

Court-Ordered Debt Task Force
Annual Agenda—2015
Approved by E&P: April 16, 2015

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Judge Mary Ann O'Malley, Co-chair and Judge David S. Wesley, Co-chair
Staff:	Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer and Jody Patel, Chief of Staff
<p>Advisory Body's Charge: Penal Code section 1463.02: The Judicial Council established a task force to evaluate criminal and traffic-related court-ordered debts imposed against adult and juvenile offenders and evaluate and make recommendations to the Judicial Council and the Legislature regarding the priority in which court-ordered debts should be satisfied and the use of comprehensive collection programs authorized pursuant to section 1463.007, including associated cost-recovery practices.</p>	
<p>Advisory Body's Membership: The Court-Ordered Debt Task Force is comprised of 20 members plus 1 in an advisory role as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Two members appointed by the California State Association of Counties.(2) Two members appointed by the League of California Cities.(3) Two court executives, two judges, and two Judicial Council employees appointed by the Judicial Council.(4) One member appointed by the Controller.(5) One member appointed by the Franchise Tax Board.(6) One member appointed by the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board.(7) One member appointed by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.(8) One member appointed by the Department of Finance.(9) One member appointed by each house of the Legislature.(10) A county public defender and a city attorney appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.(11) A defense attorney in private practice and a district attorney appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules.(12) One judge in an advisory role.	
<p>Subgroups/Working Groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Collections Working Group2. Data Collections Working Group3. Priorities Working Group	

Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:

The task force's primary objectives are to:

1. Evaluate various aspects of the criminal and traffic-related court-ordered fees, fines, forfeitures, penalties;
2. Prioritize the order in which those court-ordered debts are satisfied; and
3. Collect data concerning the revenue and expenditures associated with these fees.

In 2015, the task force will focus on:

- Training entities that perform collections to accurately distribute revenue in accordance with the State Controller's Appendix C, the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule, and legislation.
- Continuing efforts to develop a standard revenue distribution template for use in the trial courts to be tested by 3 volunteer courts in the form of a pilot project.

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
1.	<p>Deliver enhanced training to county/court/city staff that participates in revenue distribution activities to promote a common approach.</p> <p>The JCC and the State Controller’s Office have partnered to deliver remedial and new changes training in San Diego and Sacramento in May 2015. The legislative changes impacting Appendix C and their effect on revenue distribution will be communicated to participants.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Direction: This project speaks to the Judicial Council’s Goal V: Education for Branchwide Professional Excellence, specifically to “provide ongoing professional development, education, and training to address many concerns including... new management, operational, and service-level expectations.”</p> <p>Origin of Project: This effort was undertaken in response to the requirements of <i>Penal Code 1463.02</i>.</p> <p>Resources: JCC staff on the task force, CJER, JCC subject matter experts, and staff in the State Controller’s Office.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #1</p>	<p>May 2015</p> <p>Training to be delivered statewide bi-annually.</p>	<p>Accurate revenue collection and distribution will have a positive impact on the state’s budget.</p>

¹ All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

² For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

#	Project ¹	Priority ²	Specifications	Completion Date/Status	Describe End Product/ Outcome of Activity
2.	<p>Continue the 3-year pilot project to review adherence to the State Controller’s Appendix C, the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule, and legislation.</p> <p>Santa Clara, Ventura, and Shasta Superior Courts continue their active participation in a pilot program with the long-term goal of simplifying the distribution process. Distribution methodologies continue to be discussed and evaluated to assess compliance with applicable statutes and Appendix C. The goal is to develop a standard methodology that can be implemented statewide.</p>		<p>Judicial Council Direction: This project speaks to the Judicial Council’s Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration, specifically, the “developing and implementing appropriate accountability and compliance measures.” This project promotes the accuracy and statewide uniformity of revenue distribution.</p> <p>Origin of Project: This effort was undertaken in response to the requirements of <i>Penal Code 1463.02</i>. One of the statutory requirements in the Penal Code is that the task force develops and recommends processes to simplify or streamline the distribution of revenues to the various government entities.</p> <p>Resources: JCC staff to the task force, JCC subject matter experts, and staff in the Superior Courts of Santa Clara, Ventura, and Shasta.</p> <p>Key Objective Supported: #1</p>	July 2016	<p>The anticipated outcome of this project is to build a foundation for establishing statewide guidelines for effectively and efficiently managing revenue distributions.</p> <p>An anticipated end product is the development of a standardized template to be used statewide, ensuring greater accuracy in revenue distribution efforts.</p>

III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

[List each of the projects that were included in the 2014 Annual Agenda and provide the status for the project.]

#	Project	Completion Date/Status
1	Perform a review of new legislation to determine impact to the State Controller’s Manual of Accounting and Audit Guidelines for Trial Courts (Appendix C) and work with the State Controller’s Office (SCO) to further amend the document.	Completion of legislative review: December 2014 Revision efforts are ongoing as legislation passes which impacts the SCO’s Appendix C.
2	Deliver enhanced training to county/court/city staff who participates in revenue distribution activities to promote a common approach.	Completion: June 2014 A subsequent training was delivered in November 2014. Training conducted bi-annually on an ongoing basis.
3	Initiate a 3-year pilot project to review adherence to the State Controller’s Appendix C.	In progress. Completion anticipated January 2017.

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups: *[For each group listed in Section I, including any proposed “new” subgroups/working groups, provide the below information. For working groups that include members who are not on this advisory body, provide information about the additional members (e.g., from which other advisory bodies), and include the number of representatives from this advisory body as well as additional members on the working group.]*

Subgroup or working group name: Collections Working Group

Purpose of subgroup or working group: To ascertain what information is already available through Enhanced Collections and what would be needed going forward as part of the task force goal to “evaluate and make recommendations regarding the use of comprehensive collection programs authorized by Penal Code section 1463.007.”

Number of advisory body members on the subgroup or working group: 12

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory body): 0

Date formed: March 4, 2011

Number of meetings or how often the subgroup or working group meets: Anticipated to meet quarterly.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: December 2015

Subcommittee or working group name: Data Collections Working Group

Purpose of subcommittee or working group: To resolve issues specific to the citations of statutes that no longer exists and the clarification of how to apply the distribution of those fines/fees collected, to determine whether new citations need to be added to the Appendix C, and to develop a common approach to the lack of uniformity in the current statewide distribution methodology.

Number of advisory group members: 6

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group): 0

Date formed: September 2011

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: Quarterly

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: December 2015

Subcommittee or working group name: Priorities Working Group

Purpose of subcommittee or working group: To examine current county practices with respect to priorities and rankings of distributions and report their findings to the Task Force as one way to meet the Task Force goal to “evaluate and make recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding the priority in which court-ordered debts should be satisfied.”

Number of advisory group members: 9

Number and description of additional members (not on this advisory group): 0

Date formed: March 4, 2011

Number of meetings or how often the group meets: This working group will not begin its work until 2017 after the other stages of the project are completed.

Ongoing or date work is expected to be completed: TBD