

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102-3660**

**Report Summary**

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division, 415-865-7951  
Michael Roddy, Regional Administrative Director, Northern/Central  
Region, 916-263-1333  
Patricia M. Yerian, Director, Information Services, 415-865-7487  
Sheila Calabro, Regional Administrative Director, Southern  
Region, 818-558-3020

DATE: August 16, 2005

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2006–2007 Trial Court Budget  
Request (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Judicial Council is required to review and approve budget requests prior to their submission to the Governor and the Legislature. With the implementation in fiscal year 2005–2006 of the State Appropriations Limit (SAL) adjustment process for determining baseline funding increases for trial court funding, each year the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is required to submit a package to the Department of Finance (DOF) applying the estimated SAL adjustment rate to the overall trial court base funding to determine the annual SAL adjustment.

With the establishment of the SAL adjustment process, the ability of the AOC to submit budget change proposals (BCPs) to request new funding for the trial courts is limited. However, specific authorization has been received from the DOF for the submission of two trial court BCPs for fiscal year 2006–2007 to address base funding needs for security and information technology. These proposals are described in more detail in this report.

Summary of Recommendations

Staff recommend that the Judicial Council:

1. Direct staff to develop a fall budget request, to be updated in the spring, which applies the estimated year-to-year change in the SAL to overall trial court base funding to determine the annual SAL adjustment, consistent with

the provisions of Government Code section 77202. Staff shall submit this information to the DOF and, subsequently, to the Legislature.

2. Direct staff to prepare and submit a BCP that would provide funding to: (1) ensure that courts' security resources are up to the level of funding needed to implement the approved security standards; (2) address allowable costs for security services, as defined in SB 1396 (Stats. 2002, ch. 1010), that are currently provided by the sheriffs but not paid for by the courts; (3) add entrance screening stations where needed and logistically feasible; and (4) replace courts' entrance screening equipment on a routine basis.
3. Approve the establishment of a cost per new entrance screening station that will be used in the BCP and inclusion of costs for other non facility related security equipment requested by the courts. Reimbursement for the equipment would be based on actual cost, with the entrance station screening equipment limited to the established cost per entrance screening station, upon notification by the court of the amount paid for the equipment.
4. Approve the submission of a fall BCP to provide a level of baseline funding sufficient to address information technology needs in the trial courts, including the development and implementation of the following trial court technology initiatives:
  - California Case Management System;
  - Court Accounting and Reporting System;
  - Court Human Resources Information System;
  - California Courts Technology Center; and
  - Data Integration Project

#### Rationale for Recommendation

Please see each section of the report for the rationale.

#### Alternative Actions Considered

Please see each section of the report for the alternatives considered.

#### Comments from Interested Parties

The security and technology proposals were presented on a conceptual basis to the Trial Court Budget Working Group at its meeting on August 15 for their review and comment. The working group concurred with the proposal.

#### Implementation Requirements and Costs

If these budget requests are approved by the Judicial Council, BCPs will be prepared and submitted to the Governor and Legislature in fall of 2005 to seek this

funding, as well as a request for the estimated SAL adjustment funding for the trial courts.

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102-3660**

**Report**

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division, 415-865-7951  
Michael Roddy, Regional Administrative Director, Northern/Central  
Region, 916-263-1333  
Patricia M. Yerian, Director, Information Services, 415-865-7487  
Sheila Calabro, Regional Administrative Director, Southern  
Region, 818-558-3020

DATE: August 16, 2005

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2006–2007 Trial Court Budget  
Request (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Judicial Council is required to review and approve budget requests prior to their submission to the Governor and the Legislature. With the implementation in fiscal year 2005–2006 of the State Appropriations Limit (SAL) adjustment process which computes a baseline funding adjustment for trial court funding, each year the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is required to submit a package to the Department of Finance (DOF) applying the estimated SAL adjustment rate to the overall trial court base funding to determine the annual SAL adjustment.

With the establishment of the SAL adjustment process, the ability of the AOC to submit budget change proposals (BCPs) to request new funding for the trial courts is limited. However, specific authorization has been received from the DOF for the submission of two trial court BCPs for fiscal year 2006–2007 to address base funding needs for security and information technology. These proposals are described in more detail in this report.

I. SAL Adjustment

Government Code section 77202 provides that “[I]n order to ensure that trial court funding is not eroded and that sufficient funding is provided to trial courts to be able to accommodate increased costs without degrading the quantity or quality of court services, a base funding adjustment for operating costs shall be included that is computed based upon the year-to-year percentage change in the annual state

appropriations limit. For purposes of this adjustment, operating costs include, but are not limited to, all expenses for court operations and court employee salary and salary-driven benefits, but do not include the costs of compensation for judicial officers, subordinate judicial officers, or funding for the assigned judges program.”

Possible legislation under discussion with DOF staff could modify some of the specific inputs to the SAL computation and would, accordingly, affect the SAL computation methodology. Nevertheless, whether or not the specific required SAL adjustment computation is changed, AOC staff will still be required to submit a request with supporting schedules to the DOF in the fall which applies the estimated SAL percentage change to overall trial court base funding to determine the annual SAL adjustment. By January of 2006, AOC Finance Division staff will survey courts and then work with the Trial Court Budget Working Group to develop SAL funding priorities which will be presented to the Judicial Council in February of 2006. Later in the spring of 2006, courts will be surveyed to identify court costs and funding needs for retirement, security, and any approved Judicial Council funding priorities, as needed. Once the final SAL adjustment rate is known, staff will present final recommendations on the allocation of the SAL funding to the council, no later than its August 2006 meeting.

#### Recommendation

1. Direct staff to develop a fall budget request, to be updated in the spring, which applies the estimated year-to-year change in the SAL to overall trial court base funding to determine the annual SAL adjustment, consistent with the provisions of Government Code section 77202. Staff shall submit this information to the DOF and, subsequently, to the Legislature.

#### Rationale for the Recommendation

This recommendation would initiate the development of the SAL adjustment proposal, to be incorporated in the Governor’s Budget, consistent with the provisions of Government Code section 77202.

#### Alternative Actions Considered

No alternatives were considered as this is a required action on the part of the Judicial Council.

## II. SECURITY

### Background

After much discussion between the AOC and the county sheriffs, SB 1396 (Stats. 2002, ch. 1010) was enacted to address a variety of issues with regard to court security. One purpose of the legislation was to modify Function 8 of Rule 810 of

the California Rules of Court (the section that deals with court security operations) in a way that would standardize billing and accounting practices and court security plans, and identify allowable law enforcement security costs. Modifying Rule 810 was necessary because it was ambiguous as to exactly which security costs the courts should bear and which costs are the responsibility of the counties. With the passage of SB 1396, it was the intent of the Legislature that a sheriff's or marshal's court law enforcement budget not be reduced as a result of the legislation, and that any new court security costs permitted by the legislation not be operative unless the funding was provided by the Legislature.

The statute provides definitions for several areas of court security operations including the following:

1. Allowable costs for equipment, services, and supplies, including:

Purchase and maintenance of security screening equipment	
Ammunition	Batons
Bulletproof vests	Handcuffs
Holsters	Leather gear
Chemical spray and holders	Radios
Radio chargers and holders	Uniforms
One primary duty sidearm	
  
2. Allowable costs for professional support staff for court security operations, including salary, benefits, and overtime for staff performing, at a minimum, the following support functions:

Payroll	Human resources
Information systems	Accounting
Budgeting	

A maximum amount that could be charged to the courts for services provided by professional support staff was established depending on the size of the court's security services budget. For courts whose law enforcement security personnel services costs are less than \$10,000,000, a maximum of six percent of the total allowable costs for law enforcement security personnel services can be charged. For courts with law enforcement security personnel costs of over \$10,000,000, the maximum was set at four percent.
  
3. Allowable costs for security personnel services through the rank of captain, including the salary and benefits of an employee, such as:
  - County health and welfare;
  - County incentive payments;
  - Deferred compensation plan costs;
  - FICA or Medicare;

- General liability premium costs;
  - Leave balance payout commensurate with an employee's time in court security services as a proportion of total service credit earned after January 1, 1998;
  - Premium pay;
  - Retirement;
  - State disability insurance;
  - Unemployment insurance costs;
  - Workers' compensation paid to an employee in lieu of salary;
  - Workers' compensation premiums;
  - Court-required training; and
  - Overtime and related benefits of law enforcement supervisory and line personnel.
4. Allowable costs for vehicle use for court security needs, exclusive of prisoner or detainee transport to or from court, at the standard reimbursable mileage rate in effect for judicial officers and employees at the time of contract development.

Through previous surveys, AOC staff have become aware that payment by courts to sheriffs for their services in the above-mentioned areas varies widely from court to court. In some cases, the sheriffs have provided these services and historically been paid for them by the courts; while in others, the sheriffs have received no payment for these costs from the courts. As provided in SB 1396 and until additional funds are provided by the legislature for allowable services that the sheriffs have been providing and paying for, billing by the sheriff and reimbursement by the courts for these costs was required to remain at the status quo.

At its August 27, 2004 meeting, the council approved the submission of a fall fiscal year 2005–2006 BCP that would adjust the base budget for trial courts to, among other things, address the provision of security that is below established security standards and the provisions of SB 1396, where the provisions still apply.

Meanwhile, as part of the discussions between AOC staff and DOF staff in late summer and fall of 2004 regarding the implementation of the SAL adjustment for trial court funding, the DOF acknowledged that the existing level of security funding was possibly inadequate. As a result, it was agreed that a baseline BCP could be submitted in fiscal year 2006–2007 to address the following security areas: (1) bringing the courts up to the established security standards in the areas of Entrance Screening, Courtroom and Internal Security, Internal Transportation/Holding Cells/Control Rooms, and Supervision; (2) funding to pay

for the items included in SB 1396 in those instances where they are currently being provided by the sheriff, but not paid for by the court; and (3) funding additional entrance screening stations in various court facilities throughout the state, where they are logistically viable. Because of this action by the DOF, a security BCP was not submitted in fall of 2004, as the Judicial Council had originally directed.

At its April 15, 2005 meeting, the Judicial Council took several actions regarding the trial court security program. One of these was to approve the pursuit of a fiscal year 2006–2007 security BCP that, in combination with the current security baseline and the SAL funding applied to security, would fund all courts at the proposed security standards.

Although pursuit of funding to address the establishment of additional entrance screening stations has not been specifically authorized by the Judicial Council, based upon a review of security staffing information provided by the courts, it is apparent that many courts, particularly smaller courts, currently have no permanent screening stations in their courthouses. Many larger courts have either no screening stations, or an inadequate number of stations to address the volume of people entering their facilities and the types and volume of cases being heard at specific locations. Recent tragic events that have occurred in and around the nation's courthouses and the increased possibility of terrorism have emphasized the need to address these court security issues as soon as possible. The screening of people entering court facilities is recognized as the first line of defense for assuring the safety of everyone in the courthouse, and plays a part in maintaining access to the courts for all citizens.

#### *1. Funding Courts at the Security Standards*

All parties involved – the courts, the sheriffs, sheriff union representatives, the DOF, and the Judicial Council – believe that security funding for all courts should be brought up to the level required to meet the approved security standards. When the standards are applied to the trial court security budgets, some courts are over the standards while others fall below the standards. As directed by the council at its April 15, 2005 meeting, trial court security budgets that are above the standards will be reduced to the standard. This action is required to address the ongoing \$22 million reduction in funding for security that was included in the Budget Act of 2003 (Stats. 2003, ch. 157).

The existing security standards that were approved by the council in July 2004 and revised in April 2005, were based on salary and benefits data provided by the courts in the summer of 2004. As part of the current effort to raise court's security funding to the standards, the AOC required courts and sheriffs to provide updated fiscal year 2004–2005 and 2005–2006 salaries and benefits for mid-step PC 830.1

deputies and sergeants. The two sets of personnel cost information were compared. It became evident that many of the earlier salary and benefit amounts provided by the courts and sheriffs were incorrect. In some cases, the earlier salaries and benefits are significantly higher than those provided more recently for the same fiscal year. Courts and sheriffs may have anticipated increases in salaries or benefits that ultimately did not occur. As a result, the standards will need to be modified. However, in order to modify the standards, the Court Security Working Group (Working Group) must make recommendations to the council. The Working Group will not be able to meet and make recommendations before the August 26 council meeting. Because the BCP must be submitted in mid-September, staff will work on updating the standards and discussing them with the Working Group. These revised standards will be used in the BCP, and will be presented to the council for its consideration at its October meeting.

The current approved standards are displayed in the following tables:

#### Entrance Screening

PC 830.1 FTEs per Entrance Screening station (Mid-Step)	Average Weighted Filings/Location
1.4	0-249,999
1.6	250,000 – 899,000
1.85	900,000 – 2,000,000

#### Courtroom and Internal Security

Cluster	Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs)	PC 830.1 FTEs per JPE/AJN (Mid-Step)
1	1.1 to 4.0	1.140
2	4.1 to 20.0	1.260
3	20.1 to 59.9	1.300
4	60.0 to 600.0	1.340

#### Internal Transportation, Holding Cells, and Control Rooms

Cluster	Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs)	PC 830.1 FTEs per Adjusted Assessed Judicial Need (Mid-Step)
1	1.1 to 4.0	0.1700
2	4.1 to 20.0	0.1900
3	20.1 to 59.9	0.2300
4	60.0 to 600.0	0.4100

## Supervision

1.0 sergeant per 12 nonsupervisory security positions.

## Security Survey

To obtain information on SB 1396 allowable costs and the need for additional entrance screening stations, AOC staff distributed a survey in July 2005 to the courts and sheriffs for joint completion and submission. In filling out the survey, only allowable costs designated in SB 1396 that have been provided by the sheriff, but not paid for by the court, were to be included. Another form addressed the need for additional entrance screening stations for court facilities, including the one-time and ongoing cost of screening station equipment. (The survey did not include a section related to security standards because a determination as to whether a court was above or below the standard in specific security functional areas would be made based on information already provided by the court and sheriff, and a funding request would be made for those courts that are under the funding standards, on an overall basis. See the preceding section of this report.)

## 2. *SB 1396 Funding*

When the July 2005 survey responses were received from the courts, staff reviewed the SB 1396 section based upon the following criteria:

- Any positions other than lieutenant, captain, or commander in the Management section were disallowed.
- Courts were contacted if their Professional Support Staff; Services and Supplies; or Vehicle Use numbers appeared questionable. An example of a questionable Services and Supplies request would be where it appeared that guns and radios for all security staff (items that obviously have a life cycle of several years), were planned to be replaced every year.
- Funding for holding cell staff was not incorporated into this process because, if the service is provided and the courts are not currently paying for it, bringing the courts up to the security standards will provide the funding for this service.

## 3. *Additional Entrance Screening Stations*

The review of the Entrance Screening portion of the survey looked at the following:

- There was no duplication between this request and the security portion of the New Facilities for FY 2004–2005 and 2005–2006 survey, submitted in May 2005, which will be reviewed by the Working Group later this year. Two courts elected to withdraw their New Facilities security request and include those screening stations in the fiscal year 2006–2007 BCP process.

- Anything requested that was facilities/capital outlay-related, i.e., demolition, construction, or electrical, etc., was not allowed. Funds should be sought from the court construction funds to handle these types of costs.
- Estimated costs for basic screening station equipment – x-ray machines, magnetometers, and handheld wands – varied greatly from one court to another. Staff sought actual costs from a couple of courts that had recently purchased entrance screening equipment. There was still a good sized variance in cost. The staff recommendation is to set an equipment cost per new entrance screening station (for example, \$30,000) that would be included in the BCP. The staff recommends further that, should the BCP be funded and one-time funding for the equipment be included, actual costs for these items would be reimbursed, up to the established cap or cost per station, based on notification to AOC staff of the purchase amount.
- Some courts included other security equipment such as cameras, monitors, key card systems, door alarms, and weapons detection units. Staff recommend including a one-time request in the BCP to fund these items, particularly as some of the items will allow courts to close off some public entrances and direct those entering the building to fewer entrances where screening can then occur.
- Fiscal year 2006–2007 deputy sheriff/marshal salary and benefit amounts were compared to the fiscal year 2005–2006 amounts for the same position provided earlier this calendar year. Courts were contacted if large discrepancies were identified. Administrative adjustments were made if the salary was based on top step, rather than mid-step.
- Where the request would result in three or more stations in a single facility, the request was reviewed by AOC security program management for reasonableness.
- Where new stations were requested to be open on a part-time basis (i.e., one, two, or three days a week), a full-time equivalent number of stations was established, rather than considering them to be a full time station requiring the full standard level of staffing.

In completing the additional entrance screening section of the latest security survey, several courts indicated that they had older or non-functional screening equipment that needed to be replaced. To address this issue, which will impact more courts each year, staff recommend requesting ongoing funding in the security BCP to be used to replace entrance screening equipment in courts based on a routine replacement schedule.

To ensure that any funding received for new entrance screening stations or to replace existing screening equipment will be used by the courts solely for this purpose, staff recommend that should these funds be included in the Budget Act of 2006, one-time funding for entrance screening equipment not be allocated to a court until it has submitted invoices to AOC staff indicating the actual cost of the equipment and any ongoing maintenance charges, and funding for security staff not be allocated until AOC has been notified that the new security personnel have begun work at the court, and the actual cost for the personnel.

### Recommendation

Staff recommend that the Judicial Council:

2. Direct staff to prepare and submit a BCP that would provide funding to: (1) ensure that courts' security resources are up to the level of funding needed to implement the approved security standards; (2) address allowable SB 1396 (Stats. 2002, ch. 1010) costs for security services, as defined in SB 1396, that are currently provided by the sheriffs but not paid for by the courts; (3) add entrance screening stations where needed and logistically feasible; and (4) replace courts' entrance screening equipment on a routine basis.
  
3. Approve the establishment of a cost per new entrance screening station that will be used in the BCP and inclusion of costs for other non facility related security equipment requested by the courts. Reimbursement for the equipment would be based on actual cost, with the entrance station screening equipment limited to the established cost per entrance screening station, upon notification by the court of the amount paid for the equipment.

### Rationale for Recommendation

With the advent of the SAL growth factor for new funding for trial courts, submission of BCPs is more limited than in previous fiscal years. AOC staff received agreement of DOF management to review a proposal that identifies baseline funding needs for the three areas of security included in the recommendation. Until an augmentation is provided to address the unpaid SB 1396 costs, the ability of the courts to address these costs is negligible.

Because of historical funding patterns, some courts have received, and paid for, higher levels of court security than other courts, without diminishing other services. Less well funded courts are, however, often either forced to rely on a lower level of service, or maintain a higher level of security to the detriment of other important programs. Until standards were established for the provision of security, there was no way to determine what level of security should be provided and how much courts should be spending for these services. Now that funding standards have been established, direction provided by the council to bring courts

up to these funding levels, and authority from the DOF to apply for this funding, this request proposes to request the needed funding.

While there is a standard for the amount of funding to be provided to staff an existing entrance screening station, there are many courts that have no permanent entrance screening stations (22 as of fiscal year 2004–2005), and others that have an insufficient quantity of stations based on the number of people entering their facilities and the number and types of cases being heard at the facilities. Due to the economic condition of the state, no new state funding has been received to add any new security positions to the courts since fiscal year 2001–2002. Because of recent well-publicized, violent occurrences in and around courthouses, nationwide, the need to prevent people with weapons from entering courthouses has become even more imperative. For some courts, the only security presence they currently have are bailiffs, or in some cases, court attendants, in the courtroom. Having additional personnel at the front entrance will help deter or prevent individuals from bringing weapons into the courthouse and, in the event that altercations occur, will enhance the court’s ability to bring such situations more quickly under control. As approval has been received to request this funding, and it will only be sought for those facilities where it is physically feasible to place them, and the funding for staffing will be based on the standards, staff believe that the request should be submitted to the DOF for fiscal year 2006–2007. In addition, routinely replacing entrance screening equipment will ensure that a court’s security is not being compromised by the use of old equipment.

The Judicial Council approved a policy at its April 15, 2005 meeting that court security budget allocations may only be expended for that purpose and that unused funds would roll over on an annual basis to be reallocated to fund one-time costs. To ensure, to the best of our ability, that this policy is followed, funding should not be allocated to courts until AOC staff have been notified that the court has implemented the security for which funding was requested.

#### Alternative Actions Considered

Instead of going forward at this time with a request for funding for all three of these security areas, funding could be requested for only one or two of them, which would result in a substantially lower request. However, because the authorization to submit a BCP for fiscal year 2006–2007 included all three areas, and was presented as a one-time opportunity, these alternatives are not recommended. If some of this funding is not requested now, but the Judicial Council at a later date decided that it wanted to address these security funding needs, the costs would have to be funded out of future SAL security funding, leaving less funding available to address mandatory increases in security costs.

### Comments from Interested Parties

Staff's intention to submit a BCP addressing the security funding needs has been discussed with members of the California State Sheriffs Association on several occasions. Sheriffs' Association representatives have expressed their strong support for this approach. The BCP was presented to the Trial Court Budget Working Group at its August 15, 2005 meeting for their review and comment.

### Implementation Requirement and Costs

If the preceding recommendations are approved by the council, staff will prepare a security BCP that will be submitted to the DOF in September of 2005.

## III. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

### Background

For the past several years, the AOC, in partnership with the trial courts, has undertaken development and begun implementation of various statewide technology initiatives as part of the overall development of statewide automation and information technology services. While the initial funding in fiscal years 2000–2001 and 2001–2002 for the development of many of these technology initiatives came from the General Fund, since then these initiatives have been supported by funding from the Trial Court Improvement Fund, the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, and, beginning in fiscal year 2004–2005, direct cost recovery from the trial courts. Based upon a review of projected costs and available funding sources, it has been determined that continued development and implementation of these information technology initiatives will require an ongoing commitment of additional resources, including the need for a General Fund augmentation.

Over the past several years, through the use of statewide BCPs, the AOC has pursued funding to continue to develop and implement these technology initiatives. However, due to the economic condition of the state, new funding has not been available. As courts have transitioned off of county-provided services and onto the newly developed systems, the AOC has worked with the courts to redirect the funds they had been paying to the counties towards the support of the technology infrastructure. While this funding has been crucial, it is not sufficient to pay for the development and ongoing maintenance of these programs.

On July 11, 2005, the Governor vetoed \$57.5 million from General Fund transfers to the Trial Court Trust Fund, indicating that with the implementation of the State Appropriations Limit, the Trial Court Trust Fund does not need a large reserve. In addition, the Governor vetoed \$10.9 million in new technology funding from the Uniform Civil Filing Fees that will be implemented January 1, 2006. These actions eliminated funding that would have been available to support these technology-related activities. AOC management, in subsequent discussions with

DOF staff, explained that these funds had been set aside to be available to address a number of areas including technology projects and did not, therefore, represent excess funding.

There have been initial discussions with management and staff at the Department of Finance regarding the need for a baseline funding increase to trial court funding to address statewide information services needs in future fiscal years. While no commitment has been made with regard to supporting a funding increase, the Department of Finance has committed to reviewing court information technology funding needs as part of the development of the fiscal year 2006–2007 fiscal year Governor’s Budget.

Consistent with this, staff recommends development and submission of a BCP which will identify the overall projected shortfall in resources available to support statewide court information technology needs. Specifically, the funding shortfall for technology projects is primarily related to the major technology initiatives, which include the following:

- Staffing and funding to provide oversight for design, development, implementation, and ongoing support for the statewide California Case Management System (CCMS).
- Staffing and funding to provide support for continued implementation and support for the statewide Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS).
- Staffing and funding for development and implementation of the statewide Court Human Resource Information System (CHRIS).
- Staffing and funding to provide oversight and transition coordination for the centralized California Courts Technology Center (CCTC).
- Staffing and funding to support the new Data Integration Program, which will set standards and implement tools to facilitate exchange of information by courts with justice system partners.

Each of these initiatives is discussed in greater detail below.

### **California Case Management System (CCMS)**

California courts are in the process of developing and implementing a case management system for calendaring, scheduling, noticing, docketing, event handling, and which will support management and financial reporting. In support of the Judicial Branch’s Strategic Plan for Court Technology and the Tactical Plan for Court Technology, a data survey was conducted to evaluate the then-current state of case management systems in the trial courts. Results of the survey identified more than 70 variations, many of which did not meet the basic needs of the courts. Meetings held between the Administrative Director of the AOC, the Chief Justice, and two previous Governors identified the need for the judicial

branch to develop branch-wide solutions since the state could not feasibly support 58 different solutions.

In 2002, an assessment of case management systems in the courts was performed to understand the status of their systems, including their technical support, technology infrastructure and other characteristics. The assessment found all courts had critical CMS needs because of unstable systems, inadequate technical support, the inability to meet legislative and reporting requirements, or significant ongoing support costs, which were severe enough to warrant new systems.

Based upon this assessment, it was concluded that a custom solution would need to be developed for large courts with multiple CMS applications, complex business procedures and interfaces. During this same timeframe, several large courts issued RFPs for CMS products (Los Angeles and Ventura for a civil system; San Diego for all case types). Both RFPs were eventually rescinded as no vendor products could meet the large court needs. The courts in the Southern Region agreed to migrate to a common CMS solution and identified four courts in the region and the Southern Region Administrative Director to lead the effort.

In 2003, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation that the collaborative Southern Region effort would result in a statewide system, the California Case Management System (CCMS) that functionally and technically meets the needs of all courts.

The California Case Management System is a development and deployment project with final completion planned for fiscal year 2009–2010. Building on the system developed by the Superior Courts of Orange and Ventura Counties, the California Case Management System is being developed to allow the courts to manage all case types with a common application. The development and deployment of CCMS is being coordinated with the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) and data integration projects to provide the courts with a standard solution for interfacing with local and state justice partners. This collaboration will also allow the courts to meet the Judicial Council’s goal of public access to court information utilizing technologies such as IVR (interactive voice response) and web-pay and electronic filing via the internet.

The project has been supported by funding from the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, the Trial Court Improvement Fund, and General Fund monies.

#### *Accomplishments to date*

Two phases are under way — development and installation of the criminal and traffic system, and a civil, small claims, and probate system. Planning for the third phase,

which includes family law, juvenile, and mental health case types, begins in the fall of 2005. The final phase to migrate all case types to a single platform is slated to begin in 2006. The criminal and traffic system was installed in the California Courts Technology Center in July 2004. Implementation of the criminal and traffic system in the Alameda Superior Court is underway. The Superior Courts of Orange, Fresno, San Luis Obispo, Marin, Solano, Sonoma, and Butte Counties are in various stages of implementation planning. Development of the civil, small claims, and probate system is well underway and on schedule to be completed in October 2005. The Superior Courts of San Diego, Sacramento, and Los Angeles Counties are beginning implementation planning.

*Planned future objectives (current fiscal year and fiscal year 2006–2007)*

The traffic system go-live is planned for the Superior Court of Alameda County in fall 2005. Deployment discussions are being held with additional courts that have expressed interest in using the application sooner than originally anticipated. Management of future enhancements includes the establishment of court user groups to define product requirements. Development and application design sessions will continue with appropriate groups to discuss methods of exchanging data with justice partners. As CCMS develops and future versions are released, the application and supporting technology will continue to respond to public access and electronic access to court records.

The planned implementation schedule assumes that additional funding will be secured. However, if no General Fund increase is secured, the trial courts will continue to operate a variety of disparate case management applications, many with failing hardware, across the state. For example, there are at least 10 courts that are in desperate need to get the Version 2 (Criminal/Traffic) component of CCMS installed. Their systems are failing and/or the costs to continue with their counties is prohibitive.

**Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS)**

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 consolidated all court funding at the state level and requires the AOC to provide fiscal oversight for the courts. Two major stipulations of the AB 233 are that the state is responsible for funding trial court operations, and a county may give notice at least 90 days prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year that it no longer intends to provide specified services to the court. Prior to AB 233, trial courts had bifurcated funding in which they received the majority of funding through their counties. Since the passage of AB 233, courts are struggling to comply with required AOC and State reporting requirements because either (1) the county systems are not designed to produce special court reporting requirements or (2) courts have had to migrate from county financial services and systems.

Fifty-three of the fifty-eight superior courts within the state had different and non-compatible accounting systems. Many courts are unable to produce financial statements that fully comply with relevant statutes, rules, and regulations, including GAAP requirements. A majority of the courts are still out-sourcing their accounting to counties that either will not or cannot produce financial information that meets the reporting and management information needs of the courts.

Based upon a review of these problems, CARS was selected as the most cost effective approach to resolving these financial reporting shortcomings for all courts, statewide, by developing and implementing a comprehensive and uniform financial system.

Most counties are using antiquated financial systems but are in the process of moving to or planning on moving to new financial systems over the next 5-7 years. Some of the few counties with relatively newer financial systems will also require upgrades in the near future. Courts that remain with their counties will be forced to bear their share of the costs for these system changes and upgrades, costing up to several millions of dollars, yet which will continue not to meet the basic needs for the courts or state. This shift to new county financial systems or upgrades of existing county systems has already occurred or is planned to occur soon in several large counties (Alameda, Sacramento) with the result of significant cost increases to the courts. Future cost avoidance was analyzed and considered as another important factor in the decision to implement CARS statewide.

The statewide implementation of CARS and the institution of a centralized Accounting Processing Center ensures that courts will be able to produce financial statements and meet GAAP requirements and adhere to appropriate statutes, rules, and regulations; provides professional accounting support that replaces and enhances the support previously provided by counties; supports consistent coding of expenditures for comparable data among the courts and for the courts as a whole; allows the Judicial Council to fulfill its requirement to provide financial oversight of the courts as required by AB 233; and provides courts with immediate access to financial information to enable them to make business decisions in order to more efficiently and prudently operate their courts on a day-to-day basis.

Over the past five years, the Information Services and Finance divisions of the AOC have developed a multi-phased project plan to implement a centralized Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, including the Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS), which will meet the basic accounting needs of the trial courts, provide accurate and timely financial information, comply with the Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures, and provide standard reporting to meet the needs of trial courts, the AOC and other California state agencies.

CARS is a statewide development and deployment project with completion anticipated by fiscal year 2007–2008. Twenty courts have been implemented to date. Approximately 10 to 15 courts are scheduled for implementation each year up to July 2008. Support and maintenance will be ongoing.

*Accomplishments to date*

The approach taken to implement a statewide judicial branch financial system includes five steps: (1) Creation of a trial court financial policies and procedures manual; (2) Establishment of an internal audit unit; (3) Installation of a standardized statewide accounting software system; (4) Establishment of an accounting processing center; and (5) Establishment of a centralized treasury.

Accomplishments to date include:

- A request for proposal for statewide accounting software was developed and issued.
- SAP software was selected and the statewide design was configured.
- CARS was successfully implemented at the Stanislaus Superior Court, the pilot court, using the statewide design.
- A request for proposals for a CARS implementation vendor for the remaining 57 courts was developed and issued.
- CARS implemented at California Courts Technology Center.
- An accounting processing center was established.
- A centralized treasury was established.
- A comprehensive governance structure for CARS was established, encompassing a steering committee (AOC Finance and Information Services Divisions and implementer), executive sponsors (AOC Finance and Information Services Divisions), a multi-resource team (AOC Finance and Information Services Divisions), and co-program managers (AOC Finance and Information Services Divisions) who approve all project plans and deliverables.
- CARS (SAP software) was upgraded to Enterprise version 4.7.
- CARS has been implemented for 20 superior courts as of July 2005.

*Planned future objectives (current fiscal year and fiscal year 2006–2007)*

- Implementation is planned for 15 courts in fiscal year 2005–2006 and 17 courts in fiscal year 2006–2007.

If sufficient resources are not identified to support continued implementation of this system, delayed CARS implementation of the remaining 38 courts may result, leading to increased costs for implementation at a later date and a higher per court cost.

## **Court Human Resources Information System (CHRIS)**

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 consolidated all court funding at the state level and requires the AOC to provide fiscal oversight for the courts. One of the major stipulations of AB 233 states that a county may give notice at least 90 days prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year that it no longer intends to provide specified services to the court. As courts are moving off of their county systems for fiscal services and implementing CARS, many counties are also dropping the courts for HR provided services.

The Court Human Resources Information System (CHRIS), a new ERP system based on the SAP software suite, is intended to provide a comprehensive information system infrastructure to support all aspects of court human resources information system needs. This system will be rolled out to trial courts as they transition from HR county-provided services. The SAP modules that will make up the backbone of this system include personnel administration, organization management, benefits, training and events, payroll, performance management, compensation, recruiting, time management, and personnel cost planning. In the future, trial courts will receive support through a centralized HR system, using single integrated application software, through the technology center.

CHRIS is a development and deployment project with completion scheduled by fiscal year 2008–2009. Currently, a CHRIS prototype is being developed with the assistance of subject matter experts from the courts. If successful, the prototype will be deployed to the courts. Support and maintenance will be ongoing.

The CHRIS project began in fiscal year 2003–2004 and was supported by initial funding from the Modernization Fund and available General Fund monies. The General Fund supported AOC staff and the Modernization Fund supported the development of the CHRIS prototype.

### *Accomplishments to date*

The CHRIS project was initiated in November 2004. SAP software was selected because of its integration with CARS. A model court is being selected to validate the baseline configuration for the first CHRIS installation. Twelve court subject matter experts volunteered to be part of the CHRIS project team. Blueprinting sessions to identify functional requirements were held with representatives from these courts. Bearing Point was contracted to work with the project team to define the business requirements and build a foundational model for the 10 HR modules in SAP. The project team has had working sessions for all modules and Bearing Point has begun development of the model.

*Planned future objectives (current fiscal year and fiscal year 2006–2007)*

Work with a model court to configure the CHRIS application so that a prototype can be demonstrated to the courts, and ensure that this system meets the HR business requirements of the Judicial Branch.

Without a General Fund augmentation, the ability of the judicial branch to fully implement CHRIS is doubtful. And there is some urgency to system implementation in the courts as courts face the termination of county-provided human resources services.

### **California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)**

In fiscal year 2000–2001, the AOC developed a strategic plan for trial court technology. Included in the plan was a recommendation for establishing a Technology Center to provide the trial courts with an alternative statewide platform for their technology solutions. Beginning in fiscal year 2002–2003, the AOC moved forward with this recommendation, and began operating a new statewide technology center. The California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) is a shared services environment designed to a centralized data center standard.

This project has been funded from the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Mod Fund) and Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF), and is the centerpiece for all technology-related trial court projects. It has been established through a third party hosting service, with the potential to support the 58 trial courts to varying degrees. It not only provides economies of scale and avoidance of costly increases in county charges, but also provides a statewide infrastructure for the trial courts to utilize a cafeteria-style offering of the following:

- Case Management applications
- Court Accounting and Reporting System
- Jury applications
- Court Human Resources Information System
- Email
- Desktop support
- Helpdesk support
- Telecommunication support
- Network support
- Security assessment and support
- Disaster Recover process design and support

The CCTC's core mission is to:

- Offer best in class services, tools and support to the entire branch at the most economical price
- Provide uniform technology service and support across the branch regardless of a court's size or location
- Design and implement branch wide technology architecture standards and IT operations best practices; and
- Through design and execution, foster software and infrastructure architectural standards.

*Accomplishments to date*

The CCTC provides comprehensive information technology support for a growing number of trial courts, including the following services:

- Sustain Justice Edition – Interim Case Management System
- California Court Case Management System (CCMS/V.2)
- Traffic/Criminal Application
- SAP – Court Accounting & Reporting System (CARS)
- Disaster Recovery
- Microsoft Exchange/Outlook Email
- Microsoft Active Directory
- Internet Access
- Network and Application Security Monitoring
- Centralized Help Desk
- Local Trial Court Hosting & Monitoring
- Desk Side Services (Moves/Adds/Changes, Inventory Control & Reporting)

28 courts currently subscribe to one or more of these hosted offerings. Additional courts are connected to the CCTC each month. The rate at which additional courts connect to the CCTC will accelerate in fiscal year 2005–2006 through 2009–2010 as these courts convert to CCMS and the menu of services offered at the CCTC grows.

*Planned future objectives (current fiscal year and fiscal year 2006–2007)*

Several major system installations are underway at the CCTC including the following:

- Computer-Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) system
- Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS)
- Integration Services Backbone (ISB)
- CCMS Civil, Small Claims and Probate Case Management Application (CCMS/V.3) and;
- Netegrity Enterprise Wide Authentication and Password Self-Service Application.

Other projects in the planning stage include the SAP Human Resources module (CHRIS) and future CCMS application modules. Data recovery and security monitoring services continually improve and expand as the CCTC's portfolio of services broaden.

If no additional funding is secured to support the continued implementation of the technology center, the following impacts would likely result:

- New services would not be deployed at the CCTC
- Additional courts would not be connected to CCTC and would be unable to use the services
- Courts that could not use the CCTC would have to deploy services locally, incurring larger downstream costs as branch wide efficiencies are not realized
- Without the anticipated scale, the AOC will be at a disadvantage in future negotiations with our data center outsourcing vendor, Siemens Business Services (SBS)
- Canceling projects in progress will result in significant termination costs and;
- Projects reinitiated at a future date will result in significant negative cost variances.

### **Data Integration Program**

The Data Integration Program (DI Program) was established to support the trial courts in maintaining data exchanges with their justice partners. A court, as a member of the integrated justice community, frequently shares data related to criminal case adjudication with its justice partners and, in turn, receives critical information that supports the criminal case processing. This type of collaboration has a significant role in maintaining public safety. This project has served as a model to achieve the goals of the Attorney General's Subcommittee on Integrated Justice Systems, chaired by Sheila Calabro, Administrative Regional Director for the Southern Regional Office of the AOC.

The Data Integration Program will be a critical component to maintaining this relationship as the courts migrate from their local systems to the California Case Management System in the California Courts Technology Center. The program has two components:

- Development of data exchange standards: Working with trial court working groups, and beginning with the criminal case type, the DI Program has identified high-value data exchanges that are used in the trial courts. To support the execution in electronic format, the DI Program also developed draft specifications that identified data standards, schemas, and a data dictionary.

- Development of the Integration Services Backbone (ISB): To support electronic exchanges, the DI Program purchased software and engaged professional services to develop the ISB. The ISB will combine the use of the data exchange standards and software to support data exchanges between the individual court's data that resides on CCMS, and a multitude of justice partner systems in the county jurisdictions.

The project has been funded since fiscal year 2001–2002 from available resources from the General Fund, the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, and the Trial Court Improvement Fund.

*Accomplishments to Date*

- 2002: Development of nine criminal high-value data exchange standards.
- 2002: Initiated the Second Generation Electronic Filing Specification (2GEFS) project, which has developed draft specifications for the electronic filing and requesting information.
- 2004–2005: Development of eight criminal high-value data exchange standards.
- 2005: Initiation of the ISB project by developing the technical architecture and infrastructure in the California Courts Technology Center, and initiating the “proof of concept” in Alameda Superior Court.
- 2005: Extension of data exchange standards to include family law and juvenile case types to support their use in the California Case Management System.

*Planned future objectives (current fiscal year and fiscal year 2006–2007)*

The Data Integration Program will continue to focus its efforts on the deployment of the exchange standards and integration tools statewide. Through these efforts, courts will be prepared to establish information exchanges with their justice partners as they transition from their legacy information systems to statewide applications. Work on three phases of the ISB is underway and will be completed in the fiscal year 2005–2006 timeframe. Project phases include:

- Implementation of the proposed solution in the California Courts Technology Center.
- Assistance in the initial deployment of the ISB solution to support a trial court's transition to the new California Case Management System.
- Design and recommendation for the organization, programs, and processes to deploy the solution across the trial courts, and to operate, manage, and support the ISB solution on a long-term basis.

Recommendation

AOC staff recommend that the Judicial Council:

4. Approve the submission of a fall BCP to provide a level of baseline funding sufficient to address information technology needs in the trial courts, including the development and implementation of the following trial court technology initiatives:
  - California Case Management System;
  - Court Accounting and Reporting System;
  - Court Human Resources Information System;
  - California Courts Technology Center; and
  - Data Integration Project

#### Rationale for Recommendation

All of the technology initiatives are planned to be fully implemented in or before fiscal year 2009–2010. If replacement of this funding is not sought through a BCP, the pace of implementation will be reduced dramatically, and it will take much longer to provide these services to the courts and fully support them.

#### Alternative Actions Considered

In developing the recommendations, the following alternatives were considered:

1. Slow down or stop development and implementation of a project or key projects:
  - The impact on courts is that courts with critical technology needs resulting from county separation would be left with inadequate applications and infrastructure support for their systems.
  - In some cases, current services of the county may not meet the needs of the trial courts, e.g., financial management and reporting systems.
  - Some court would be charged continually increasing fees for support from the county without receiving commensurate improvement in services.
2. Trial courts add staff or outsource services locally.
  - This is expensive, inefficient, and does not leverage economies of scale.
  - Trial courts are unable to offer the service without experiencing a reduction to existing base services, impairing the ability of the court to maintain mandatory operations.
  - Standardization of applications and technology infrastructure would not be achievable.
3. AOC – Information Services Division provide services by utilizing existing services:
  - This would severely limit the number of trial courts that could be supported and migrated to centralized standard applications.

- Other projects for the AOC, the California Supreme Court, and the courts of appeal would be slowed or even halted in order to redirect AOC staff to meet the needs of the trial courts.
- For courts that no longer receive support from their counties case management systems, jury, financial, and human resource management systems.

#### Comments from Interested Parties

This proposal was presented on a conceptual basis to the Trial Court Budget Working Group at its August 15, 2005 meeting for their review and comment. The working group concurred with the proposal.

#### Implementation Requirement and Costs

If the preceding recommendation is approved by the council, staff will prepare an information technology BCP that will be submitted to the DOF in September of 2005.