

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Malcolm Franklin, Senior Manager, Emergency Response and Security,
415-865-8830, malcolm.franklin@jud.ca.gov
Marcia Caballin, Assistant Division Director, AOC Finance Division,
415-865-8821, marcia.caballin@jud.ca.gov

DATE: November 15, 2007

SUBJECT: FY 2007–2008 Entrance Screening Station Replacement Schedule and
Delegation of Authority (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Judicial Council has the authority to approve the entrance screening equipment that will be replaced during FY 2007–2008, which will allow for replacement of essential screening equipment that is essential to preserving a safe environment for the public, judicial officers, and court staff. This report presents recommendations for the allocation of the screening equipment replacement funding that was included in the Budget Act of 2007 (Stats. 2007, ch. 171). Additionally, there is a recommendation for the delegation of authority and responsibility to approve the entrance screening equipment that will be replaced in subsequent years based on existing criteria and the continued availability of funding.

Recommendation

AOC staff recommend that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the list of equipment to be replaced in FY 2007–2008 from the replacement funding in the 2007 Budget Act, as indicated in the attachment.
2. Delegate to the Administrative Director of the Courts the authority to approve the list of equipment to be replaced in following fiscal years from the replacement funding in the Budget Act.

Rationale for Recommendation

Court facilities statewide vary widely in the availability of entrance screening stations, and in some instances, screening equipment is outdated or faulty. To address this issue, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) requested funding for new equipment as well as replacement screening equipment. The Budget Act of 2006 (Stats. 2006, ch. 47) provided

ongoing funding, and in the first equipment replacement cycle the AOC upgraded a great deal of screening equipment that was over eight years old or problematic.

The Budget Act of 2007 (Stats. 2007, ch. 171) included the funding that will be needed for FY 2007–2008 replacements, and the AOC surveyed the courts to determine their need for replacement equipment. The information requested included the equipment’s location, manufacturer, model, serial number or court ID, year of make, and comments on the condition of the equipment.

Some courts have been able to replace their entrance screening equipment in the last few years, but many have not had the funding to do so. As one would expect, as this equipment ages it tends to develop more problems and need more maintenance. Some of the older equipment is no longer under warranty, or perhaps not able to be repaired, as it is now obsolete. Such equipment is considered high priority for replacement.

Based on the established replacement cycle of six to seven years, staff recommends that as many X-ray machines and magnetometers dating from 2000 and before as possible should be replaced in FY 2007–2008.¹

Not all equipment that is over seven years old is guaranteed to be replaced—i.e., a 1999 magnetometer that is a back-up machine is not as critical as a newer one that is malfunctioning. However, as many machines as possible have been recommended for replacement based on the funding in the Budget Act. The AOC’s Emergency Response and Security (ERS) staff, who have experience with entrance screening equipment, reviewed the list of equipment and determined which pieces to recommend for replacement by considering both the age and functionality of the equipment.

Equipment that was not considered for replacement includes:

- Equipment that is in storage (not used);
- Equipment that is for backup (not used regularly and therefore not a priority);
- Equipment that was already replaced by the AOC in a previous year’s replacement cycle; and
- Magnetometers at multiple-entrance facilities that will no longer be needed when the court receives funding for a new entrance screening station through the Budget Act and closes all but one entrance.

Evaluating the equipment needs of the trial courts requires reviewing extensive material that the courts submit in support of their requests. Staff members of the AOC are uniquely suited to performing this work. They have had responsibility for administering trial courts’ requests for replacement screening equipment in the past, and they are experienced in reviewing

¹ The replacement cycle was originally intended to be five years; however, the cost for a full screening station suite with the required maintenance contract exceeded the maximum reimbursement amount specified in the Budget Act of 2006. The Judicial Council voted to increase the maximum reimbursement amount to \$37,000 at its October 2006 meeting. This change lengthened the anticipated replacement cycle from every five years to approximately six or seven years.

courts' funding requests and making recommendations and decisions based on existing equipment and funding priorities.

Delegation of the stated authority to the Administrative Director will promote the Judicial Council's goals for statewide administration. It will also enhance effectiveness and efficiency by allowing the AOC to make decisions promptly on replacement screening equipment requests.

Alternative Actions Considered

If the Judicial Council decided not to approve the recommended replacements, the program could be further delayed and older or problematic screening equipment could become unserviceable. Therefore, this alternative is not recommended.

Similarly, if the Judicial Council decided not to delegate to the Administrative Director the authority to approve replacement equipment in future fiscal years, administration of the program could be delayed. However, the AOC is the judicial branch entity responsible for discharging administrative duties for the branch. AOC staff's proposals promote an appropriate division of responsibilities by permitting the Judicial Council to attend primarily to larger issues of policy and governance. Therefore, this alternative is not recommended.

Comments From Interested Parties

None.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

No additional funds are needed to implement these recommendations. If the amount allocated in Budget Act is not sufficient in any given year for the necessary replacements, AOC will pursue other funding through other grant money such as the Trial Court Improvement Fund that ERS administers.

Attachment

Attachment

County Name	Equipment Type	Number of Units Approved	Cost Per Unit	Proposed Allocation
Alameda	Magnetometer	6	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 28,200.00
	X-ray	6	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 188,400.00
Butte	X-ray	1	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 31,400.00
Fresno	Magnetometer	10	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 47,000.00
	X-ray	1	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 31,400.00
Kern	Magnetometer	9	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 42,300.00
	X-ray	2	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 62,800.00
Kings	Magnetometer	10	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 47,000.00
	X-ray	3	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 94,200.00
Lake	Magnetometer	1	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 4,700.00
Los Angeles	Magnetometer	15	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 70,500.00
	X-ray	13	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 408,200.00
Monterey	Magnetometer	9	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 42,300.00
Napa	Magnetometer	1	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 4,700.00
	X-ray	2	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 62,800.00
Nevada	X-ray	1	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 31,400.00
Orange	Magnetometer	2	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 9,400.00
Placer	Magnetometer	3	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 14,100.00
Riverside	Magnetometer	15	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 70,500.00
	X-ray	2	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 62,800.00
Sacramento	Magnetometer	3	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 14,100.00
	X-ray	1	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 31,400.00
San Diego	Magnetometer	16	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 75,200.00
	X-ray	6	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 188,400.00
San Joaquin	Magnetometer	4	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 18,800.00
	X-ray	2	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 62,800.00
Santa Clara	X-ray	3	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 94,200.00
Santa Cruz	Magnetometer	3	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 14,100.00
	X-ray	3	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 94,200.00

Shasta	Magnetometer	2	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 9,400.00
	X-ray	1	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 31,400.00
Sonoma	Magnetometer	2	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 9,400.00
Stanislaus	Magnetometer	2	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 9,400.00
	X-ray	1	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 31,400.00
Sutter	Magnetometer	3	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 14,100.00
	X-ray	1	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 31,400.00
Tulare	Magnetometer	5	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 23,500.00
Ventura	Magnetometer	6	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 28,200.00
	X-ray	4	\$ 31,400.00	\$ 125,600.00
Yolo	Magnetometer	2	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 9,400.00
TOTAL				\$ 2,270,500.00
Total Allocation for FY 07/08				\$ 2,286,000.00
Total Proposed Replacement Amount				\$ 2,270,500.00
Amount Available for Emergency Equipment Replacement				\$ 15,500.00