

All 167 district and juvenile courts use “For the Record” (FTR) software as the official record of the court. This software is currently hosted on PCs in each courtroom. In its present configuration, FTR does not interface with WebEx and all hearings must be downloaded from Webex onto FTR which is a labor-intensive process. Further, the server costs to store the data (with redundancy) with this configuration are substantial.

**Motion:** Judge May moved to approve the Upgrade of FTR Software request for \$187,000 in one-time funds, as presented. Judge Connor seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**Supplemental – Secondary Language Stipends**

\$5,200

One-time funds

Because of a lack of second language capable candidates in the courts, historically, all 64 available second language slots have not been filled. The program typically spends only about 80% of the potential budget (\$1,300 x 64 = \$83,200 is the potential budget); they used the actual average expenditures of \$68,900 as this year’s carryforward budget request (will fund approximately 53 interpreters).

**Motion:** Judge Connors moved to approve the Supplemental – Secondary Language Stipend request for \$5,200 in one-time funds, as presented. Judge Shaughnessy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The Utah Domestic Violence Coalition (UDVC) approached the Domestic Violence Program (DVP) with an opportunity to collaborate on a grant application which the Council approved. The UDVC and the DVP outlined a three-year plan to resolve two issues that compromise safety and access to justice within the courts. The first issue highlights the courts' rate of compliance with the National Crime Information Center's (NCIC) protective order data requirements. Approximately 12% of protective orders issued each month have data errors and fail to successfully transmit to NCIC. As a result, individuals who should be prohibited from purchasing firearms according to federal law, are able to purchase firearms. Currently, the DVP does not have enough staff to address these needs.

The second issue outlined in the grant proposal examines the lack of access to justice for Native Americans experiencing domestic violence. It is estimated that 39% of Native American women have experienced intimate partner violence during their lifetimes, significantly higher than domestic violence rates for women from different ethnicities and racial backgrounds. The courts typically oversee domestic violence cases with non-native defendants and Native American victims. Despite the courts adjudicating over these cases, Native American court patrons report that they do not feel able to seek justice with the courts.

Ms. Hernandez requested the Council approve the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) Year 2021 Rural Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking Program Grant. The courts would not have any matching funds and would not need to hire any new employees.

Judge May stated that what had generated the most discussion in the Budget and Fiscal Management Committee was the importance of understanding that once a Tribal Liaison position was created, if the court ever loses the grant funding, a request for ongoing funds would need to be made to the legislature because the courts would never want to look like they were eliminating a tribal liaison position. Judge Shaughnessy wondered where the funding would come from if not approved by the legislature. Ms. Hernandez stated that part of the funding would be provided by the Court Improvement Program (CIP) grant. Judge May voiced concerns that the CIP grant must be used explicitly for child welfare. Ms. Hernandez reassured the Council that the position would involve 20 hours of domestic violence work and 20 hours of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA). The Council questioned if there were any other grants available to continue to pay for the position in the future. Ms. Hernandez feels confident in their ability to continue receiving the grants. If grant money was not available, the legislative request would be \$80,000 to \$100,000, including salary and benefits.

**Motion:** Judge May moved to approve the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) Year 2021 Rural Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking Program Grant for \$750,000, as presented. Judge Connors seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Murray provided a brief update on the grants funding of the online dispute resolution project. The project encompasses updates to the usability and accessibility of the online disputes resolutions platform. With approval from the funding sources, they received a six-month extension which will carry through to June 30, 2022. Mr. Murray informed the Council that the grant application proposal form has been updated and provided with Ms. Hernandez's budget request.

Chief Justice Durrant thanked Judge May, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Bahr, Ms. Siaperas, Ms. Anderson, Ms. Mann, Mr. Murray, Ms. Hernandez, and Ms. Taitano.

**14. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS**

No old or new business was discussed at this time.

**15. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**Motion:** Judge Shaughnessy moved to go into an executive session to discuss a personnel matter. Judge Sessions seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The Council returned from their executive session.

**Motion:** Judge Shaughnessy moved to approve the expenditure of the \$52,000 for the matters discussed in an executive session. Judge Chin seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**16. CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

a) Committee Appointments. Appointment of Lara Swenson to the Ethics Advisory Committee. Appointment of Judge Ann Marie McIff Allen to the Committee on Resources for Self-Represented Parties. Appointment of Judge Angela Fannesbeck and Judge Denise Porter to the Uniform Fine Committee. Approved without comment.

b) CJA Rules 1-205, 2-103, 3-420, and 4-903 for Public Comment. Approved without comment.

c) Forms Committee Forms. Notice of Pronouns; COVID Eviction Declaration; OCAP Child Support Language Changes; Notice of Disclosure Requirements in Domestic Relations Cases; Financial Declaration; Non-public Information - Safeguarded Contact Information; Motion for Default Judgment; Motion to \_\_\_\_ ; and Petition to Modify Child Custody, Parent-time and Child Support

**17. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned.