

**REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE  
OF THE UNITED STATES**

**September 14, 2010**

The Judicial Conference of the United States convened in Washington, D.C., on September 14, 2010, pursuant to the call of the Chief Justice of the United States issued under 28 U.S.C. § 331. The Chief Justice presided, and the following members of the Conference were present:

First Circuit:

Chief Judge Sandra L. Lynch  
Chief Judge Mark L. Wolf,  
District of Massachusetts

Second Circuit:

Chief Judge Dennis Jacobs  
Chief Judge William K. Sessions III,  
District of Vermont

Third Circuit:

Chief Judge Theodore A. McKee  
Chief Judge Harvey Bartle III,  
Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Fourth Circuit:

Chief Judge William B. Traxler, Jr.  
Judge James P. Jones,  
Western District of Virginia

Fifth Circuit:

Chief Judge Edith Hollan Jones  
Judge Sim Lake III,  
Southern District of Texas

Sixth Circuit:

Chief Judge Alice M. Batchelder  
Chief Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr.,  
Northern District of Ohio

Seventh Circuit:

Chief Judge Frank H. Easterbrook  
Chief Judge Richard L. Young,  
Southern District of Indiana

Eighth Circuit:

Chief Judge William Jay Riley  
Judge Rodney W. Sippel,  
Eastern District of Missouri

Ninth Circuit:

Chief Judge Alex Kozinski  
Judge Charles R. Breyer,  
Northern District of California

Tenth Circuit:

Chief Judge Mary Beck Briscoe  
Judge Robin J. Cauthron,  
Western District of Oklahoma

Eleventh Circuit:

Chief Judge Joel F. Dubina  
Judge Myron H. Thompson,  
Middle District of Alabama

District of Columbia Circuit:

Chief Judge David Bryan Sentelle  
Chief Judge Royce C. Lamberth,  
District of Columbia

Federal Circuit:

Chief Judge Randall R. Rader

Court of International Trade:

Chief Judge Jane A. Restani

The following Judicial Conference committee chairs attended the Conference session: Circuit Judges Bobby R. Baldock, Julia Smith Gibbons, Michael S. Kanne, M. Margaret McKeown, Jeffrey S. Sutton, and Richard C. Tallman, and District Judges Julie E. Carnes, Rosemary M. Collyer, Janet C. Hall, Robert L. Hinkle, D. Brock Hornby, George H. King, Mark R. Kravitz, Barbara M.G. Lynn, J. Frederick Motz, Donald C. Pogue, Michael A. Ponsor, Julie A. Robinson, Lee H. Rosenthal, Charles R. Simpson III, George Z. Singal, and Laura Taylor Swain. Bankruptcy Judge Rosemary Gambardella and Magistrate Judge Anthony J. Battaglia were also in attendance, and Collins Fitzpatrick of the Seventh Circuit represented the circuit executives.

James C. Duff, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, attended the session of the Conference, as did Jill C. Sayenga, Deputy Director; William R. Burchill, Jr., Associate Director and General Counsel; Laura C. Minor, Assistant Director, and Wendy Jennis, Deputy Assistant Director, Judicial Conference Executive Secretariat; Cordia A. Strom, Assistant Director, Legislative Affairs; and David A. Sellers, Assistant Director, Public Affairs. District Judge Barbara Jacobs Rothstein, Director, and John S. Cooke, Deputy Director, Federal Judicial Center, and Judith W. Sheon, Staff Director, United States Sentencing Commission, were in attendance at the session of the Conference, as was Jeffrey P. Minear, Counselor to the Chief Justice. Scott Harris, Supreme Court Counsel, and the 2010-2011 Supreme Court Fellows also observed the Conference proceedings.

Acting Deputy Attorney General Gary Grindler addressed the Conference on matters of mutual interest to the judiciary and the Department of Justice. Senators Patrick Leahy and Jeff Sessions spoke on matters pending in Congress of interest to the Conference.

## **REPORTS**

Mr. Duff reported to the Conference on the judicial business of the courts and on matters relating to the Administrative Office (AO). Judge Rothstein spoke to the Conference about Federal Judicial Center (FJC) programs, and Chief Judge Sessions, in his capacity as Chair of the United States Sentencing Commission, reported on Sentencing Commission activities. Judge Gibbons, Chair of the Committee on the Budget, presented a special report on the budget outlook.

## **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

---

### **RESOLUTION**

The Judicial Conference approved a recommendation of the Executive Committee to adopt the following resolution recognizing the substantial contributions made by the Judicial Conference committee chairs whose terms of service end in 2010:

The Judicial Conference of the United States recognizes with appreciation, respect, and admiration the following judicial officers:

**HONORABLE DONALD C. POGUE**

Committee on Audits and Administrative Office Accountability

**HONORABLE BARBARA M. G. LYNN**

Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System

**HONORABLE JULIE E. CARNES**

Committee on Criminal Law

**HONORABLE CHARLES R. SIMPSON III**

Committee on International Judicial Relations

**HONORABLE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN**

Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

**HONORABLE ROBERT L. HINKLE**  
Advisory Committee on Rules of Evidence

Appointed as committee chairs by the Chief Justice of the United States, these outstanding jurists have played a vital role in the administration of the federal court system. These judges served with distinction as leaders of their Judicial Conference committees while, at the same time, continuing to perform their duties as judges in their own courts. They have set a standard of skilled leadership and earned our deep respect and sincere gratitude for their innumerable contributions. We acknowledge with appreciation their commitment and dedicated service to the Judicial Conference and to the entire federal judiciary.

---

**JUDICIARY STRATEGIC PLANNING**

In 2008, with the permission of the Chief Justice, the Executive Committee formed an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Judiciary Planning to propose a new planning process for the federal judiciary. The group, which was comprised of current and former Conference committee chairs and members of the Executive Committee, as well as court executives, also took on the role of developing a new strategic plan that would potentially replace the *Long Range Plan for the Federal Courts* adopted by the Conference in 1995 (see JCUS-SEP 95, pp. 38-63). After two years of work and extensive consultation within the judiciary, in August 2010, the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee proposed a strategic plan that was intended to serve as a broad action agenda addressing judiciary trends, issues, challenges, and opportunities. Beginning with restatements of the vision, mission, and core values of the judiciary, the plan identifies seven key issues and sets forth 13 strategies and more than 30 goals by which the judiciary could address those issues. The Ad Hoc Advisory Committee also made several recommendations with regard to an approach to planning.

On recommendation of the Executive Committee, and after discussion, the Judicial Conference approved the proposed *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary*, as well as a recommended approach to planning, both with minor changes recommended by the Executive Committee on the Conference floor. With regard to the planning approach, the Conference agreed that—

- a. The Executive Committee chair may designate for a two-year renewable term an active or senior judge, who will report to that Committee, to serve as the judiciary planning coordinator. The planning coordinator will have responsibility to facilitate and coordinate the strategic planning efforts of the Judicial Conference and its committees.
- b. With suggestions from Judicial Conference committees and others, and the input of the judiciary planning coordinator, the Executive Committee will identify issues, strategies, or goals to receive priority attention over the next two years.
- c. The committees of the Judicial Conference will integrate the *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary* into committee planning and policy development activities.
- d. For every goal in the *Strategic Plan*, a mechanism to measure or assess the judiciary's progress will be developed.
- e. Any substantive changes to the *Strategic Plan* will require the approval of the Judicial Conference, but the Executive Committee will have the authority, as needed, to approve technical and non-controversial changes to the *Strategic Plan*. A review of the *Strategic Plan* will take place every five years.
- f. The new *Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary* will supersede the December 1995 *Long Range Plan for the Federal Courts* as a planning instrument to guide future policy-making and administrative actions within the scope of Conference authority. This action, however, should not be interpreted as an across-the-board rescission of the individual Conference policies articulated in the recommendations and implementation strategies of the earlier plan.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

The Executive Committee —

- Approved a statement on behalf of the Conference in reaction to pending legislation – as it related to the judiciary – that would have clarified the Government Accountability Office’s (GAO’s) ability to

enforce its existing authority to see records and expanded its interview authority, as well as its power to make and retain copies of agency records; and endorsed pursuit of formal protocols for GAO's interactions with the judiciary;

- Declined to recommend action by the Judicial Conference on a request for Conference review of a Judicial Conduct and Disability Act complaint that had been dismissed and for which the petition for review had been denied by the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability, on delegation from the Conference;
- Pending final congressional action on the judiciary's appropriations for fiscal year (FY) 2011, approved FY 2011 interim financial plans for the Salaries and Expenses, Defender Services, Court Security, and Fees of Jurors and Commissioners accounts, and endorsed a strategy for distributing court allotments among the court programs;
- Discussed challenges faced by the judiciary with regard to its courthouse construction program and decided to form an ad hoc group of judges to discuss how the judiciary should approach these challenges; and endorsed a letter to be sent by the Director of the Administrative Office on behalf of the judiciary to the President regarding FY 2012 funding for new federal courthouse construction projects.

## **COMMITTEE ON AUDITS AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ACCOUNTABILITY**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Audits and Administrative Office Accountability reported that it was briefed on the scope, methodology, findings, and identified risks in recent audits. It also reviewed an analysis of audit data over the past ten years, which showed a downward trend in the average number of audit findings since the implementation of numerous enhancements to the judiciary's financial management, audit, and internal control programs over the last decade. Noting that the minority of court units which do not complete annual internal control evaluations tend to have more audit findings, the Committee asked the AO to consider how best to encourage those courts to

complete the annual self-evaluations. The Committee selected two AO employees to receive the Leonidas Ralph Mecham Award for Exemplary Service to the Courts, and the Committee determined to expand the award's scope to recognize career excellence and outstanding leadership.

## **COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BANKRUPTCY SYSTEM**

---

### **BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP VACANCIES**

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 152(b)(3), the Judicial Conference conducts a comprehensive review of all judicial districts every other year to assess the continuing need for authorized bankruptcy judgeships. By December 31 of each even-numbered year, the Conference reports its recommendations to Congress for the elimination of any authorized bankruptcy judgeship position that can be eliminated when a vacancy exists by reason of resignation, retirement, removal, or death. On recommendation of the Bankruptcy Committee, which relied on the results of the 2010 continuing needs survey, the Judicial Conference agreed to take the following actions:

- a. Recommend to Congress that no bankruptcy judgeship be statutorily eliminated; and
- b. Advise the Eighth Circuit Judicial Council with regard to the District of South Dakota and the Northern District of Iowa and the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council with regard to the District of Alaska to consider not filling vacancies in those districts that currently exist or may occur by reason of resignation, retirement, removal, or death, until there is a demonstrated need to do so.

---

### **CRITERIA FOR ADDITIONAL BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIPS**

In March 1991, the Judicial Conference adopted a policy statement regarding the standards to be used for considering requests for additional bankruptcy judgeships. At the same time, the Conference adopted bankruptcy case weights developed by the Federal Judicial Center to be used in administering those standards (JCUS-MAR 91, pp. 12-13). The Federal Judicial Center recently developed new case weights that reflect the effects of

economic, technological, and legislative developments since 1991 (such as the enactment of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005) on the judicial time needed to process bankruptcy cases. The Committee recommended that the Conference adopt the new case weights to be used for assessing judgeship needs. The Committee also recommended that the Conference revise the 1991 policy statement to (a) make non-substantive changes to the standards for evaluating additional bankruptcy judgeship needs; (b) add standards for evaluating requests for conversion of temporary judgeships to permanent; and (c) incorporate the standards the Conference has approved for use in the biennial continuing needs surveys. The Conference approved the Committee's recommendations.

---

## **OFFICIAL DUTY STATIONS**

On recommendation of the Bankruptcy Committee and in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 152(b)(1), the Judicial Conference took the following actions regarding official duty stations:

- a. Approved a request from the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council to designate in the Central District of California Santa Ana as the duty station for two of the vacant bankruptcy judgeships in that district and Riverside as the duty station for the four bankruptcy judges currently serving at that location; and
- b. Approved a request from the Second Circuit Judicial Council to designate Burlington as the duty station for the bankruptcy judgeship in the District of Vermont.

---

## **BANKRUPTCY ADMINISTRATOR REGULATIONS**

On recommendation of the Bankruptcy Committee, the Judicial Conference approved revisions to the Regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States Governing the Bankruptcy Administrator Program that clarify language and consolidate sections that were duplicative. The regulations appear in Volume 9, Chapter 2, of the *Guide to Judiciary Policy*.

---

## **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System reported that it agreed unanimously to recommend to the Budget Committee that funding in FY 2012 for recalled bankruptcy judges and temporary law clerks remain at the FY 2011 projected current services levels. At the request of the Budget Committee, the Bankruptcy Committee also discussed the programmatic impact of a proposal to lower the budget cap for the Salaries and Expenses account, and had no objection to the proposal.

## **COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET**

---

### **FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

After careful consideration of the funding levels proposed by the program committees, the Committee on the Budget recommended to the Judicial Conference a fiscal year 2012 budget request to Congress that is 4.7 percent above assumed appropriations for FY 2011. This request contains funding to meet the essential, increasing workload needs of the judiciary while taking into consideration the limited funding that Congress is likely to have available. The Conference approved the budget request subject to amendments necessary as a result of (a) new legislation, (b) actions of the Judicial Conference, or (c) any other reason the Executive Committee considers necessary and appropriate.

---

## **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on the Budget reported that in light of the current and projected austere fiscal outlook, its FY 2012 budget recommendation would provide funding for only what is essential to support the judiciary's mission. In addition, noting that it expects that budgets in the next several cycles will be tighter than in the current cycle, the Budget Committee asked Administrative Office staff to develop alternative budget cap proposals that are lower than the current 8.2 percent annual budget cap for the Salaries and Expenses account adopted by the Judicial Conference in March 2007 (JCUS-MAR 07, p. 10). Any proposals will be provided to the program committees in advance of their December 2010 meetings for their input. The Budget Committee commended the program committees for their

cost-containment initiatives to date and noted that the long-term financial health of the judiciary will be aided by future cost-containment efforts that provide tangible cost savings or avoidances.

## **COMMITTEE ON CODES OF CONDUCT**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Codes of Conduct reported that since its last report to the Judicial Conference in March 2010, the Committee received 17 new written inquiries and issued 17 written advisory responses. During this period, the average response time for requests was 22 days. In addition, the Committee chair responded to 159 informal inquiries, individual Committee members responded to 133 informal inquiries, and Committee counsel responded to 358 informal inquiries.

## **COMMITTEE ON COURT ADMINISTRATION AND CASE MANAGEMENT**

---

### **CAMERAS IN THE COURTROOM PILOT PROJECT**

On recommendation of the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management, the Judicial Conference authorized a pilot project to evaluate the effect of cameras in district court courtrooms, of video recordings of proceedings therein, and of publication of such video recordings. The pilot project will proceed in accordance with the tenets outlined below, and is subject to definition and review by the Committee. In addition, the Committee will request that a study of the pilot be conducted by the Federal Judicial Center.

- a. The pilot will be national in scope and consist of up to 150 individual judges from districts chosen to participate by the Federal Judicial Center, in consultation with the Court Administration and Case Management Committee. The pilot project should include a national survey of all district judges, whether or not they participate in the pilot, to determine their views on cameras in the courtroom.

- b. The pilot will last up to three years, with interim reports prepared by the Federal Judicial Center after the first and second years.
- c. The pilot will be limited to civil cases only.
- d. Courts participating in the pilot will record proceedings, and recordings by other entities or persons will not be allowed.
- e. Parties in a trial must consent to participating in the pilot.
- f. Recording of members of a jury will not be permitted at any time.
- g. Courts participating in the pilot should – if necessary – amend their local rules (providing adequate public notice and opportunity to comment) to provide an exception for judges participating in the Judicial Conference-authorized pilot project.
- h. The Court Administration and Case Management Committee is authorized to issue and amend guidelines to assist the pilot participants.
- I. The Administrative Office is authorized to provide funding to the courts with participating judges – if needed – for equipment and training necessary to participate in the pilot.

---

### **PACER ACCESS TO CERTAIN BANKRUPTCY FILINGS**

Under the Judicial Conference policy on privacy and public access to electronic case files, bankruptcy filings should include only the last four digits of filers' social security numbers on their petitions and other public documents (JCUS-SEP/OCT 01, pp. 48-50). However, documents filed prior to implementation of the policy in 2003 are still available on the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) system and contain the debtors' full social security numbers, creating privacy concerns. To address those concerns, on recommendation of the Committee, the Judicial Conference agreed to amend its privacy policy to restrict public access through PACER to documents in bankruptcy cases that were filed before December 1, 2003 and have been closed for more than one year, with the following conditions:

- a. The docket sheet and docket information would remain available to the general public via PACER.
- b. Any party who has filed a notice of appearance in an individual case would have Case Management/Electronic Case Files (CM/ECF) system or PACER access to all filings in that case.
- c. All filings in such cases would remain accessible at the clerks' offices, except those under seal.
- d. Access to documents in bankruptcy case appeals filed in the district courts, bankruptcy appellate panels, or courts of appeals for bankruptcy cases filed before December 1, 2003, would be similarly restricted.

The Conference also agreed to delegate to the Court Administration and Case Management Committee the authority to develop implementation guidance for the courts to effectuate this policy. This guidance will include encouraging courts to establish a method to accept requests for copies of documents in these cases.

---

## **CENTRAL VIOLATIONS BUREAU PETTY OFFENSE CASES**

Petty offense cases committed on federal property are processed by the judiciary's Central Violations Bureau (CVB). In order to facilitate management of such cases, the Administrative Office is working to integrate CVB data into the CM/ECF system and make such cases accessible through PACER. However, because standard CVB violation notices contain personal identifiers such as social security numbers, full birth dates, and full home addresses, the Committee recommended that the Conference endorse the approach of providing courts with redacted and unredacted versions of the CVB violation notice, with participant access to the unredacted version, and public access through PACER to the redacted version. The Conference adopted the Committee's recommendation.

---

## **RECORDS MANAGEMENT**

The Committee recommended that the Judicial Conference adopt a revised district court records disposition schedule for civil cases that sets retention periods for non-trial civil cases largely by case type. Under this schedule, it is estimated that half of the closed case files currently in storage at federal retention centers (for which storage fees are charged) would be immediately eligible for disposal, which would lead to reductions in storage fees. The Conference adopted the revised retention schedule.

---

## **PACER TRAINING PROGRAM**

In September 2007, the Judicial Conference approved a pilot project to provide free public access to PACER at Federal Depository Libraries (FDLs) (JCUS-SEP 07, pp. 12-13). However, that program was suspended when a PACER security vulnerability was discovered. At this session, the Committee recommended, and the Conference approved, the establishment of a program involving the Government Printing Office, the American Association of Law Libraries, and the Administrative Office, that would provide training and education to the public about the PACER service, and would exempt from billing the first \$50 of quarterly usage by a library participating in the program.

---

## **COURT LIBRARIES AND LIBRARY SERVICES**

At the request of the Committee, the Administrative Office undertook a comprehensive study of court libraries and library services focusing on the role for libraries in the digital age, options for change, and consideration of potential savings. Based on the results of that study, and after receiving significant input from circuit librarians, subject matter experts, judges, and legal researchers, among others, the Committee made a number of recommendations, which were approved by the Conference as follows:

- a. With regard to library collections, agreed to—
  - (1) Ask that the Committee establish guidelines to discourage maintaining subscriptions to regional reporters, state case law reporters, and specialty reporters in libraries and advise circuit

librarians to consider significantly reducing the number of subscriptions to the federal reporters in staffed libraries, especially West's Federal Supplement. If there is a concern that legal research services for the public/litigants or bar would be hindered if case law reporters are not available in the library, the local court(s) should consider using attorney admission funds to maintain the subscriptions.

- (2) Request that the circuit librarians conduct and lead a comprehensive assessment of usage and need in the headquarters library and each satellite library or shared collection. The assessment should involve local judges, legal researchers, and any relevant circuit library committees; consider if infrequently used categories of materials identified by the library survey results could be eliminated; and include an analysis of duplication. A summary of the assessment should be reported to the Committee.
  - (3) Ask that the Committee establish guidelines discouraging subscriptions to case law reporters for newly appointed judges and existing judges.
- b. With regard to the number and size of libraries, agreed to request that the circuit judicial councils, working with circuit librarians, library committees, and relevant judges, review satellite libraries to assess the continuing need for each library. In addition, they should review more closely libraries that serve fewer than 10 judges and report to this Committee whether those libraries will remain open or are targeted either for closure or reduction in size and collection. Consideration should be given to the circuit library program as a whole and the impact of closure of any satellite on the remaining libraries and the judges and others served.

---

## **NATIONAL VACCINE ACT PROPOSAL**

The National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 establishes a procedure to compensate vaccine-injured individuals through use of vaccine special masters within the United States Court of Federal Claims. Special masters conduct hearings and issue findings of fact and conclusions of law, and their determinations are appealable to Court of Federal Claims judges and

then to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. To address significant backlogs in processing these cases, the Court of Federal Claims has proposed legislation that would (a) assign vaccine claims directly to Court of Federal Claims judges, who could then hear the cases or refer them to vaccine judges; (b) rename vaccine special masters as vaccine judges; (c) authorize vaccine judges to issue a recommended decision, or with the consent of the parties, hear and enter judgement; (d) with the consent of the parties, authorize appeal of the vaccine judge's decision directly to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; and (e) authorize the Court of Federal Claims clerk instead of the chief special master to assume responsibility for the managerial aspects of the vaccine judges. After considering the proposal, the Committee recommended that the Judicial Conference decline to endorse renaming vaccine special masters as vaccine judges in light of the limited jurisdiction of those officers, but endorse the remaining concepts proposed by the Court of Federal Claims. The Conference adopted the Committee's recommendations.

---

## **TRANSLATED FORMS**

The Judicial Conference declined to approve a motion to recommit an information item regarding the translation of court forms for voluntary use by district courts in civil cases.

---

## **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Court Administration and Case Management reported that given the current economic climate, it determined to defer until June 2011 its cyclical review of miscellaneous fee schedules regarding increases for inflation. The Committee continued to provide policy guidance and oversight in the development of the functional requirements for the next generation CM/ECF software. It also endorsed an updated policy on wireless communication devices in courthouses and asked for review of the policy by the Judicial Security Committee. In addition, the Committee expressed support for the Codes of Conduct Committee's recently issued resource packet to assist courts in developing guidelines for employees on the use of social media.

## COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAW

---

### SEARCH AND SEIZURE

Guidelines. On recommendation of the Committee on Criminal Law, the Judicial Conference approved guidelines entitled, “Search and Seizure Guidelines for United States Probation Officers in the Supervision of Offenders on Supervised Release or Probation,” to replace model search and seizure guidelines adopted in 1993 (JCUS-MAR 93, p. 13). The new guidelines reflect developments in case law, best practices, and updates to administrative policies and procedures.

Use-of-Force Policy. In September 2002, the Judicial Conference approved a use-of-force continuum to govern self-defense responses by probation and pretrial services officers (JCUS-SEP 02, p. 44). Noting that certain provisions of that policy might conflict with provisions in the new search and seizure guidelines, the Committee recommended that the Conference approve revisions to the use-of-force policy to allow officers to manage searches as permitted by the new guidelines. The Conference approved the Committee’s recommendation.

---

### ***THE SUPERVISION OF FEDERAL DEFENDANTS,*** **MONOGRAPH 111**

On recommendation of the Committee, the Judicial Conference approved revisions to Monograph 111, *The Supervision of Federal Defendants*. The monograph, which provides guidance to officers who supervise defendants on pretrial release, was updated to reflect current knowledge in the field of substance abuse and mental health treatment.

---

### COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Criminal Law reported that it discussed the status of the implementation of actuarial risk-needs instruments developed by the AO for use in pretrial and post-conviction supervision, consistent with the Committee’s ongoing commitment to evidence-based practices. In addition, the Committee reviewed the results of several preliminary studies of the

effectiveness of certain evidence-based practices that have been implemented by the courts.

## **COMMITTEE ON DEFENDER SERVICES**

---

### **COMMUNITY DEFENDER ORGANIZATION MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT**

On recommendation of the Committee on Defender Services, the Judicial Conference approved a Model Code of Conduct for Federal Community Defender Employees, which is based on the code of conduct applicable to federal public defender organization employees, but modified appropriately for non-profit criminal defense organizations. The Conference also approved a new paragraph to be added to the community defender organization (CDO) grant and conditions document that requires CDOs to adopt the code, absent an approved variance from the AO. Finally, the Conference delegated to the Defender Services Committee the authority to make future adjustments to the CDO code that are substantially in accord with the code of conduct applicable to federal public defenders.

---

### **LITIGATION SUPPORT**

The Committee recommended and the Conference approved revisions to the Criminal Justice Act (CJA) Guidelines, *Guide to Judiciary Policy*, Volume 7A, § 320.70.40, and the corresponding sample model order, to streamline and clarify the procedures for CJA panel attorneys to request and acquire computer hardware and software for use in CJA representations.

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Defender Services reported that, under delegated authority from the Judicial Conference (JCUS-MAR 89, pp. 16-17), it approved FY 2011 budgets and grants for federal defender organizations. The Committee also approved funding for the establishment of a federal public defender organization in the Northern District of Alabama, to be headquartered in Birmingham, with a staffed branch office in Huntsville and a staffing level of six assistant federal public defenders. The Committee reviewed an update to the 1998 report, “Federal Death Penalty Cases:

Recommendations Concerning the Cost and Quality of Defense Representation” (the “Spencer Report”), and endorsed updated commentary to the original recommendations and public dissemination of the report, as updated.

## **COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE JURISDICTION**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Federal-State Jurisdiction reported that it discussed with the Legal Adviser for the Department of State the position adopted by the Judicial Conference in March 2010 regarding federal legislation to implement the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements. The Committee also reviewed proposed legislation to authorize the High Court of American Samoa to exercise federal criminal jurisdiction, and determined to recommend no change in the 1996 Judicial Conference position expressing a preference for a territorial court in the event Congress chooses to extend federal jurisdiction to the territory. In addition, the Committee reviewed a legislative proposal to establish standards for state court actions on child custody orders affecting military personnel deployed overseas. Noting that the Judicial Conference has opposed legislation that would result in child custody cases being brought in federal court, the Committee asked the AO Director to transmit a letter to Congress suggesting that it consider an amendment to the proposed measure that would clarify the exclusion of such cases from federal courts.

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Financial Disclosure reported that as of July 1, 2010, it had received 4,015 financial disclosure reports and certifications for calendar year 2009, including 1,215 reports and certifications from Supreme Court justices, Article III judges, and judicial officers of special jurisdiction courts; 339 reports from bankruptcy judges; 534 reports from magistrate judges; and 1,927 reports from judicial employees. The Committee continues to oversee the development of a system for the electronic filing and records management of financial disclosure reports. The system will work in conjunction with the financial disclosure report software currently used to produce these reports.

## **COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

---

### ***LONG RANGE PLAN FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY***

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 612 and on recommendation of the Committee on Information Technology, the Judicial Conference approved the fiscal year 2011 update to the *Long Range Plan for Information Technology in the Federal Judiciary*. Funds for the judiciary's information technology program will be spent in accordance with this plan.

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Information Technology reported that it endorsed a number of information technology (IT) program initiatives designed to enhance communication and collaboration with the courts, provide the courts with key IT services and support, and strengthen the reliability and capability of the judiciary's IT infrastructure. The Committee discussed ongoing initiatives including the next generation CM/ECF architecture study, the development of functional requirements for the next generation CM/ECF system, and the development of an electronic vouchering system for Criminal Justice Act panel attorneys. The Committee received a presentation on how information in digital form is transforming the writing of judicial opinions and discussed the potential implications of this trend.

## **COMMITTEE ON INTERCIRCUIT ASSIGNMENTS**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Intercircuit Assignments reported that 112 intercircuit assignments were undertaken by 89 Article III judges from January 1, 2010, to June 30, 2010. During this time, the Committee continued to disseminate information about intercircuit assignments and aided courts requesting assistance by identifying and obtaining judges willing to take assignments.

## **COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL JUDICIAL RELATIONS**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on International Judicial Relations reported on its involvement in rule of law and judicial reform throughout the world, highlighting activities in Asia and the Pacific Basin, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East, Europe, and Eurasia. The Committee further reported on its participation in the rule of law component of the Library of Congress' Open World Program for jurists from Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, and Tajikistan, and in activities involving the Federal Judicial Center, the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the Department of Justice, the Patent and Trademark Office, the AO Office of Defender Services, and U.S. court administrators. The Committee also received an analysis of current rule of law and judicial reform issues in Eastern Europe and the Balkans from the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Slovenia.

## **COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIAL BRANCH**

---

### **JUDGES' TRAVEL REGULATIONS**

The Judicial Conference approved an amendment to the Travel Regulations for United States Justices and Judges, *Guide to Judiciary Policy*, Vol. 19, § 220.30.10(g), to provide that a chief district judge, with the concurrence of the circuit judicial council, may authorize a senior district judge who lives within the territorial boundaries of the court to which the judge was originally commissioned, reimbursement for enhanced transportation, lodging, and subsistence expenses (e.g., airfare, lodging, and three meals per day) when it is in the interest of the administration of justice (e.g., due to a shortage of judge power or case backlog). The amendment is intended to address a situation where the judge's residence, although within the court's territorial boundaries, may be located outside the commuting area of the court.

---

## **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on the Judicial Branch reported that it continues to consider ways to maintain and enhance the independence and dignity of the federal judicial office. The Committee also considered steps that may be taken to improve the total compensation of federal judges. The Committee continues to examine ways to improve judicial-legislative communications, and educating the public, especially the media, on the judiciary and the role of judges in society remains a priority of the Committee.

## **COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND DISABILITY**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability reported that on April 12, 2010, it issued a Memorandum of Decision on a petition for review of a circuit judicial council order on a complaint under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364. In addition, the Committee has issued a set of complaint filing instructions for courts to post online. The Committee continues to address courts' inquiries and to develop resources and infrastructure in support of the Committee's responsibilities.

## **COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL RESOURCES**

---

### **JUDICIARY SALARY PLAN PAY-SETTING FLEXIBILITY**

With limited exceptions, the salary for applicants from outside the federal civil service is set at step 1 of the Judiciary Salary Plan (JSP) grade to which they are appointed. On recommendation of the Committee on Judicial Resources, the Judicial Conference affirmed the interpretation and application of the Judiciary Salary Plan (JSP) non-chambers pay-setting flexibility that would allow an applicant for a court unit executive or second-in-command (e.g., Type II chief deputy/deputy chief) JSP position to be appointed at step 1 or above in a grade lower than the highest grade for which the individual is qualified, subject to the following policy provisions:

- a. The salary for the higher step may not exceed the corresponding salary for step 1 of the higher grade for which the individual is qualified;
- b. If such an employee is subsequently promoted in less than one year from the individual's appointment date, the promotion may not result in the individual's salary exceeding the highest grade and step for which the individual was initially eligible;
- c. For individuals appointed using this flexibility, the two-step increase JSP promotion rule may not be applied until the employee has worked at the grade and step to which the individual is appointed for one year; and
- d. The position must be announced at all possible grades that the appointing officer is considering for the appointment.

This pay flexibility allows a court to offer a salary that is not at the highest possible grade or salary for that applicant, but may still be competitive because it is at a higher step than could otherwise be offered in the lower grade.

---

### **JUDICIAL ASSISTANT/ COURT REPORTER POSITION**

On recommendation of the Committee, and in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 753(a), the Judicial Conference approved the addition of court reporter duties to the judicial assistant position in the chambers of Judge Roberto A. Lange in the District of South Dakota based on the circumstances presented by the court and because it is in the public interest. The approval is limited to the present incumbent judicial assistant in Judge Lange's chambers. The judicial assistant-court reporter is required to follow all statutory requirements and Judicial Conference policies related to court reporting, as well as the Code of Conduct for Judicial Employees, when providing court reporting services to the court and the litigants.

---

### **COURT INTERPRETER POSITIONS**

Using established criteria, the Committee recommended and the Conference approved one additional Spanish staff court interpreter position each for the Southern District of California and the District of New Mexico

and two additional Spanish staff court interpreter positions for the Western District of Texas for fiscal year 2012, based on the Spanish language interpreting workload in these courts. Accelerated funding in fiscal year 2011 was authorized for the one additional Spanish staff court interpreter position for the District of New Mexico and the two additional Spanish staff court interpreter positions for the Western District of Texas.

---

## **TELEWORK POLICY**

On recommendation of the Committee, the Judicial Conference amended its telework policy for courts and federal public defender organizations as it relates to teleworkers who work permanently from remote locations to change the official duty station for locality pay purposes to the site where the employee spends the majority of his or her time in the performance of official duties, and to clarify travel and relocation policies for such employees. Specifically, the Conference revised the current telework policy to —

- a. Define “official duty station” as the telework site for an employee who is not required to report to the employing court or federal public defender organization at least twice each biweekly pay period on a regular and recurring basis (other than during temporary telework, e.g., during a medical recovery period), and as the site of the employing court or organization for any employee who reports to the court or organization at least twice each biweekly pay period on a regular and recurring basis;
- b. Provide that a court or federal public defender organization should establish in its telework policy generally, and in each telework agreement specifically, what, if any, travel reimbursement is authorized when an employee travels to the employing court or organization; and
- c. Clarify that relocation expenses are not authorized when the official duty station changes as a result of the initiation of full-time telework, or modification or termination of a telework agreement.

---

## **EMPLOYMENT DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

On recommendation of the Committee, the Conference adopted the following policy statement regarding a judge's role when presiding in an employment dispute resolution (EDR) proceeding:

- a. EDR proceedings are strictly administrative and are not "cases and controversies" under Article III of the Constitution;
- b. Judges presiding in EDR matters are functioning in an administrative rather than judicial capacity;
- c. Judges' decisions in EDR matters must be in conformance with all statutes and regulations that apply to the judiciary, and judges in the EDR context have no authority to declare such statutes or regulations unconstitutional or invalid; and
- d. Judges presiding in EDR matters may not compel the participation of or impose remedies upon agencies or entities other than the employing office which is the respondent in such matters.

---

## **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Judicial Resources reported that it submitted to the Committee on the Budget a fiscal year 2012 budget request that represents a 5.4 percent increase over the fiscal year 2011 assumed appropriations. In order to stay within the guidelines recommended by the Budget Committee for 2012, the request was based on a re-computation of the staffing formulas using only the fastest 70 percent of the work measurement data at the category level of work (e.g., civil cases, Chapter 7 bankruptcy cases). The Committee also established as Committee policy its intent to use category-level formula adjustments as a cost-containment mechanism for developing its budget request each year when budget guidance establishes a ceiling lower than would be derived using the work measurement formulas at 100 percent of requirements. The Committee asked the Administrative Office to conduct studies on the alternative dispute resolution program, death penalty law clerks, and court sizing formulas, and present the results to the Committee at its June 2011 meeting.

## **COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL SECURITY**

---

### **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Judicial Security reported that it discussed and concurred with the Space and Facilities Committee’s recommendation that the Conference endorse the concept of the establishment of a Capital Security Program (*see infra*, “Capital Security Program,” p. 30). The Committee also reported on the development of a guide for judges who have had false liens filed against them, which provides easy-to-follow instructions on requesting representation and taking appropriate action.

## **COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGES SYSTEM**

---

### **CHANGES IN MAGISTRATE JUDGE POSITIONS**

After consideration of the report of the Committee on the Administration of the Magistrate Judges System and the recommendations of the Director of the Administrative Office, the district courts, and the judicial councils of the circuits, the Judicial Conference approved the following changes in the number, locations, salaries, and arrangements of magistrate judge positions in the respective district courts. Changes with a budgetary impact are to be effective when appropriated funds are available.

#### **SEVENTH CIRCUIT**

##### Southern District of Indiana

1. Authorized an additional full-time magistrate judge position at Indianapolis; and
2. Made no other change in the number, locations, salaries, or arrangements of the magistrate judge positions in the district.

## **EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

### District of Minnesota

1. Authorized an additional full-time magistrate judge position at Minneapolis or St. Paul; and
2. Made no other change in the number, locations, salaries, or arrangements of the magistrate judge positions in the district.

## **NINTH CIRCUIT**

### Central District of California

1. Authorized an additional full-time magistrate judge position at Santa Ana or Riverside; and
2. Made no other change in the number, locations, salaries, or arrangements of the magistrate judge positions in the district.

### District of Nevada

1. Authorized an additional full-time magistrate judge position at Las Vegas; and
2. Made no other change in the number, locations, or arrangements of the magistrate judge positions in the district.

The Conference also agreed to make no change in the number, locations, salaries, or arrangements of the magistrate judge positions in the District of Puerto Rico; District Court of the Virgin Islands; District of Nebraska; District of South Dakota; Southern District of Georgia; and District of Columbia.

---

## **ACCELERATED FUNDING**

On recommendation of the Committee, the Judicial Conference agreed to designate for accelerated funding, effective April 1, 2011, the new full-time magistrate judge positions at Indianapolis in the Southern District of Indiana;

Minneapolis or St. Paul in the District of Minnesota; Santa Ana or Riverside in the Central District of California; and Las Vegas in the District of Nevada.

---

## COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on the Administration of the Magistrate Judges System reported that under the September 2004 Judicial Conference policy regarding the review of magistrate judge position vacancies (JCUS-SEP 04, p. 26), during the period between the Committee's December 2009 and June 2010 meetings, the Committee chair approved filling nineteen full-time magistrate judge position vacancies. At its June 2010 meeting, the full Committee approved filling one vacancy and deferred action on another vacancy pending further review at its December 2010 meeting. The Committee also reviewed a report on long-range planning for the magistrate judges system and agreed to consider, at its December 2010 meeting, several long-range planning issues identified in the report.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

---

### FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

Rules Amendments. The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submitted to the Judicial Conference proposed amendments to Appellate Rules 4 (Appeal as of Right — When Taken) and 40 (Petition for Panel Rehearing), together with committee notes explaining their purpose and intent. The Judicial Conference approved the proposed rules amendments and authorized their transmittal to the Supreme Court for its consideration with a recommendation that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

Statutory Amendment. The Committee also recommended seeking legislation to amend 28 U.S.C. § 2107, consistent with the proposed amendment to Appellate Rule 4, to clarify and make uniform the treatment of the time to appeal in all civil cases in which a federal officer or employee is a party. The Conference adopted the Committee's recommendation.

---

## **FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE**

Rules Amendments. The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submitted to the Judicial Conference proposed amendments to Bankruptcy Rules 2003 (Meeting of Creditors or Equity Security Holders), 2019 (Representation of Creditors and Equity Security Holders in Chapter 9 Municipality and Chapter 11 Reorganization Cases), 3001 (Proof of Claim), 4004 (Grant or Denial of Discharge), 6003 (Interim and Final Relief Immediately Following the Commencement of the Case — Applications for Employment; Motions for Use, Sale, or Lease of Property; and Motions for Assumption or Assignment of Executory Contracts), and new Rules 1004.2 (Petition in Chapter 15 Cases) and 3002.1 (Notice Relating to Claims Secured by Security Interest in the Debtor’s Principal Residence), together with committee notes explaining their purpose and intent. The Judicial Conference approved the proposed rules amendments and new rules and authorized their transmittal to the Supreme Court for its consideration with a recommendation that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

Forms Amendments. The Committee also submitted to the Judicial Conference proposed revisions to Official Forms 9A, 9C, 9I, 20A, 20B, 22A, 22B, and 22C. The Judicial Conference approved the revised forms to take effect on December 1, 2010.

---

## **FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE**

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submitted to the Judicial Conference proposed amendments to Criminal Rules 1 (Scope; Definitions), 3 (The Complaint), 4 (Arrest Warrant or Summons on a Complaint), 6 (The Grand Jury), 9 (Arrest Warrant or Summons on an Indictment or Information), 32 (Sentencing and Judgment), 40 (Arrest for Failing to Appear in Another District or for Violating Conditions of Release Set in Another District), 41 (Search and Seizure), 43 (Defendant’s Presence), and 49 (Serving and Filing Papers), and new Rule 4.1 (Complaint, Warrant, or Summons by Telephone or Other Reliable Electronic Means), together with committee notes explaining their purpose and intent. The Judicial Conference approved the proposed amendments and new rule and authorized their transmittal to the Supreme Court for its consideration with a recommendation

that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

---

## **FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE**

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submitted to the Judicial Conference proposed restyled Evidence Rules 101-1103, together with committee notes explaining their purpose and intent. The restyling of the Evidence Rules is the fourth in a series of comprehensive style revisions to simplify, clarify, and make more uniform all of the federal rules of practice, procedure, and evidence. The Judicial Conference approved the proposed restyled rules amendments and authorized their transmittal to the Supreme Court for its consideration with a recommendation that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

---

## **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure reported that it approved publishing for public comment proposed amendments to Bankruptcy Rules 3001, 7054, and 7056, proposed revisions of Bankruptcy Official Forms 10 and 25A, and a proposed new attachment and supplements to Bankruptcy Official Form 10, and proposed amendments to Criminal Rules 5 and 58, and a new Criminal Rule 37. The comment period expires on February 16, 2011.

## **COMMITTEE ON SPACE AND FACILITIES**

---

### **CAPITAL SECURITY PROGRAM**

Noting that there are many court facilities that have serious operational and security deficiencies, but might not qualify for funding for a new courthouse, the Committee recommended that the Judicial Conference endorse the concept of a Capital Security Program to assist such courts. The program, which would be a collaborative effort between the judiciary and GSA, would fund the retrofitting of certain types of physical security enhancements at locations that are suitable for such improvements. The Conference adopted the Committee's recommendation.

---

**FIVE-YEAR COURTHOUSE PROJECT PLAN**

On recommendation of the Committee, the Judicial Conference approved the *Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan for FYs 2012-2016*, which (a) adds the courthouse in Los Angeles, California, to the first year of the plan (FY 2012) as it is the only judicial space emergency that has not yet been built and is the judiciary's highest space priority; and (b) includes two new projects in the last year of the plan (FY 2016) for which it has been determined sufficient funding exists under the Judicial Conference's rent cap.

---

**FEASIBILITY STUDIES**

Requests for GSA feasibility studies must be approved by the Judicial Conference as Component B projects under the judiciary's circuit rent management program (JCUS-SEP 07, pp. 36-37). After reviewing requests for feasibility studies using asset management planning (a methodology approved by the Conference, *see* JCUS-MAR 08, p. 26) and determining urgency scores for each project, the Committee recommended that the Conference approve GSA feasibility studies for the projects in the following three locations: Hartford, Connecticut; Winston-Salem/Greensboro, North Carolina; and Clarksburg, West Virginia. The Conference approved the Committee's recommendation.

---

**COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Committee on Space and Facilities reported that it advised the Administrative Office on procedures for responding to out-of-cycle circuit rent budget Component B requests for housing for newly confirmed judges, and clarified the process through which its space planning and rent management subcommittees deal with requests for feasibility studies. The Committee also discussed the status of the first three tenant alterations projects (in Des Moines, Iowa; Chicago, Illinois; and Washington, D.C.) planned by the courts under the newly granted congressional authorization for the GSA to delegate to the judiciary the authority to perform tenant alterations projects costing up to \$100,000.

## **FUNDING**

All of the foregoing recommendations that require the expenditure of funds for implementation were approved by the Judicial Conference subject to the availability of funds and to whatever priorities the Conference might establish for the use of available resources.

Chief Justice of the United States  
Presiding