



## Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on January 23, 2014

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Branch Technology: Budget Change Proposal Update	Information Only
Submitted by	Date of Report
Judicial Council Technology Committee Hon. James E. Herman, Chair Hon. David De Alba, Vice-Chair	January 16, 2014
	Contact
	Virginia Sanders-Hinds, 415-865-4617 Virginia.Sanders-Hinds@jud.ca.gov Jessica Craven, 818-558-3103 Jessica.Craven@jud.ca.gov

---

### Executive Summary

This informational report allows the Judicial Council Technology Committee to provide an update on the *Fiscal Year 2014–2015 Judicial Branch Budget Change Proposal: Foundation for Digital Courts—Phase One (Case Management Systems Replacement and Expansion of LAN/WAN Telecommunications Program)*.

### Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council voted to stop the deployment of the California Court Case Management System (CCMS V4) at its [March 2012 meeting](#). The council also directed the CCMS Internal Committee, in partnership with the superior courts, to develop timelines and recommendations for assisting courts with existing critical case management system (CMS) needs and for developing a judicial branch court technology governance structure that would best serve the implementation of technology solutions.

Additionally, the council voted to continue maintenance of the interim case management systems, V2 and V3, and directed the CCMS Internal Committee to consider staff

recommendations regarding opportunities for greater cost efficiencies. The committee was directed to return to the council with these recommendations at a future meeting.

In May 2012, the Judicial Branch Technology Initiatives Working Group (JBTIWG) was formed; the working group sponsored the work-stream effort focused on short-term solutions for case management systems, e-filing, and other technologies. In [June 2012](#), the CCMS Internal Committee was renamed the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC). At the [August 30, 2012 Judicial Council meeting](#), Judge James E. Herman, chair of the JCTC, reported that funding restrictions imposed by the Legislature had ended the effort to leverage the external components of the CCMS V4 application.

The [October 2012](#) Judicial Council meeting minutes reported on a technology summit, which was hosted by the JCTC, the Court Technology Advisory Committee, and the JBTIWG with extensive court participation. This gathering helped expand the dialogue between the judicial branch, the Legislature, and the executive branch on court technology. One outcome of the work of the JCTC was the formation of the Technology Planning Task Force (TPTF), charged with defining judicial branch technology governance; developing a strategic plan for technology at the Supreme Court, Court of Appeal, and levels; and developing recommendations for funding judicial branch technology. The JCTC chair has since reported on the work of the JCTC and the TPTF at every Judicial Council meeting.

Replacing failing case management systems is a large concern for the trial courts and a key concern for the JCTC. This concern was confirmed in the 2012 Trial Court Technology Needs Survey, which the Judicial Council directed the JCTC to perform. The funding of the case management system of the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County was included as part of the March 2012 Judicial Council decision. In [February 2013](#), the Judicial Council recommended that the Superior Court of Kings County be funded for case management system replacement. Then, at the [August 2013 Judicial Council meeting](#), the Superior Court of Fresno County received funding to replace its criminal and traffic case management system.

## **Methodology and Process**

The TPTF is developing a technology governance model and a 3-5 year strategic plan for technology along with a 24-month tactical plan. In accordance with input from California Department of Technology, the development of the strategy and plans has been a collaborative process, led by judicial officers and court executives. These plans, scheduled for delivery in 2014, are in alignment with the overall California Judicial Branch strategic plan and will establish a common shared roadmap and common goals identified by Judicial Officers, Court Executive Officers, and Court Information Technology Officers.

The highest priority identified in the proposed Strategic Plan for Technology is establishing the foundation for “digital courts” throughout California with the goals of increasing access to the courts, gaining case processing efficiencies, and improving public safety. Digital courts would provide the services and technology to facilitate public and government agency access to court

information, enabling them to efficiently accomplish their goals when interacting with the courts. The foundation for digital courts includes case management systems, document management systems, and electronic filing systems that meet the diverse needs of individual courts and their constituents while providing common interfaces to ensure interoperability and efficient data exchange.

The courts participating in this BCP, in alignment with the vision of the JCTC, seek to replace systems that are outdated, failing, and inherently risky. The JCTC has been working with the TPTF on a process for evaluating technology projects and determining which projects will be recommended for funding. The TPTF developed a prioritization subgroup to develop criteria and a matrix for evaluating technology projects (Attachment B), and they were approved by the JCTC.

On September 25, 2013, a survey was sent to the trial courts to gauge interest in participating in a budget change proposal (BCP) on case management system replacement. This survey was to identify potential candidates to participate in the BCP, as part of the process to evaluate technology projects. On October 21, 2013, a follow-up request for information was then sent to the courts that had responded to the first survey and indicated a funding need. (Copies of correspondence are included in Attachment B.) This request included a spreadsheet for prioritizing technology projects specifically for case management system replacement, which the courts completed and returned. The findings are summarized in Attachment C. The JCTC met on November 5 and 7 to review the prioritization spreadsheet. On November 8, the JCTC then chose six courts to continue in the selection process: Calaveras, Glenn, Lassen, Los Angeles, Monterey, and San Diego. On November 25, the six courts presented additional information, and on November 26, the JCTC voted to have all six courts continue in the budget change proposal process.

At its October 31, 2013, meeting, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee approved a preliminary recommendation that the council-approved allocation of \$8.74 million for the LAN/WAN program in fiscal year (FY) 2013–2014 be increased by \$6.87 million and that all 58 trial courts benefit from the total allocation of \$15.61 million. The subcommittee is waiting for the Governor to release the 2014–2015 budget proposal before deciding whether to make the recommendation to the full committee. This BCP adds the final four courts—Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego—to the statewide LAN/WAN program and establishes funds for ongoing support to ensure a secure, robust, reliable, and sustainable infrastructure. Currently funding for the LAN/WAN program cannot support all 58 superior courts. This BCP will bridge the gap and provide funding for the four courts not currently participating in the LAN/WAN program.

Specifics about all of the projects are detailed in *Fiscal Year 2014–2015 Judicial Branch Budget Change Proposal: Foundation for Digital Courts—Phase One (Case Management Systems Replacement and Expansion of LAN/WAN Telecommunications Program)* (Attachment D).

## Policy and Cost Implications

The *Prioritization Spreadsheet for Technology Projects* demonstrates a clear, analytical, and transparent process for evaluating and scoring technology projects. The BCP provides an opportunity to use this prioritization model, allowing the JCTC and the TPTF to gather the information necessary to substantiate and prioritize the need for funding. The individual requirements and justifications for funding are detailed in the attached BCP for each specific project. The time to replace the legacy CMSs ranges from 12 to 21 months.

A summary of the projects in this BCP, including costs, is detailed in the following table:

Court	Project Description	One-Time		Ongoing
		FY 14–15	FY 15–16	
Calaveras	Deploy a new vendor-hosted CMS for all case types	\$141,000	\$84,096	\$0
Glenn	Deploy a new vendor-hosted CMS for all case types	\$230,222	\$0	\$0
Lassen	Deploy a new vendor-hosted CMS for all case types	\$371,825	\$0	\$0
Los Angeles	Deploy a new locally hosted CMS for probate cases	\$425,000	\$241,800	\$0
Monterey	Deploy a new locally hosted CMS for civil cases	\$500,000	\$0	\$0
San Diego	Deploy a new locally hosted CMS for family law	\$2,461,483	\$962,947	\$0
Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego	Replace local network infrastructure	\$3,462,120	\$0	\$2,453,522
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$7,591,650</b>	<b>\$1,288,843</b>	<b>\$2,453,522</b>

This BCP for CMS replacements and the expansion of the LAN/WAN program supports the goal of digital courts and the goal of optimizing infrastructure as described in the JCTC strategic plan, the concept of 3D Access as proposed by the Chief Justice, and the necessary investment in technology to meet the needs of the judicial branch in serving the public.

A new CMS would not only eliminate the risk of being tied to unsupported, unreliable legacy case management systems, but would provide the ability to implement current web-based technology that could integrate with other tools and systems to extend the functionality of the CMS. By implementing a new CMS the courts would have the opportunity for e-filing and e-services. With this new technology the courts would have systems that provide for online case information, data sharing, and data exchange with state-run systems such as the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Franchise Tax Board (FTB), the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), the Department of Social Services (DSS), and Child Welfare Services (CWS). For each of these stakeholders, as well as for the courts, self help litigants and families in crisis, a modern CMS offers a number of important advantages.

A new CMS would improve internal court operations through more efficient case processing, enhanced analysis and reporting tools, in-courtroom tools, content (document) management, financial management, and increased information access. A new CMS would increase public access to the judicial system through the availability of online services. Clerks could focus on processing case documents and serving customers filing documents at the court. Courts would have the opportunity to maintain and capture data in a more comprehensive and reliable manner. By increasing the availability and quality of its data the judicial branch would become more transparent, accountable, and credible as more information becomes available online.

The expansion of the LAN/WAN program to include the four courts not currently participating in the program would allow for the leveraging of the branchwide network security program to obtain economies of scale in procurement of equipment and services. The LAN/WAN program focuses on the annual technology refresh of court equipment that manufacturing vendors deem “end of life” or “end of support.” By performing this refresh, courts looking to deploy new technology systems—such as video remote interpretation, video arraignments, VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) multimedia streaming, building automation, and video surveillance—will no longer be limited because of lack of functionality and compatibility of end-of-life products. Maintaining supported network hardware also mitigates the risk of hardware failures that could leave daily courthouse operations vulnerable to security breaches and connectivity failures. Lastly, refreshing the network infrastructure enables improved access to court data, administers timely and much more efficient justice, gains case processing efficiencies, and vastly improves public safety through electronic services for public interaction and collaboration with justice partners.

## **Summary of Findings**

The six courts mentioned above have stated that they have critical case management needs. The expansion of the LAN/WAN project to include the four courts not currently participating in the program allows for leveraging of the branchwide program to obtain economies of scale in procurement of equipment and services.

The implementation of a new CMS for the six courts is expected to yield significant operational benefits. Listed below is a high-level summary of these expected benefits:

- Provide the courts with a CMS that can integrate with a document management system (DMS) that supports e-filing and e-services. The integration of the CMS, e-filing, and DMS would enable the courts to automate manual tasks and work processes, allowing the courts to manage their cases with greater efficiency and to use their staffing resources more productively.
- Provide the courts with the ability to share online case information and implement data exchanges with their state and local justice partners. Exchanging case information electronically with justice partners reduces errors possible with manual entry; improves case processing, helping to reduce backlog; and results in faster decisions in the courtroom, providing for shorter case life cycles and more timely justice.
- Increase the public's access to the judicial system through the availability of online services, such as determining the status of filings or confirming the dates of upcoming hearings. Providing the public online access allows the clerks to focus on processing case documents or serving customers who are filing documents at the window.
- Maintain and capture data in a more comprehensive and reliable manner. By increasing the availability and quality of data, the judicial branch would become more transparent, accountable, and credible as more information becomes available online.
- Provide the ability to reduce, and in some instances eliminate, the need for physical storage of files, which would create the potential for significant court savings.

### **Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives**

The budget change proposal addresses several strategic goals:

- Goal I, Access, Fairness, and Diversity
- Goal III, Modernization of Management and Administration
- Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
- Goal VI, Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

### **Attachments**

1. Attachment A: *Prioritization Spreadsheet for Technology Projects*
2. Attachment B: Communication to trial courts, including survey on participation in case management system replacement budget change proposal
3. Attachment C: Results of survey on participation in case management system replacement budget change proposal
4. Attachment D: *Fiscal Year 2014–2015 Judicial Branch Budget Change Proposal: Foundation for Digital Courts—Phase One (Case Management Systems Replacement and Expansion of LAN/WAN Telecommunications Program)*

## Prioritization Spreadsheet for Technology Projects

<b>Court Name</b>	
<b>Submitter's Name</b>	
<b>Requested Funds</b>	
<b>Project Description</b>	

Project Evaluation Criteria		Response	Comments
<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	Alignment with Branch Strategic Goals (Access)	<b>4-6 Goals</b>	
	Alignment with Branch Technology Priorities	<b>High</b>	
	External partner Alignment		
<b>External Impact</b>	Public Benefit		
	Justice Partner Benefit		
<b>Benefit Realization</b>	Scope of impact		
	Financial ROI		
	Likelihood of benefit realization		
<b>Organizational Risk Mitigation</b>	Urgency for change - operations		
	Urgency for change - legal/regulatory/compliance		
	Organization readiness		
<b>Technology Alignment / Fit</b>	Level of alignment with branch-wide technology standards		
	Level of alignment with branch-wide vendors		
	Level of alignment with branch architecture		
<b>Technology Risk</b>	Existing infrastructure can support this project		
	Identified tech staff can support this technology		
	Product / technology maturity		

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Oyung [<mailto:ROyung@scscourt.org>]  
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 12:18 PM  
To: Oyung, Robert  
Cc: Craven, Jessica; Stewart, Renea; Sanders-Hinds, Virginia; Dusman, Mark  
Subject: RE: ACTION 2: BCP survey to Trial Courts on Case Management Systems

Just a reminder that responses are due by the end of the day tomorrow, Friday October 25.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,  
-rob

Robert Oyung  
Chief Information Officer  
Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara  
191 North First St. San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 882-2802  
[royung@scscourt.org](mailto:royung@scscourt.org)  
[www.scscourt.org](http://www.scscourt.org)

---

From: Robert Oyung/Superior Court  
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 2:59 PM  
Cc: 'Jessica.Craven@jud.ca.gov'; 'jherman@sbcourts.org';  
'Curt.Soderlund@jud.ca.gov'; 'Mark.Dusman@jud.ca.gov'; 'Virginia.Sanders-Hinds@jud.ca.gov'; 'Renea.Stewart@jud.ca.gov'; '"Chatters, Jake"  
<[jchatters@placer.courts.ca.gov](mailto:jchatters@placer.courts.ca.gov)>'; 'Ashmann-Gerst, Judith';  
'DJBuckley@LASuperiorCourt.org'; 'rmoos@occourts.org';  
'bcotta@fresno.courts.ca.gov'; 'Ynson, Charlene'; 'Bruiniers, Terence';  
'jkalyvas@foley.com'; '"Slough, Marsha" <[mslough@sb-court.org](mailto:mslough@sb-court.org)>';  
'ira.kaufman@plumas.courts.ca.gov'; 'glen.reiser@ventura.courts.ca.gov';  
'Sherri R. Carter'  
Subject: ACTION 2: BCP survey to Trial Courts on Case Management Systems

TO: Courts that responded to the BCP survey and indicated a funding need  
(note: addresses have been bcc)

cc: Technology Planning Task Force

Thank you for responding to the BCP survey to Trial Courts on Case Management Systems.

We are following up with you to provide additional information so that you can determine if you wish to submit additional data to be considered for participating in the upcoming BCP request.

1. We do not anticipate receiving much funding from this initial request but will expect more from future ones.
2. The Judicial Council Technology Committee will be using the previously shared prioritization criteria for selecting courts with the highest need to participate in this BCP request.
3. Based on the short timeframe for preparation and the intent to pilot new processes, we anticipate including no more than 3 courts in this initial BCP request for no more than \$5 million in requested funds.
4. If approved by the Department of Finance, we anticipate that funds would be available for distribution in July 2014 for courts to purchase a replacement CMS.
5. Although this amount may not fund a full case management system for some courts, it may provide enough funding to replace a single critical case type.
6. Remember that participating - or choosing not to participate - in this survey will not exclude your court from future funding opportunities.
7. Once we complete this second round of data gathering, the Technology Committee will use the prioritization criteria to select the courts to include in the BCP. These courts will need to then provide detailed program and financial information to complete the BCP request that will be sent to the Department of Finance.

If you would like to be considered for participation in this BCP, please fill out the attached spreadsheet and submit it by replying to this email by the end of the day this Friday October 25. Please do not "reply to all".

(See attached file: Tech Prioritization Survey v2.xlsx) We've simplified the request by providing selection boxes for you to use to choose your answer. Please see the second tab labeled "Alignment Measurement Guide" for clarification on how to fill out the form (e.g. ROI determination).

If you have any questions, please let me know.  
-rob

Robert Oyung  
Chief Information Officer  
Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara  
191 North First St. San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 882-2802  
[royung@scscourt.org](mailto:royung@scscourt.org)  
[www.scscourt.org](http://www.scscourt.org)

---

From: Robert Oyung/Superior Court  
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 9:25 AM  
To: [tgerou@amadorcourt.org](mailto:tgerou@amadorcourt.org); [amiller@buttecourt.ca.gov](mailto:amiller@buttecourt.ca.gov);  
[jrobertson@calaveras.courts.ca.gov](mailto:jrobertson@calaveras.courts.ca.gov); [dglab@contracosta.courts.ca.gov](mailto:dglab@contracosta.courts.ca.gov);  
[agiron@eldoradocourt.org](mailto:agiron@eldoradocourt.org); [bcotta@fresno.courts.ca.gov](mailto:bcotta@fresno.courts.ca.gov);  
[russellc@humboldtcourt.ca.gov](mailto:russellc@humboldtcourt.ca.gov); [ralph.meza@imperial.courts.ca.gov](mailto:ralph.meza@imperial.courts.ca.gov);  
[jeff.roberts@inyocourt.ca.gov](mailto:jeff.roberts@inyocourt.ca.gov); [tim.davis@kern.courts.ca.gov](mailto:tim.davis@kern.courts.ca.gov);  
[kdones@kings.courts.ca.gov](mailto:kdones@kings.courts.ca.gov); [melissa.perry@lake.courts.ca.gov](mailto:melissa.perry@lake.courts.ca.gov);  
[diane.stjacques@lassencourt.ca.gov](mailto:diane.stjacques@lassencourt.ca.gov); [kristina.wyatt@madera.courts.ca.gov](mailto:kristina.wyatt@madera.courts.ca.gov);  
[dorothy.mccarthy@marincourt.org](mailto:dorothy.mccarthy@marincourt.org); [richardb@mariposacourt.org](mailto:richardb@mariposacourt.org);  
[robert.parrott@mendocino.courts.ca.gov](mailto:robert.parrott@mendocino.courts.ca.gov); [Gus.Solidum@mercedcourt.org](mailto:Gus.Solidum@mercedcourt.org);  
[hgonzalez@monocourt.org](mailto:hgonzalez@monocourt.org); [paras.gupta@monterey.courts.ca.gov](mailto:paras.gupta@monterey.courts.ca.gov);  
[jeannette.vannoy@napa.courts.ca.gov](mailto:jeannette.vannoy@napa.courts.ca.gov);  
[david.schlothauer@nevadacountycourts.com](mailto:david.schlothauer@nevadacountycourts.com); [sogata@occourts.org](mailto:sogata@occourts.org);  
[Gharding@placer.courts.ca.gov](mailto:Gharding@placer.courts.ca.gov); [gary.whitehead@riverside.courts.ca.gov](mailto:gary.whitehead@riverside.courts.ca.gov);  
[heather.pettit@saccourt.ca.gov](mailto:heather.pettit@saccourt.ca.gov); [ACrouse@sb-court.org](mailto:ACrouse@sb-court.org);  
[celeste.schwartz@sdcourt.ca.gov](mailto:celeste.schwartz@sdcourt.ca.gov); [ronho@sftc.org](mailto:ronho@sftc.org); [atran@courts.san-joaquin.ca.us](mailto:atran@courts.san-joaquin.ca.us);  
[doug.jones@slo.courts.ca.gov](mailto:doug.jones@slo.courts.ca.gov); [rwalery@sanmateocourt.org](mailto:rwalery@sanmateocourt.org); [jbrock@sbcourts.org](mailto:jbrock@sbcourts.org);  
[bpeterson@scscourt.org](mailto:bpeterson@scscourt.org); [michelle.duarte@santacruzcourt.org](mailto:michelle.duarte@santacruzcourt.org);  
[kbell@shastacourts.com](mailto:kbell@shastacourts.com); [lkirby@sierracourt.org](mailto:lkirby@sierracourt.org); [cbrown@siskiyou.courts.ca.gov](mailto:cbrown@siskiyou.courts.ca.gov);  
[adcreiglow@solanocourts.com](mailto:adcreiglow@solanocourts.com); [dchulick@sonomacourt.org](mailto:dchulick@sonomacourt.org); [mike.cole@stanct.org](mailto:mike.cole@stanct.org) ;  
[jsweet@suttercourts.com](mailto:jsweet@suttercourts.com); [ksmith@suttercourts.com](mailto:ksmith@suttercourts.com); [ndilouie@tehamacourt.ca.gov](mailto:ndilouie@tehamacourt.ca.gov);  
[DWhitfield@tulare.courts.ca.gov](mailto:DWhitfield@tulare.courts.ca.gov); [gstowers@tuolumne.courts.ca.gov](mailto:gstowers@tuolumne.courts.ca.gov);  
[pat.patterson@ventura.courts.ca.gov](mailto:pat.patterson@ventura.courts.ca.gov);  
[gesposito@yolo.courts.ca.gov](mailto:gesposito@yolo.courts.ca.gov); [mpugh@yubacourts.org](mailto:mpugh@yubacourts.org)  
Cc: [CourtExecs-ALL@jud.ca.gov](mailto:CourtExecs-ALL@jud.ca.gov); [Jessica.Craven@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Jessica.Craven@jud.ca.gov); [jherman@sbcourts.org](mailto:jherman@sbcourts.org);  
[Curt.Soderlund@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Curt.Soderlund@jud.ca.gov); [Mark.Dusman@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Mark.Dusman@jud.ca.gov); [Virginia.Sanders-Hinds@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Virginia.Sanders-Hinds@jud.ca.gov); [Renea.Stewart@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Renea.Stewart@jud.ca.gov)  
Subject: ACTION: BCP survey to Trial Courts on Case Management Systems

CIOs and IT Directors,

Please work with your CEO to complete this survey.

Thank you in advance for your participation in a survey on your court's case management system needs. The Administrative Office of the Courts is preparing a FY 14-15 Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to be submitted to the Department of Finance to request additional funding for trial courts with failing/urgent case management system needs.

This survey will identify potential candidates to participate in the BCP. We do not anticipate receiving much funding from this initial request but will expect more from future ones.

Participating - or choosing not to participate - in this survey will not exclude your court from future funding opportunities.

Once we receive the survey responses, we will ask the courts with the highest need to submit more information so that we can identify the courts to include in the BCP.

The criteria used to select the courts will be the Evaluation and Approval Process that is being developed by the Technology Planning Task Force and is included here for your reference. This BCP will be the pilot for using the established criteria.

<< File: DRAFT JC Tech Prioritization 2013.09.12 summary.xlsx >> Please reply to his email to answer the questions below by Friday September 27, 2014. Please make sure that you DO NOT reply to all.

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Court: \_\_\_\_\_

Questions:

1. Please rate on a scale of 1 - 10 your court's need to replace its case management system.  
(Note that 10 is worst e.g., a failing case management system, in immediate need for replacement.): \_\_\_\_\_
2. Specify the timeframe/date the court's current case management is expected to no longer be viable:  
\_\_\_\_\_

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks,  
-rob

Robert Oyung  
Chief Information Officer  
Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara  
191 North First St. San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 882-2802  
[royung@scscourt.org](mailto:royung@scscourt.org)  
[www.scscourt.org](http://www.scscourt.org)

Note: Courts highlighted in green participated in second round of survey.

Court	Need (10=high)	Date	Notes	Respondent
San Diego	10	2013	See comments	Celeste Schwartz
Tulare	10	2013	See comments	Deon_Whitfield
Monterey	10	2013	See comments	Paras Gupta
Los Angeles	10	2013	See separate tab	Janice Teramura
Sierra	10	2014	See comments	Jean-Anne Cheatham, on behalf of Lee E. Kirby
Sacramento	10	2014	See comments	Chris Volkers
San Joaquin	9	2014		Anh Tran
Mendocino	9	2014		April Allen / Robert Parrott
Calaveras	9	2014	See comments	Hugh Swift
Napa	8	2015		Rick Feldstein
Orange	8	2015	See comments	Snorri Ogata
Butte	8	2016	See comments	Anthony Miller
Glenn	8	2016	See comments	Janelle Bartlett
San Mateo	7	2014	See separate tab	Rick Walery
Contra Costa	7		See comments	David Glab
Mariposa	6	2016		Richard Blalock
Lassen	6	2016	See comments	Andi Ashby
Humboldt	6	2017		Russ Catalan
San Bernardino	6	2018		Alan Crouse
Tuolumne	5	2016		Glenn Stowers
Solano	5	2018	See comments	Adam Creiglow
Madera	4	2015	See comments	Kristina Wyatt
Imperial	4	2018		Kristine Kussman & Ralph Meza
Plumas	4		See comments	Deborah W. Norrie
Del Norte	3			Sandra Linderman
San Benito	2	2017	See comments	Nancy Iler
Marin	2	2019	See comments	Kim Turner
Mono	2		See comments	Hector Gonzalez
Shasta	2			Kristel Bell
Trinity	2		See comments	Staci Holliday for Laurie Wills
Siskiyou				Mary Frances McHugh
Merced				Linda Romero-Soles

FISCAL YEAR  
2014 – 2015  
JUDICIAL BRANCH  
BUDGET CHANGE  
PROPOSAL

---

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL COURTS -  
PHASE ONE (CASE MANAGEMENT  
SYSTEMS REPLACEMENT AND  
EXPANSION OF LAN/WAN  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM)



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 03/13)

Fiscal Year 14/15	BCP No. TC3	Org. Code 250	Department Judicial Branch	Priority No. 3
Program 30, 45			Element 05,10,15	Component

**Proposal Title**

Foundation for Digital Courts – Phase One (Case Management System Replacement and Expansion of LAN/WAN Telecommunications program)

**Proposal Summary**

The Judicial Council proposes a one-time General Fund augmentation of \$8,969,151, and an ongoing General Fund augmentation of \$2,498,412. The one-time augmentation, requiring \$7,680,308 in FY 2014-2015 and \$1,288,843 in FY 2015-2016, would support the deployment of new case management systems for the Superior Courts of Calaveras, Glenn, Lassen, Los Angeles, Monterey, and San Diego County, and expansion of the local area network/wide area network (LAN/WAN) telecommunications network infrastructure program to support all 58 courts by including the Superior Courts of Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego County. Ongoing funds would support the maintenance of the LAN/WAN program expansion, including funding for two full time equivalent (FTE) positions.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date
---	----------------	------

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the California Technology Agency, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR     SPR                      Project No.                      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?     Yes     No  
*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	Date	Agency Secretary	Date

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Technology Agency

BCP Type:                       Policy                       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
------	-----------------------------------

## Analysis of Problem

### A. Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council proposes a one-time General Fund augmentation of \$8,969,151, and an ongoing General Fund augmentation of \$2,498,412. The one-time augmentation, requiring \$7,680,308 in FY 2014-2015 and \$1,288,843 in FY 2015-2016, would support the deployment of new case management systems for the Superior Courts of Calaveras, Glenn, Lassen, Los Angeles, Monterey, and San Diego County, and expansion of the local area network/wide area network (LAN/WAN) telecommunications network infrastructure program to support all 58 courts by including the Superior Courts of Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego County. Ongoing funds would support the maintenance of the LAN/WAN program expansion, including funding for two full time equivalent (FTE) positions.

The table below summarizes the projects included in this BCP.

Court	Project Description	One-Time		On-going
		FY 14-15	FY 15-16	
Calaveras	Deploy a new vendor-hosted CMS for all case types	\$141,000	\$84,096	\$0
Glenn	Deploy a new vendor-hosted CMS for all case types	\$230,222	\$0	\$0
Lassen	Deploy a new vendor-hosted CMS for all case types	\$371,825	\$0	\$0
Los Angeles	Deploy a new locally-hosted CMS for Probate cases	\$425,000	\$241,800	\$0
Monterey	Deploy a new locally-hosted CMS for Civil cases	\$500,000	\$0	\$0
San Diego	Deploy a new locally-hosted CMS for Family Law	\$2,461,483	\$962,947	\$0
Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego	Replace local network infrastructure	\$3,550,778	\$0	\$2,498,412
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$7,680,308</b>	<b>\$1,288,843</b>	<b>\$2,498,412</b>

### B. Background/History (Provide relevant background/history and provide program resource history. Provide workload metrics, if applicable.)

California's court system serves a population of more than 38 million people, approximately 12.1 percent of the total U.S. population, and processed almost 8.5 million cases in fiscal year 2011–2012. The \$3.1 billion judicial branch budget represents about 2.1 percent of the California state budget for the current 2013-2014 fiscal year, and makes possible the case-processing activity detailed above while also providing the basis of support for approximately 2,000 judicial officers and 19,000 court employees statewide. (Reference: 2013 Court Statistics Report)

Case management is the foundation of court operations, and includes tracking and recording case information, processing and managing filings, and collecting and reporting on revenues from filings,

## Analysis of Problem

finances and fees. Effective and efficient case management is essential for courts to function productively, especially in the new digital era. For a decade, until early 2012, the technology strategy for the judicial branch was the deployment of a single branchwide case management system (CMS) to serve all trial courts, improve public access and integrate with justice partners. The strategy for this branchwide CMS solution recognized the need for an advanced technology infrastructure as a key component of the initiative. On March 27, 2012, the Judicial Council made the decision to cancel the deployment of the branchwide CMS due to budgetary constraints.

Although deployment of the branchwide CMS initiative was canceled, the technology needs of the courts remained. In October 2012, the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) in partnership with the Court Technology Advisory Committee and other branch stakeholders held a technology summit. At this summit and during subsequent meetings, representatives from the executive branch's California Department of Technology (CDT) made it clear that additional funding for technology initiatives would depend on the ability of the branch to establish a sound long-term strategy for technology. Key to this strategy will be the ability of the branch to address technology planning and governance with buy-in from the courts. Following the summit, the Chief Justice authorized the creation of a Technology Planning Task Force focused on judicial branch technology governance, strategic planning, and funding. The task force adopted this vision statement: "Through collaboration, initiative, and innovation on a statewide and local level, the judicial branch adopts and uses technology to improve access to justice and provide a more broad range, and higher quality of services to the courts, litigants, lawyers, justice partners and the public." This vision statement sets the direction for future technology initiatives.

The task force is developing a technology governance model and a 3-5 year strategic plan for technology along with a 24-month tactical plan. In accordance with input from CDT, the development of the strategy and plans has been a collaborative process, led by court judicial officers and court executives. These plans, scheduled for delivery in 2014, are in alignment with the overall California Judicial Branch strategic plan and will establish a common shared roadmap and common goals identified by Judicial Officers, Court Executive Officers, and Court Information Technology Officers, while recognizing the opportunity for individual courts to innovate and leverage solutions as a branch or in a multi-court consortium.

The highest priority identified in the proposed Strategic Plan for Technology is establishing the foundation for "digital courts" throughout California with the goals of increasing access to the courts, gaining case processing efficiencies, and improving public safety. Digital courts would provide the services and technology to facilitate public and government agency access to court information, enabling them to efficiently accomplish their goals when interacting with the courts. The foundation for digital courts includes case management systems, document management systems, and electronic filing systems that meet the diverse needs of individual courts and their constituents while providing common interfaces to ensure interoperability and efficient data exchange.

The courts participating in this BCP, in alignment with the vision of the Judicial Council Technology Committee, seek to replace systems that are outdated, failing, and inherently risky. With case management as a core service for court operations, a system failure carries the risk of a widespread outage for an unknown duration. The ability to recover would depend upon the technology and availability of resources to address the problem. A system failure would result in a direct, negative impact to court services and the ability of the court to serve the public.

In addition to the replacement of failing case management systems, telecommunications is also key. The LAN/WAN proposal is focused on updating the network infrastructure for the four courts—the Superior Courts of Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego County—not currently participating in the infrastructure program and therefore not able to benefit from this branchwide initiative. When the LAN/WAN program was implemented, the Los Angeles Superior Court did not participate in the refresh program due to the complex integration in place with their county justice partners and the need for a more aggressive refresh cycle. The Orange Superior Court did not participate because a new network infrastructure had been deployed at the time of the program startup. Similarly, the San Diego Superior Court had deployed a new network infrastructure throughout the court to support local projects, at the time of the program startup. In later years San Diego did participate in two smaller LAN/WAN

## Analysis of Problem

infrastructure deployments—wireless and network access control. Funding through this BCP will enable all courts to benefit from the LAN/WAN program.

The LAN/WAN refresh program enables trial courts to physically separate from their county network, eliminate their dependence on the county infrastructure and establish a secure, robust and reliable network. Core to the LAN/WAN program is the replacement of network infrastructure equipment that is deemed to be “end-of-life” or “end-of-support” by the manufacturers. These products and devices are considered obsolete and are no longer sold, manufactured, improved, repaired, maintained or supported. These products are not eligible for security patches or maintenance contracts, which leaves the courts vulnerable to security breaches and connectivity failures.

Stable, dependable, and current technology is required for the case management systems that provide core services for the courts; a reliable and robust network infrastructure is essential for all systems serving the courts, justice partners, and the public.

### C. State Level Considerations

The development of digital courts is consistent with the following Judicial Branch strategic goals:

- Goal I – Access, Fairness and Diversity
- Goal III – Modernization of Management and Administration
- Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
- Goal VI – Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

This foundation for digital courts is aligned with the vision conveyed by the Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye in a video update posted on August 14, 2013. In this update, the Chief Justice outlined a vision for restoring access to justice for Californians through an effort called "Access 3D." (<http://www.courts.ca.gov/13805.htm>). The vision for Access 3D is better service and benefits to the public through physical access to court facilities, remote access to court services; and equal access to court resources, which aligns with the goals for digital courts to improve access, administer timely and efficient justice, and gain processing efficiencies.

Through alignment with the goals listed above, the programs supported by this request will enable the courts to implement technology solutions that:

- Enable the timely exchange of data between the courts, law enforcement agencies and justice partners;
- Increase access to the judicial system through available online services;
- Provide online access to case information;
- Allow parties to e-file documents;
- Support workflow for more efficient case processing;
- Provide more efficient analysis and reporting tools; and
- Provide a security framework to protect branch and justice partner information.

There are no known or anticipated adverse impacts.

### D. Justification

In recent years, the trial courts have sustained significant reductions in funding while also facing constraints in FY 2014-2015 on their ability to make capital investments in the replacement of court technology. Since FY 2008-2009, the amount from the state General Fund provided to support state trial court funding has seen an ongoing reduction of \$663.8 million with trial courts' base allocations reduced \$415.1 million. In addition, in FY 2014-2015 a cap of 1 percent of trial courts' operational expenditures will be placed on the amount of courts' reserves that they can retain.

## Analysis of Problem

In February 2013, in conversation with Public Policy Institute President Mark Baldassare, the Chief Justice highlighted the reductions to the entire judicial branch and went on to say “All the while our caseload remains the same, we continue to provide a forum for justice....it means disparate justice, and in some it means no access to justice.”

The recent and continuing budget reductions have required the courts to do more with fewer resources. Over the last several years, the courts reduced operational costs in numerous areas, implemented furloughs, did not fill vacant positions, and limited internal promotions to reduce costs. Economic challenges have resulted in reductions to court staff, a reduction in business hours at all court branches, and the temporary closure of courthouses.

Business hours reductions and courthouse closures have limited access to court services for the public. As a result public access to documents in some court facilities is limited in hours per week. Lines during these time periods are frustrating for the public and overwhelming for court staff. It is imperative that the courts implement innovative and cost-effective ways to resume and enhance public access to necessary court services.

The challenges the courts encounter due to reduced resources are further heightened due to outdated and antiquated systems built on platforms that are difficult and expensive to update, often with limited or no vendor support. The incompatibility of old technology with current platforms causes challenges for the courts. One example is not being able to use common web-based services such as online search features for case information, online payments, and e-filing. The courts that are seeking funding under this BCP have systems that range from outdated, antiquated ones that were implemented 18 years ago, are expensive to maintain, and lack vendor support, to systems which are stable but technically inadequate for today’s digital environment.

The proposed Strategic Plan for Technology, currently in development by the Technology Planning Task Force (TPTF), provides guidance for courts seeking to implement modern case management systems, which are key to the foundation of digital courts and e-business. By replacing legacy case management systems, many of which cannot interface with current technology solutions, the courts will be able to achieve operational efficiencies, expand public access, and promote information sharing. By expanding the LAN/WAN infrastructure program, additional courts will have a stable network infrastructure capable of supporting core systems as well as the opportunity to leverage economies of scale across the branch.

This investment in new technology will enable the courts to mitigate the impact of the reduction in court resources by leveraging technology to reduce case backlogs, managing future growth and allowing greater public access through online services. This investment also supports the guidance provided by CDT, to enter into consortiums as a means of leveraging resources for court case management solutions. Three of the six courts have joined together to collaborate on a Software as a Service (SaaS) implementation which would yield several benefits. They would have predictable annual costs. There would be no additional costs for hardware, software licenses or maintenance and support. Their individual deployment cost would be substantially lower as part of the consortium.

Listed below is a high-level justification for each request addressed in this BCP. More detailed information about each court is included in their section of the BCP submission:

### **1. Calaveras Superior Court**

The Calaveras Superior Court is one of seven courts participating in the Nor Cal Collaboration Project (NCCP) to deploy the Tyler Odyssey CMS as a replacement for the Court’s current COBOL case management system with a modern web-based solution for all case types. The new Odyssey CMS would be hosted at the vendor’s data center under an agreement defined as “Software as a Service” (SaaS). Under this agreement the vendor provides the software and hardware necessary to run the application. The court has access to their case management system and their data but they do not require technical staff to support the system on a daily basis. Project implementation costs are based on the number of users and the courts will receive a discounted rate based on the agreement to work as a consortium, use a

## Analysis of Problem

standard configuration and share resources. The NCCP collaboration presents the best opportunity for the Court to move forward with a new CMS as it provides economies of scale in terms of financial and staff resources, and is the least costly alternative for the court.

### **2. Glenn Superior Court**

The Glenn Superior Court is one of seven courts participating in the Nor Cal Collaboration Project (NCCP) to deploy the Tyler Odyssey CMS as a replacement for the Court's current COBOL case management system with a modern web-based solution for all case types. The new Odyssey CMS would be hosted at the vendor's data center under an agreement defined as "Software as a Service" (SaaS). Under this agreement the vendor provides the software and hardware necessary to run the application. The court has access to their case management system and their data but they do not require technical staff to support the system on a daily basis. Project implementation costs are based on the number of users and the courts will receive a discounted rate based on the agreement to work as a consortium, use a standard configuration and share resources. The NCCP collaboration presents the best opportunity for the Court to move forward with a new CMS as it provides economies of scale in terms of financial and staff resources and has a return on investment (ROI) of 23 percent.

### **3. Lassen Superior Court**

The Lassen Superior Court is one of seven courts participating in the Nor Cal Collaboration Project (NCCP) to deploy the Tyler Odyssey CMS as a replacement for the court's COBOL case management system with a modern web-based solution for all case types. The new Odyssey CMS would be hosted at the vendor's data center under an agreement defined as "Software as a Service" (SaaS). Under this agreement the vendor provides the software and hardware necessary to run the application. The court has access to their case management system and their data but they do not require technical staff to support the system on a daily basis. Project implementation costs are based on the number of users and the courts will receive a discounted rate based on the agreement to work as a consortium, use a standard configuration and share resources. The NCCP collaboration presents the best opportunity for the Court to move forward with a new CMS as it provides economies of scale in terms of financial and staff resources and is the least costly alternative for the court.

### **4. Los Angeles Superior Court**

The Los Angeles Superior Court project replaces a probate case management system that has been in operation for 18 years, has limited functionality, is incompatible with standard computer operating systems, and presents an obstacle to other technology projects. Probate services which had previously been provided at 9 courthouses have been centralized to a single Central Probate courthouse. With reduced physical access, electronic filing will make it more convenient for the public to submit documents to the court. The project has a projected ROI of 18 percent.

### **5. Monterey Superior Court**

The Monterey Superior Court project replaces the existing CMS for the civil case category which includes civil limited, civil unlimited, family law, probate, and small claims case types. The current CMS is built on antiquated technology, is expensive to support and maintain, and is technologically deficient. Economic challenges have resulted in a reduction of 25 percent of court staff, a reduction in business hours and the temporary closure of the King City Courthouse. Public access to documents in civil court is limited to 18 hours per week. The replacement of the existing CMS is expected to relieve staff overload, improve communication, and increase accessibility. The project has a projected ROI of 65 percent.

### **6. San Diego Superior Court**

The San Diego Superior Court project replaces the existing DOS-based Family Law system developed in 1973. Due to budget challenges, the court has reduced court-wide staff costs by \$33 million annually. The court's processing time has increased from 48 hours to 4 months, requiring the public to wait a substantial amount of time for critical life decisions. By replacing the legacy family law CMS the court will gain case processing efficiencies and achieve a projected ROI of 10 percent.

### **7. LAN/WAN Project**

The LAN/WAN project adds the final four courts: Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego to the branchwide LAN/WAN program and establishes funds for ongoing support to ensure a secure, robust,

## Analysis of Problem

reliable, and sustainable infrastructure. The expansion of the LAN/WAN program to include the four courts not currently participating in the program allows for the leveraging of the branchwide network security program to obtain economies of scale in procurement of equipment and services compared to those same services procured by individual courts.

### **E. Outcomes and Accountability** *(Provide projected workload metrics that reflect how this proposal improves the metrics outlined in the Background/History section.)*

For the six courts deploying a new CMS, each court will be responsible for monitoring the day-to-day activities of their project and will make periodic reports regarding program performance and financial status. Courts will also coordinate with the AOC to account for and monitor the funds on a periodic basis. Standard forms and reports will be used by the courts in accordance with procedures under the Independent Verification and Validation process. Accounting records will be supported by appropriate documentation. The courts will provide information regarding any and all fund expenditures to the AOC. The information requested may include, but is not limited to, performance and financial reports. Performance reports shall contain a comparison of actual accomplishments to the objectives, for the reporting period. Results will be quantified where possible.

The AOC administers the LAN/WAN program by providing subject matter expertise for all network designs, managing the procurement, deployment and testing of all equipment and services leveraging existing CALNET Master Service Agreements. An assigned AOC project manager will be responsible for coordination of resources, monitoring daily activities, making weekly status reports regarding the progress and financial status of the project, reporting directly to the AOC program manager. The weekly status reports shall contain the list of accomplished objectives versus the scheduled objectives for the reporting period. All capital assets purchased as part of this program will be tracked by the court's local asset tracking methodology for the life of the devices. Expanding the LAN/WAN program to include the four additional courts will require the addition of two new FTEs. The FTE positions are permanent, providing a Senior Business Systems Analyst and a Senior Technical Analyst, at the same rate of pay. The ongoing annual expenditure for the two FTE positions is \$321,165.

### **F. Analysis of All Feasible Alternatives**

#### **Alternative 1**

The recommended solution is for the six trial courts included in this BCP to replace their legacy case management systems with a new CMS and to expand the LAN/WAN telecommunications network infrastructure program to include four additional courts. Listed below is a table identifying the amount of funding requested by fiscal-year for each project:

## Analysis of Problem

Court	Project Description	One-Time		On-going
		FY 14-15	FY 15-16	
Calaveras	Deploy a new CMS for all case types that is vendor hosted	\$141,000	\$84,096	\$0
Glenn	Deploy a new CMS for all case types that is vendor hosted	\$230,222	\$0	\$0
Lassen	Deploy CMS for all case types that is vendor hosted	\$371,825	\$0	\$0
Los Angeles	Deploy CMS for Probate cases that is locally hosted	\$425,000	\$241,800	\$0
Monterey	Deploy CMS for Civil cases that is locally hosted	\$500,000	\$0	\$0
San Diego	Deploy CMS for Family Law that is locally hosted	\$2,461,483	\$962,947	\$0
Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego	Local network infrastructure replacement	\$3,550,778	\$0	\$2,498,412
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$7,680,308</b>	<b>\$1,288,843</b>	<b>\$2,498,412</b>

The six courts seeking to replace their legacy CMS have an opportunity for both technical and operational improvements.

A new CMS would not only eliminate the risk of being tied to unsupported, unreliable legacy case management systems, but would provide the ability to implement current web-based technology that could integrate with other tools and systems to extend the functionality of the CMS. By implementing a new CMS the courts would have the opportunity for integration with a document management system (DMS) that supports e-filing and e-services. With this new technology the courts would have systems that provide for online case information, data sharing, and data exchange with state-run systems such as the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Franchise Tax Board (FTB), the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), the Department of Social Services (DSS), and Child Welfare Services (CWS). For each of these stakeholders, as well as for the courts, self help litigants and families in crisis, a modern CMS offers a number of important advantages.

The integration of CMS, e-filing, and DMS would enable the courts to automate manual tasks and work processes that would allow the courts to manage their cases with greater efficiency and to use their staffing resources more productively. Electronic documents would be accessible to multiple people and provide a source of cost recovery for the courts as litigants, and interested persons or entities seek copies of specific case filings. New technology provides the ability to reduce and in some instances eliminate the need for physical storage of files. This creates the potential for significant savings. Exchanging case information electronically reduces errors due to manual entry, and improves case processing—which reduces backlogs—resulting in faster decisions in the courtroom, shorter case lifecycles, and more timely justice.

A new CMS would improve internal court operations through more efficient case processing, enhanced analysis and reporting tools, in-courtroom tools, content (document) management, financial management, and increased information access. The new systems would include calendaring and docketing and would support workflow processes to reduce the number of discrete processing tasks and to create efficiencies which are needed to operate with fewer resources. Court executives could generate productivity reports and other data which can help to effectively manage resources and improve performance and customer service.

## Analysis of Problem

A new CMS would increase public access to the judicial system through the availability of online services. The CMS would provide online access to case information such as dockets and events, which would allow court users to determine the status of filings or confirm dates for upcoming hearings without visiting the clerk's office. In turn, that clerk could focus on processing case documents or on serving customers filing documents at the window. The system would allow parties to e-file documents with the court and, once integrated with the court's document management system, to review documents from a remote location.

A new CMS would allow the courts to maintain and capture data in a more comprehensive and reliable manner. By increasing the availability and quality of its data the judicial branch would become more transparent, accountable, and credible as more information becomes available online. Having a portal for the public and for justice partners would provide a security framework to protect branch and justice partner information while increasing the timely exchange of data between the courts, law enforcement agencies, and justice partners.

The expansion of the LAN/WAN program to include the four courts not currently participating in the program would allow for the leveraging of the branchwide network security program to obtain economies of scale in procurement of equipment and services compared to those same services procured by an individual court. The LAN/WAN program focuses on the annual technology refresh of court equipment that is deemed to be "end-of-life" or "end-of-support" by the manufacturing vendors. This equipment is considered obsolete and is no longer sold, manufactured, improved, repaired, maintained, or supported by the manufacturer. Equipment designated as end-of-life no longer is eligible for security patches or maintenance contracts. By performing this refresh, courts looking to deploy new technology systems, such as video remote interpretation, video arraignments, VOIP (Voice-over-IP) multimedia streaming, building automation and video surveillance will no longer be limited due to lack of functionality and compatibility of older end-of-life products. In addition, refreshing the network infrastructure enables improved access to court data, administers timely and much more efficient justice, gains case processing efficiencies and vastly improves public safety through electronic services for public interaction and collaboration with justice partners.

Hardware failures could leave daily courthouse operations vulnerable to security breaches and connectivity failures. Courts would have to research, procure and deploy new replacement devices on their own in the event of a failure. During such an event, court operations may experience an adverse impact for the duration of the procurement process depending on the type and function of that device. From the initial outage until restoration, it may take up to ten business days for a court to regain full operational status.

The table below summarizes the estimated 5 year benefits by court for the CMS replacement and the LAN/WAN program:

<b>Court</b>	<b>5 year Benefit</b>
Calaveras CMS	\$668,166
Glenn CMS	\$641,512
Lassen CMS	\$719,494
Los Angeles CMS	\$3,037,374
Monterey CMS	\$1,262,116
San Diego CMS	\$8,354,521
Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego LAN/WAN	\$8,977,990

The 5-year benefit amount for the courts replacing their legacy CMS is derived from a combination of cost avoidance and increased revenues to be realized with the implementation of a more modern case management system. The cost avoidance is obtained through operational efficiencies such as the capability for on-line access to case information, e-filing and e-payment as well as a reduction in the maintenance and support costs of the legacy case management system. The Calaveras Superior Court projects that processing efficiencies will result in costs savings of at least \$65,000 annually through the elimination of one full time equivalent clerk position. The Lassen Superior Court anticipates savings

## Analysis of Problem

estimated at \$97,733 over four fiscal years through a reduction in costs for IT contract services. The Glenn Superior Court projects improvements in collections by an estimated \$80,000 - \$120,000 annually. The increased revenues are expected from e-filing fees and improved collections. The San Diego Superior Court projected estimated revenues from e-filing of \$360,000 over 5 years. The Monterey Superior Court estimates for revenues from e-filing and document fees are \$350,000 annually. In addition, the three courts that joined together in a consortium have estimated their savings at approximately 50 percent, based on the SaaS model, compared to implementing the same product as a stand-alone customer.

### Alternative 2 – Do Nothing

The alternative solution would be for the six courts to continue using their legacy case management systems. There are no clear advantages to continuing to use the legacy case management systems for the trial courts while the disadvantages are many. Courts would continue to be challenged by case management systems that are incompatible with new computer operating systems, limited support and functionality and run the risk of failing. Courts would eventually be forced to procure new systems, at a potentially higher cost, and under circumstances which further limit their ability to serve the public.

The exclusion of the four courts from the LAN/WAN program may push the refresh schedule out which then places court operations at higher risk should an infrastructure device failure or security breach occur.

## G. Implementation Plan

For the six courts replacing their case management system, each court will have an implementation plan which ranges from 12 to 21 months for deployment of the new case management system, and adheres to standard systems development life cycle (SDLC) project management phases:

- Phase 1: Project Initiation
- Phase 2: Project Planning and Design
- Phase 3: Project Execution and Implementation
- Phase 4: Project Closing

For the LAN/WAN project, the implementation plan is as follows:

The network design proposals are prepared for each court and the equipment ordered. Deployment commences once the equipment arrives and can take up to six months for the larger courts. Documentation is required at each phase of the court refresh projects and includes the following artifacts for each court: a project statement of work, a project plan, preliminary network designs, a technical implementation plan, network configuration templates, a configuration and performance test plan, final as-built network diagrams, and a closing project check-list.

## H. Supplemental Information (Check box(es) below and provide additional descriptions.)

None     Facility/Capital Costs     Equipment     Contracts     Other \_\_\_\_\_

## I. Recommendation

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it provides the six courts with modern case management systems that have the functionality needed to allow the courts to increase operational efficiencies and to provide greater access to the public and justice partners. Similarly, expanding the LAN/WAN program to the four courts not currently in the program helps ensure that these courts have a secure, reliable, and

flexible network. Alternative 1 also supports the Chief Justice's Access 3D vision for the Judicial Branch and the proposed strategic goal of "digital courts" (being developed by the Technology Planning Task Force).

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 03/13)

Fiscal Year 2014-2015	BCP No. TC3	Org. Code 0250	Department JUDICIAL BRANCH	Priority No. 3
Program 45			Element 10	Component

Proposal Title

Foundation for Digital Courts – Phase One (Case Management System Replacement – Calaveras Superior Court)

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$225,000 for one time costs to fund a replacement case management system for the Superior Court of Calaveras. The requested funding will be used for the implementation and deployment costs for this system. There is no staffing augmentation.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date
---	----------------	------

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the California Technology Agency, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR       SPR      Project No.      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?       Yes       No  
*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	Date	Agency Secretary	Date

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Technology Agency

BCP Type:       Policy       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
------	-----------------------------------



# Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Request

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL  
COURTS - PHASE ONE (CASE  
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
REPLACEMENT - CALAVERAS  
SUPERIOR COURT)

VERSION 1

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18,  
2013

## DOCUMENT REVISIONS

<Once the document is finalized, any subsequent changes must be noted in the table below.>

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Change Description</b>	<b>Sections</b>
<i>1.0</i>	<i>December 18, 2013</i>	<i>Hugh Swift</i>	<i>Complete Template</i>	<i>Entire document</i>

## RELATED DOCUMENTATION

*<Complete this optional section to reference any other documents that might provide additional context, information, etc. related to the document.>*

Version	Date	Name	Description	Location

## APPROVALS

*<Document review of this document and approval of the project by obtaining sign-offs in this section or providing a link to the repository in which electronic approvals (e.g., emails) are archived.>*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature/Link to Electronic Approval</b>	<b>Date</b>

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>PROPOSAL SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND .....	7
1.2	STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
1.3	JUSTIFICATION .....	9
1.4	OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....	11
<b>2</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1	ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION) .....	12
2.1.1	Description .....	12
2.1.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	12
2.1.3	Costs .....	14
2.1.4	Estimated Benefits .....	15
2.1.5	Return on Investment .....	17
2.1.6	Implementation Plan for recommenDed solution.....	17
2.2	ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING) .....	18
2.2.1	Description .....	18
2.2.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	18
2.2.3	Costs .....	19
2.2.4	Estimated Benefits .....	20
2.2.5	Return On Investment .....	20
2.3	RECOMMENDATION .....	21
	<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS.....</b>	<b>23</b>

# 1 PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Calaveras Superior Court (Court) is seeking funding support for replacement of our current case management system (CMS). The Court intends to implement the Odyssey CMS solution in a vendor-hosted Software as a Service (SaaS) model offered by Tyler Technologies under the Nor Cal Collaboration Project (NCCP). The project involves a joint, collaborative implementation of Odyssey in seven participating California trial courts. The cost savings as a result of this collaborative project make this the lowest cost alternative.

As explained in more detail below, the Court requests funding for a new CMS because the current system, CIBER, is more than 15 years old, technologically obsolete (written in COBOL), provides limited functionality and there are serious concerns regarding the vendor’s ability and willingness to provide ongoing support.

The Court requests \$225,096 to implement and deploy the Tyler Odyssey CMS. The Court calculated the requested amount as follows:

Implementation and Deployment Cost	\$254,096
Part-Time Project Manager	\$ 60,000
Subtotal	\$305,096
FY13-14 Costs – Implementation and Deployment	( \$69,000)
FY13-14 Costs – Project Management	( \$20,000)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$225,096</b>

	<b>FY13-14</b>	<b>FY14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY16-17</b>	<b>FY17-18</b>
Software	\$ 69,000	\$111,000	\$74,096		
Project Manager	\$ 20,000	\$ 30,000	\$10,000		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$89,000</b>	<b>\$141,000</b>	<b>\$84,096</b>		
<b>TOTAL FUNDING REQUEST FOR FY 14-15 &amp; 15-16: \$225,096</b>					

The Court will contract with a project manager to assist in the implementation and deployment efforts. The Court does not expect to hire any additional staff and therefore does not seek funding to supplant its current operating budget. The Court does not seek funding for fiscal year 13-14 and has sufficient budgeted funding to pay these costs.

The duration of the project is anticipated to be 21 months beginning in January 2014. The first phase of the project will include project and infrastructure planning, as well as a business process review. The second phase will involve development of the master configuration and application development. Deployment in Calaveras is scheduled to begin in December 2014. “Go Live” is scheduled for July 2015, and product acceptance is to occur in August 2015. All of the requested funding will be allocated to the one-time project costs identified above.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

A CMS is the backbone of the Court's day-to-day operations. The technological and functional limitations of the current system restrict the Court's ability to effectively and efficiently serve the community. The need for a new CMS has existed for more than 10 years. However, the Court delayed purchasing a new case management system in anticipation of the implementation of the statewide Court Case Management System (CCMS) project. When the CCMS project was terminated, the Court began to look at CMS alternatives.

After responding to a statewide RFP and undergoing a rigorous selection process, Tyler Technologies entered into a master service agreement (MSA) to provide its Odyssey CMS to all California trial courts. Calaveras, in collaboration with six (6) other courts have chosen the Tyler product. Each court will enter into an individual participation agreement with Tyler pursuant to the terms of the MSA and a proposal from Tyler.

A new CMS will allow the Court to increase the level of service it currently provides to the public, court staff, attorneys and justice partners.

Recent and continuing budget reductions require the Court to do more with fewer resources. Over the last several years, the Court implemented furloughs, left positions vacant and limited internal promotions in an effort to reduce costs. Despite these cost-savings efforts, the Court faces a significant operating deficit in FY 14-15, and a reduction in staffing levels is inevitable.

Because staffing reductions have not yet been implemented, it is difficult to quantify their impacts. However, to align revenue and expenditures, the Court anticipates it will be necessary to eliminate approximately 3 positions or 10% of staff. The Court expects this will result in fewer service windows being open, fewer employees to answer phone call and process documents, and fewer courtrooms in operation at any given time due to a lack of staff. The consequences of the operational impacts will be longer waits at the public counter, delays in processing civil, family law, small claims and probate documents and more congested court calendars.

A new CMS would allow the Court to mitigate the adverse impacts of the budget reductions by leveraging technology which will create efficiencies in the Court's business processes and allow greater public access through online services the current system cannot support.

The requested statistics for our court is provided below:

- Judgeships: 2, plus 0.3 commissioner
- Users: 30
- Population: 45,578
- Annual cases: 7,278

## 1.2 STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS

A new CMS is consistent with the following goals of the Judicial Branch's strategic plan:

- Goal 1 – Access, Fairness and Diversity – The Odyssey CMS promotes the goal of increasing access to the judicial system through the available online services. The system will provide online access to case information such as dockets and events, which will allow court users to determine the status of filings or confirm dates for upcoming hearings without visiting the clerk's office. The system allows parties to e-file documents with the court and, once integrated with the Court's document management system, review documents from a remote location.
- Goal 2 – Independence and Accountability – A new CMS will allow the Court to maintain and capture data in a more comprehensive and reliable manner. By increasing the availability and quality of its data the judicial branch becomes more transparent, accountable and credible as it promotes its various policy positions.
- Goal 3 – Modernization of Management and Administration – The Tyler product includes calendaring, docketing, and document production functionality not available with the current systems. The system supports workflow processes, which can reduce the number of discrete processing tasks and create the efficiencies needed to operate with fewer resources. It also allows management to generate productivity reports and other data which can be used as tools to more effectively manage resources and improve performance and customer service.
- Goal 4 – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public – There are many examples of how a new CMS will improve the quality of justice and service to the public. The Court anticipates it be able to operational efficiencies through the development of workflow processes, which will allow staff to provide a higher level of service to the public. The availability of online case information will eliminate the need for a party or attorney to call a clerk to find out whether a pleading was filed or when the next is hearing is scheduled. In turn, that clerk can focus on processing case documents or serving a customer filing a document at the window.
- Goal 6 – Branch-wide Infrastructure for Service Excellence – A new CMS will support this goal as it provides an stable platform for greater technological access and integration within the branch, as well as local and state justice partners.

The proposed CMS will impact other state agencies inasmuch as it should help to facilitate integration with other system and improve data exchange capability. There are no known or anticipated adverse impacts.

The Court expects strong support from local justice partners. Through a grant from the State Justice Institute, the Court initiated a countywide strategic planning process for an integrated justice information system (IJIS). The strategic plan notes that Court's current CMS does not support the technology needed for the most basic data exchanges. A fully integrated system requires the Court to upgrade its CMS to electronically exchange information with its local justice partners.

The Court does not anticipate any opposition to the project.

### 1.3 JUSTIFICATION

A new CMS will create operational efficiencies, while at the same time, improving access to justice. The availability of online access to case information, a fully integrated e-payment solution and e-filing capability will allow the Court to maintain or improve upon our current level of customer service despite continuing and significant budget reductions.

The NCCP collaboration presents the best opportunity for the Court to move forward with a new CMS as it provides economies of scale in terms of both financial and staff resources. If the Court purchased the Tyler system as a single user, the implementation costs would be \$474,000, and the annual SaaS fee would double to \$90,000. This does not include the additional staff time required for a single user implementation.

Therefore, if our proposal is not approved, the Court will proceed with the project. However, the Court will rely on resources which could be used to for other important and necessary projects. For example, the Court is in the final phase of a project to complete a strategic plan for countywide integrated justice information system. Implementation of this plan requires the Court to not only upgrade its current CMS; but to fund its proportional share of the costs of countywide implementation of the integrated system.

The proposed solution is entirely consistent with the guiding principles of the judicial branch. Examples of how the project furthers the strategic technology goals of the branch include:

- Ensure Access and Fairness – online access to case information, e-filing, DMS, e-payment
- Include Self Represented Litigants – online access can be provided through computers in the Court’s Self-Help Center and kiosks located in public lobby
- Improves the Court’s Technology Infrastructure and Protects from Technology Failure – The project is based on a SaaS model. The vendor hosts the system, which provides the Court with a level of technical support and redundancy the Court could not achieve using internal resources.
- The collaborative effort provides economies of scale on both a one-time and ongoing basis.
- The collaboration also provides statewide compatibility through common technology standards and more uniform business processes.

The current CMS is functionally deficient in a number of areas. As noted above, the system will not support an electronic data exchange with local justice partners. The system is unable to interface with the FTB Court Ordered Debt (COD) program. Therefore, we send our collections cases to a third-party collections agency, which has the ability to electronically transfer cases to FTB. This causes additional work for court staff and reduces the Court’s net collections revenue by approximately \$25,000 annually.

Online public access is available but would require significant programming and is cost-prohibitive. The lack of access to case information via the internet means members of the public and attorneys who need the most basic case information, i.e., whether the clerk received proof of completion of a traffic violator course, must either call the clerk or visit the court during normal business hours. Online public access would give court users the ability to obtain this case information from any place and at any time. It also eliminates the need for a clerk to respond to a phone inquiry or pull the case file.

The current system does not have any online payment functionality. Therefore, online payments are currently accepted through a third-party vendor. This results in clerks entering the payments manually after receiving a report from the credit card payment vendor.

The current system is not compatible with standard Office products such as Word. Therefore, the Court has very limited ability to generate custom forms and notices from the system.

The software code for our existing CMS is written in Cobol. Any updates or modifications to the code tables or programming are performed by a single individual; who is apparently the only person employed by the vendor familiar enough with the system and the requirements of California courts to make programming changes. If that employee retires or is otherwise unavailable, the ability of the vendor to support the system is in doubt.

Programming changes are expensive. As an example, last year the County adopted a resolution which increased the base fine for Vehicle Code misdemeanors and infractions by \$5.00. (Penal Code Section 1463.28) Since this was not a statewide change, it was not covered by the vendor's standard services agreement. It took the programmer 28 hours to make this relatively basic change. At the hourly rate of \$150.00, this minor modification cost the Court \$4,200.00.

In addition, this system is deployed in approximately seven (7) other California courts and the annual costs of support and maintenance of the system are spread among the courts. As these other courts transition to new systems, it seems reasonable to assume the vendor's fixed administrative and operating costs associated with providing support of the system will be apportioned among a smaller group of users. This will result in an increase in the annual maintenance and support fees for the courts remaining on the system.

This implementation of a new CMS should be a priority due to the fact the current system has reached the end of its life cycle many years ago. Due to its limited functionality, lack of technical support and use of outdated programming language, the current CMS presents significant fiscal and operational risks to the Court.

The proposed solution, Tyler Odyssey offers a number of benefits to the Court, the public and our justice partners:

- Odyssey operates on a stable platform (Microsoft) and is completely compatible with the Court's current technology environment. The Court will be able to generate forms, orders and notices through the system using Microsoft Word. The system can be configured to send automated reminders and reports to staff to staff and notices to parties and attorneys via Microsoft Outlook.
- The CMS supports the use of automated workflows, which will significantly reduce the number of case processing tasks which are now performed manually. Streamlined procedures will create operational efficiencies and cost-savings.
- The availability of e-filing and an integrated DMS means the Court can eliminate manual effort to pull cases files/folders for hearings, legal research and public inquiries. Clerks will no longer need to spend time looking for misplaced documents or files.
- Once fully implemented, the Court expects to generate net e-filing revenue of approximately \$45,000 annually.

- Implementation of the Odyssey system will allow the public, attorneys and justice partners to access court case information online. The availability of this information through the Court's website will not only increase access to the Court, it will also reduce the amount of staff time spent answering phone inquiries, and pulling files to obtain this information.
- The Court estimates these processing efficiencies will result in costs savings of at least \$65,000 annually through the elimination of one full time equivalent clerk position. The Court expects to realize these costs after the third year when e-filing becomes mandatory and workflows fully functional.
- The Court expects the costs of maintenance and support of the CIBER system will increase as the other user courts transition to new systems. The Court estimates it will realize total cost savings of \$95,000 over a 5-year period when the SaaS fees charged by Tyler are compared to the expected increases in CIBER's annual maintenance charges.

#### 1.4 OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The Court intends to establish performance measurements at the implementation stage of the project and at regular intervals after implementation.

As the proposed CMS should provide the Court with a range of functionality not currently available, the first measurement of performance will be to verify the system was fully implemented and the Court is able to utilize all of the systems functions, e.g., Case Management, Content Management, Financial Management, and e-Filing, etc. .

Following implementation, performance will be measured on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis as appropriate to determine whether the new system has resulted increased usage of online services and a corresponding reduction in telephone and service counter transactions, reduced case processing times and improved case disposition rates.. As the Court will not deploy the Odyssey CMS until July 2015, there will be sufficient time to establish baseline performance metrics to use for comparison.

The Court will establish internal financial control of the funding received by establishing a project code in the statewide Phoenix financial system. All project related expenditures appropriately categorized, which will allow the Court to effectively monitor the use of project funding.

The NCCP will establish a governance structure focused on project administration and vendor performance. We expect to hold high-level progress meetings with Tyler on a monthly basis to review the projects status in terms of performance and schedule.

During implementation and deployment the Court intends to rely on Project Oversight and IV&V resources made available through the Administrative Office of the Courts.

## 2 ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION)

#### 2.1.1 DESCRIPTION

The Calaveras Superior Court will implement the Tyler Odyssey Case Management System (CMS) under a single collaborative project with 6 other similarly sized Northern California superior courts (7 courts in total).

The Courts participating in the NCCP collaboration are:

<b>Court</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Users</b>
Tehama	63,463	40
Glenn	28,061	23
Calaveras	45,578	30
Colusa	21,419	17
Alpine	1,180	5
Lassen	34,895	39
Yuba	72,155	55
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>266,751</b>	<b>209</b>

The Tyler CMS encompasses all case types and includes functionality for court case management, content (document) management, financial management, portal for public and justice partner access, in-courtroom tools, electronic filing, reporting, and statewide interfaces.

The CMS will be implemented as Software as a Service (SaaS) solution that is completely hosted by Tyler in their secure data center located in Dallas, TX.

#### 2.1.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

**Advantages:**

1. **Proven Solution:** The CMS solution is a highly configurable product suite with robust functionality. Odyssey is a proven Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) solution and thus there will be very minimal software development necessary, if any, to implement Odyssey in our court.

Tyler will have implemented its CMS in at least two other California courts before this project begins. Any issues related to statewide functional requirements such as fine and fee distribution and integration with state agencies, i.e., DMV, DOJ, FTB, will have been resolved.

2. ***Comprehensive Solution:*** The Odyssey CMS is comprehensive and encompasses all case types. The solution includes functionality for court case management, content (document) management, financial management, portal for public and justice partner access, in-courtroom tools, electronic filing, reporting, and statewide interfaces.
3. ***Hosted Solution:*** By implementing Odyssey as a Tyler-hosted solution (SaaS), our court gains the ability to better predict future CMS expenses, as we will be invoiced annually, at a fixed cost for a defined period of time. This enables our court to better manage and plan for future budget needs. Additionally, there are no additional costs for purchasing hardware, Maintenance and Support, or for software licenses.
4. ***Significant Cost Savings:*** Because this is a collaboration, the cost of implementation is approximately 50% less than the cost of implementing this same product as a stand-alone customer. Pursuant to the terms of the statewide MSA the vendor costs of a single court implementation for 30 user court would be \$474,000 for professional services and \$90,000 for the annual SaaS fee. Additionally, by collaborating with the other NCCP courts, we are able to save on implementation costs by conducting the effort required together for shared project activities.
5. ***Reduced burden on Court Resources:*** Given the size of our court, we have significant constraints on resources. The collaboration with the other courts allows Calaveras to rely on subject matter experts and administrative staff from our partner courts during all phases of implementation. It is doubtful Calaveras could successfully implement a new CMS if we relied solely on the Court's existing staff.
6. ***Technical Support:*** As part of our Odyssey implementation, Tyler will be designating a Personal Support Representative ("PSR") who provides the initial response and routing for each issue. Tyler's support team includes over 50 professionals who work exclusively with Tyler's Courts and Justice partners. In addition to help desk assistance, Tyler provides technical server and systems support, 24x7 emergency support, and weekend technical support for planned IT maintenance functions. This is a significant benefit to our court given our limited IT resources.
7. ***Long-term Solution:*** Tyler's perpetual software solution assures that our Court will remain current with the latest technology and features through annual software releases, eliminating the need to re-license the next version or pay exorbitant fees to migrate customizations. This enables our court to focus budget on other operational areas without the need to save money for a future CMS.

***Disadvantages:***

1. ***Risk:*** As with any project that involves multiple courts, there are inherent risks associated with collaboration as it requires effort from all participating courts and for some project decisions to be made jointly. However, the Court considered this risk in selecting a vendor. We feel the risk is minimized because Tyler has significant experience in implementing statewide systems. In addition, the Courts participating in the collaboration are all similar in size and have a history of working together and sharing of knowledge and resources.
2. ***Significant effort:*** Given the size of our court, we have very limited access to resources. We understand that implementation of a new CMS is a significant endeavor. Through collaboration, there is an expectation that each of the participating courts will support one another throughout the duration of the project. Additionally, Tyler provided a structured implementation approach that clearly identifies when our court resources will be needed.
3. ***Cost:*** Although the cost of the Odyssey solution is slightly higher than the costs of our current CMS, we believe that we will be gaining much more functionality that will enable us to be more efficient and allow us to better serve our community and justice partners with the resources we have.

2.1.3 COSTS

**2.1.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS**

***Assumptions:***

- The breakdown of costs over fiscal years is estimated only. Actual breakdown of costs over fiscal years will be determined by the timing of project activities as the project commences, and assumes a January 2014 collaborative project start date. Deployment activities in Calaveras will begin December 2014 and the projected product acceptance date is August 2015.
- The costs represented in the “Software Purchase/Licenses” row represents the implementations costs for Odyssey paid to Tyler, over three fiscal years. The Court is seeking funding for FY 14-15 and FY 15-16 for Tyler implementation costs.
- The costs represented in the “Software Maintenance/License” row in Continuing Costs represents the annual SaaS fee for operating Odyssey in our court.
- Given that Alternative 1 (Recommended Option) represents a SaaS implementation, there are no separate one-time costs for infrastructure hardware, software licenses, or data center services.
- The Court will hire a part-time project manager. It is anticipated the majority of project management activities will occur in FY 14-15, but is spread over three fiscal years.
- No additional staff will be hired to support implementation. The Court plans to reorganize and absorb additional workload with existing staffing resources.

### 2.1.3.2 COST TABLES

<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	25,000	123,842	10,000			133,842
Hardware Purchase						-
Software Purchase/Licenses	69,000	111,000	74,096			254,096
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management	20,000	30,000	10,000			60,000
Project Oversight	420	840	420			1,680
IV&V Services	840	1,680	840			3,360
Other Contract Services						-
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>115,260</b>	<b>267,362</b>	<b>95,356</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>452,978</b>

  

<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						-
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses			45,000	45,000	45,000	135,000
Telecommunications	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	55,000
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>190,000</b>

  

<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	115,260	267,362	95,356	-	-	477,978
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>190,000</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>126,260</b>	<b>278,362</b>	<b>151,356</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>667,978</b>

### 2.1.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

**Assumptions:**

- The Court anticipates the operational efficiencies associated with online public access to case information and documents, fully integrated e-payments and e-filing will result in the elimination of 1.0 full-time equivalent staff position by Year 3. This amounts to an ongoing cost savings of \$65,000 per year.
- The Court expects the costs of maintenance and support of the CIBER system will increase as the other user courts transition to new systems. The Court estimates it will realize total cost savings of \$86,468 over the implementation years FY15-16 and FY16-17 when the SaaS fees charged by Tyler are compared to the expected increases in CIBER’s annual maintenance charges. The amounts shown are the difference between the CIBER annual maintenance and the Tyler SaaS fees.
- Given the technological limitations of the Court’s current CMS, it is reasonable to assume it will need to be replaced within the next five (5) years. It is also reasonable to assume this would be a single user implementation and the Court would not realize any of the economies of scale provided by the NCCP

collaboration. Therefore, the Court considers the difference in the cost of a collaborative implementation and the cost of a single user implantation (\$220,000 in FY 17-18) a cost savings.

- E-filing adoption will transition over time. However the Court assumes a transition to mandatory adoption as quickly as possible. For the purposes of this BCP, the Court is assuming mandatory adoption of 85% starting Year 3.
- Calculation of e-filing benefits is based on our court’s case filing volume in fiscal year 2010-2011, as reported in the 2012 Court Statistics Report for Statewide Caseload Trends. Only volume for Civil and Family/Probate case types are used. This is based on the estimating practices recommended to us by Tyler Technologies for the purposes of this BCP.
- For the purposes of this BCP, it was assumed a \$10 fee per filing, where \$5 serves as a cost to Tyler Technologies, and \$5 is remitted back to the Court as revenue (approx. \$45,000 annually starting in year 3). The \$10 filing fee is just for the purposes of this BCP – the Court reserves the right to change this fee as necessary.
- The Court will be able to deliver case information to the Franchise Tax Board in the required electronic format. The Court anticipates this will result in additional collections revenue of approximately \$25,000 per year.

**Alt 1 Tyler Odyssey Recommended : Estimated Benefits**

	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	5 Year Estimate
<b>IT Cost Savings/Avoidance</b>						
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)			65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 195,000
Software Maintenance/Licenses			31,725	54,743	220,000	306,468
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Telecommunications						-
Data Center Services						-
Justice Partner costs						-
Facilities						-
Other						-
<b>Total Savings</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 96,725	\$ 119,743	\$ 285,000	\$ 501,468
<b>Revenue Opportunities</b>						
eFiling fees				\$ 45,849	\$ 45,849	\$ 91,698
Other fees			25,000	25,000	25,000	75,000
<b>Total Revenue</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 70,849	\$ 70,849	\$ 166,698
<b>Total Estimated Benefits</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 121,725	\$ 190,592	\$ 355,849	\$ 668,166

## 2.1.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Solution ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Alternative 1: Five Year Total</b>
Total 5 Year Estimated Benefits	<b>\$668,166</b>
Total 5 Year Costs	667,978
<b>Estimated 5 Yr Benefits Less 5 Yr Costs</b>	<b>\$188</b>
<b>ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>ROI</b> (Total 5 Year Benefit - Total 5 Year costs)/Total 5 year costs	0%

## 2.1.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR RECOMMENDED SOLUTION

The NorCal Collaboration Project will consist of five major phases that cover all 7 courts, with each phase consisting of tasks and deliverables. The total project duration is scheduled for approximately 21 months from project initiation through completion. Project start date and completion is estimated at January 2014 – October 2015.

The project timeline has been divided into five major phases:

- Phase 1: Project Initiation and Planning
- Phase 2: Solution Design and Development
- Phase 3: Pilot Implementation (Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine)
- Phase 4: Group 1 CMS Solution Deployment (Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba)
- Phase 5: Project Conclusion

Summaries of each of the major phases are described below:

**Phase 1: Project Initiation and Planning** involves project initiation, infrastructure planning, and the Fit Analysis. This phase feeds many of the subsequent activities in the project: configuration, application refinements, infrastructure, integration, etc. It also facilitates verifying that the sequencing, timing, and scope for the project are correct.

**Phase 2: Solution Design and Development** is focused on the infrastructure setup and installation, system-wide configuration, and application and integration development for the overall solution. The phase will

establish the detailed specifications and development of application refinements identified in Phase 1; development and testing of integrations identified in Phase 1; establishing the technical infrastructure and application installation processes; system-wide configuration of the Odyssey application to meet the courts' specific needs; and iterative refinement and testing of business processes and procedures.

**Phase 3: Pilot Implementation (Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine)** will complete the deployment of the Odyssey case management and eFiling solution for the superior courts of Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine as the pilot implementation. This phase includes activities for configuration, data conversion, testing, and cutover efforts (Go-Live events) for all case types. The phase will include each courts' sign-off of each corresponding project milestone/deliverable for User Acceptance Testing, training, final cutover, extended go-live support, and transition support to normal court operations. The results of this phase, such as configuration, and data conversion scripts, will be used as the foundation for the remaining courts' Odyssey implementations that are conducted in the project's subsequent phases.

**Phase 4: Group 1 CMS Solution Deployment (Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba)** will complete the deployment of the Odyssey case management and eFiling solution for Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba. This phase will build upon the results of the previous pilot implementation and includes activities for configuration, data conversion, testing, and cutover efforts (Go-Live events) for the all four participating courts for all case types. The phase will include each courts' sign-off of each corresponding project milestone/deliverable for User Acceptance Testing, training, final cutover, extended go-live support, and transition support to normal court operations.

**Phase 5: Project Conclusion** will include the steps to formally complete and close out the project, including efforts to finalize any remaining documentation and knowledge transfer to the participating courts.

Full Statement of Work, project schedule, and deliverable milestones for the NorCal Collaboration Project will be included in our Court's Participation Agreement (contract under the CA MSA) with Tyler Technologies. Our Court anticipates receiving these materials for review in mid-December 2013.

## 2.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING)

### 2.2.1 DESCRIPTION

This alternative involves maintaining our court's current CIBER CMS.

### 2.2.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

***Advantages:***

1. The potential risks associated with a collaborative implementation would be eliminated.

2. The increased workload burden on staff associated with the implementation of a new CMS would be avoided. However, this advantage will be lost when a new CMS is eventually implemented. In addition, the workload on staff will be significantly greater if the Court proceeds as a single user, rather than as part of a collaboration.

***Disadvantages:***

1. The primary risk involved with maintaining status quo for our court is that 5 of the 6 Superior Courts that operate the CIBER CMS are looking to migrate to Tyler Technologies and the Odyssey CMS. This presents a real risk Court given the unknown nature of CIBER's longevity in the CMS market place.
2. The workload on staff will be significantly greater if the Court proceeds as a single user, rather than as part of a collaboration.
3. Additionally, there are numerous functional capabilities that we do not have access to today with our current system, such as document management, and e-filing. The lack of functionality places an even greater strain on Court staffing resources.
4. The important goal of improving access to justice through improvements in technology will not be realized here in Calaveras County.

### 2.2.3 COSTS

#### 2.2.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS

- Maintenance and Support will increase in Years 2 and 3 by 50% each year. This reflects the anticipated reduction in the number of courts using CIBER. Fixed costs associated with maintaining and supporting this system will have to be apportioned among a smaller number of courts and users. After Year 3, it is assumed the number of courts remaining on CIBER will begin to level out and 30% increase in support and maintenance was assigned to Year 4.
- The Court will replace CIBER in Year 5 at the cost of \$474,000.
- The Court estimates staffing costs associated with implementation of a new CMS will be at least as much as they would be for the Recommended Solution - \$123,842.

**Alternative 2: Do Nothing**

<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)					123,842	123,842
Hardware Purchase						-
Software Purchase/Licenses					474,000	474,000
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight						-
IV&V Services						-
Other Contract Services						-
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>597,842</b>	<b>597,842</b>

  

<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	7,141	7,363	7,596	7,840		29,940
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses	34,100	51,150	76,725	99,743		261,718
Telecommunications	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	55,000
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>52,241</b>	<b>69,513</b>	<b>95,321</b>	<b>118,583</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>346,658</b>

  

<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	-	-	-	-	597,842	597,842
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>52,241</b>	<b>69,513</b>	<b>95,321</b>	<b>118,583</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>346,658</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>52,241</b>	<b>69,513</b>	<b>95,321</b>	<b>118,583</b>	<b>608,842</b>	<b>944,500</b>

**2.2.3.2 COST TABLES**

**2.2.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS**

This alternative provides no identifiable benefits.

**2.2.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT**

N/A

## 2.3 RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it provides the six courts with a more modern case management system which has the functionality needed to allow the courts to increase operational efficiencies and provide greater access to the public and justice partners.

## GLOSSARY

Term	Description

## APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS

The Cost Table Spreadsheet below reflects the costs for Business Case.



Calaveras Cost Table -  
3.xlsx

The Benefits Table Spreadsheet below reflects the benefits for Business Case.



Calaveras Benefits Table -  
4.xlsx

The Return On Investment (ROI) spreadsheet below reflect the total 5 year costs and benefits for each alternative included in the BCP.



Calaveras ROI Table -  
12.18.13.xlsx

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 03/13)

Fiscal Year 2014-2015	BCP No. TC3	Org. Code 0250	Department JUDICIAL BRANCH	Priority No. 3
Program 45			Element 10	Component

Proposal Title  
 Foundation for Digital Courts – Phase One (Case Management System Replacement – Glenn Superior Court)

Proposal Summary  
 The Judicial Council proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$230,222 of one time costs to fund a replacement case management system for the Superior Court of Glenn. The requested funding will be used for the implementation and deployment costs for this system. There is no staffing augmentation.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date
---	----------------	------

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the California Technology Agency, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR       SPR      Project No.      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?       Yes       No  
*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	Date	Agency Secretary	Date

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Technology Agency

BCP Type:       Policy       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
------	-----------------------------------



# Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Request

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL COURTS  
– PHASE ONE (CASE MANAGEMENT  
SYSTEM REPLACEMENT – GLENN  
SUPERIOR COURT)

VERSION 2

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2013

*Judicial Council of California Administrative Office of the Courts  
Information Technology Services Office  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688*

## DOCUMENT REVISIONS

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Change Description</b>	<b>Sections</b>
<1.0>	<i>November 27, 2013</i>	<i>Virginia Sanders-Hinds, David Koon, and Jessica Craven</i>	<i>Streamline template from standard Business Case</i>	<i>Entire document</i>
2.0	<i>December 18, 2013</i>	<i>Janelle Bartlett, Julie Leach</i>		<i>Entire document</i>

RELATED DOCUMENTATION

Version	Date	Name	Description	Location

APPROVALS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature/Link to Electronic Approval</b>	<b>Date</b>

# CONTENTS

1	PROPOSAL SUMMARY.....	6
<b>2</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION) .....	11
2.1.1	Description .....	11
2.1.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	12
2.1.3	Costs .....	13
2.1.4	Estimated Benefits .....	14
2.1.5	Return on Investment .....	16
2.1.6	Implementation Plan for recommended solution .....	16
2.2	ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING) .....	17
2.2.1	Description .....	17
2.2.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	17
2.2.3	Costs .....	18
2.2.4	Estimated Benefits .....	19
2.2.5	Return On Investment .....	19
2.3	RECOMMENDATION .....	19
<b>3</b>	<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS .....</b>	<b>21</b>

# 1 PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Glenn Superior Court is requesting funding support for replacement of our current case management system (CMS); CIBER. The Court intends to participate in the Nor Cal Collaborative Project (NCCP) involving seven courts with Tehama, Glenn and Alpine being Pilot Courts. The project includes implementation of the Odyssey CMS solution offered by Tyler Technology, a vendor-hosted SaaS (Software as a Service) environment for all case types. All seven courts will work collaboratively sharing area experts, administrative and fiscal resources.

The CIBER CMS operates with antiquated technology; has very limited functionality; severely lacks in the area of security leaving the Court vulnerable to case tampering as there is no tracking of clerk activity within the case. In the 27 years this system has been on the market very little has changed relating to functionality and security concerns.

Tyler Odyssey CMS is consistent with the Judicial Branch’s strategic goals of leveraging advances in technology to better serve our community. Additionally, by implementing Tyler our court will be joining a growing number of California Trial Courts currently in the implementation stage.

Based upon the collaborative nature of the project it is anticipated that there will be four subject experts participating from Glenn Court. In addition, there will be administrative oversight and participation.

Total five-year costs for this project will be: \$520,087.00, with benefits totaling over \$640,000 resulting in a 23% ROI. The court is requesting that FY14-15 costs of \$230,022 be funded. This covers the Tyler software implementation costs, one year’s SaaS fees and telecom costs. Since the project begins in FY13-14 with the collaboration, the court will pay these first year costs out of existing budgeted funds.

	FY13-14	FY14-15	FY 15-16	FY16-17	FY17-18
Software		\$194,722			
Telecommunications	\$600	\$ 1,000			
SaaS Fees	\$34,500	\$ 34,500			
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$230,222</b>			

## 1.1 Background

A court’s CMS is critical in every aspect to the court. Its success can determine a court’s level of funding, its judgeship and staffing needs, dispositions, timelines for processing cases, individual case information to the public and outside agencies through its statistical program and ability to capture the required data. The court’s current CMS does capture statistical data however Glenn Court opted not to purchase the updated JBSIS program due to a price tag of \$45,000. A CMS’s accounting ability is crucial to the collection of fines and fees. The current CMS lacks substantially in this area. It is not capable of printing notices in batch to send to current

and delinquent defendants. The clerks are required to enter each case individually and print one notice at a time due to the lack of functionality of the current CMS.

The Accounts Receivable Program is incapable of providing a list of past due accounts within a specific date range. If our fiscal manager prints a report for delinquent cases it will print everything back to 1995 when the court originally implemented the CMS. As a result (and reams of paper later) this becomes quite costly. The court also uses separate software for managing its trust accounts due to the limited functionality of the current CMS.

The court developed its own Collections Division ultimately to increase collections, but also to save positions. We have saved 5.4 positions in doing so. The clerks utilize Excel and other programs to capture the data needed to be in compliance with the Enhanced Collection Guidelines.

The requested statistics for our court is provided below:

Judgeships: 2, plus 0.3 commissioner

Users: 23

Population: 28,061

Annual cases: 14,082

## 1.2 State level considerations

Glenn Court believes the Nor Cal Collaborative Project (NCCP) noted above will move us closer to accomplishing the strategic plan of the Judicial Branch relating to Technology. The quote below from the Judicial Council's website under "Branch Operations & Initiatives" (Technology) is in line with what we as a collaborative consortium of courts vision and intend to accomplish.

*"The California Courts and the AOC are developing technology initiatives to meet the administrative and operational needs of the future. These include a modern, secure telecommunications network in all courts that will allow, for example, e-filing; a shared service technology center that provides 24/7 support for court management systems and applications; and a data integration program to facilitate exchange of information between the courts and their justice partners."*

The following are goals consistent with the Judicial Council's strategic plan:

- Goal 1 – Access, Fairness and Diversity – The Odyssey CMS promotes the goal of increasing access to the judicial system through the available online services. The system will provide online access to case information such as dockets and events, which will allow court users to determine the status of filings or confirm dates for upcoming hearings without visiting the clerk's office. The system allows parties to e-file documents with the court and, once integrated with the Court's document management system, review documents from a remote location.
- Goal 2 – Independence and Accountability – A new CMS will allow the Court to maintain and capture data in a more comprehensive and reliable manner. By increasing the availability and quality of its data the judicial branch becomes more transparent, accountable and credible as it promotes its various policy positions.

- Goal 3 – Modernization of Management and Administration – The Tyler product includes calendaring, docketing, and document production functionality not available with the current systems. The system supports workflow processes, which can reduce the number of discrete processing tasks and create the efficiencies needed to operate with fewer resources. It also allows management to generate productivity reports and other data which can be used as tools to more effectively manage resources and improve performance and customer service.
- Goal 4 – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public – There are many examples of how a new CMS will improve the quality of justice and service to the public. The Court anticipates it be able to operational efficiencies through the development of workflow processes, which will allow staff to provide a higher level of service to the public. The availability of online case information will eliminate the need for a party or attorney to call a clerk to find out whether a pleading was filed or when the next is hearing is scheduled. In turn, that clerk can focus on processing case documents or serving a customer filing a document at the window.
- Goal 6 – Branch-wide Infrastructure for Service Excellence – A new CMS will support this goal as it provides a stable platform for greater technological access and integration within the branch, as well as local and state justice partners.

The Court does not anticipate any opposition to the project and believes any impact to any other state agency will be positive in nature. It will enable the justice partners necessary to initiate a case filing the ability to do so. It has been a goal for over 20 years to have all courts sharing information beginning with law enforcement inputting their information into their database linked to the court's CMS; it is then forwarded electronically to the DA's office with their input as to charges, etc., then is the court completes the case filing by entering the complaint filed, date of arraignment/proceeding, custody status, bail amount, arrest warrant issued if applicable, etc.

Justice partners in the past have expressed a desire to be included in the beginning of the process and see many benefits to this approach. The funding required to interface with the court's CMS may be the stumbling block to the local and/or statewide success of the justice partner piece. Our current system requires a 24-hour delay before displaying updated case information on line. Odyssey will provide them with real time case information including calendars, dispositions, documents filed, etc. Doing so will enable the DA, Probation and other justice partner agencies to update their case file information more efficiently and allow the clerical staff to prepare for the upcoming calendar(s).

### 1.3 Justification

The NCCP collaboration presents the best opportunity for the court to obtain a new CMS. The sharing of subject area experts and the cost savings realized in the collaborative approach allows the court to move forward.

Working with a case management system with updated technology will provide the court and all users with a level of efficiency never experienced before.

- The ability to view documents on-line, from the comfort of your own home or office, from the desk of a bench officer; a clerk, administrator, DA, probation, jail, attorney etc.; will save an extraordinary amount of time for all users. From an operations perspective it takes an average of two to three minutes

for a clerk to pull a file and another two to three minutes to refile it. This process times 18 clerks with multiple trips per day can add up quickly.

- Ability to send batch notices and statements for all Account Receivables (A/R) both current and delinquent. We hear frequently from individuals coming to make a payment that if they don't receive a notice or statement they forget. The court estimates that increased revenues due to sending overdue notices will be \$80,000 - \$120,000 annually once the Tyler CMS is implemented.
- Ability to have multiple A/Rs in each case for parties ordered to reimburse for filing fees (after fee waiver), mediation, probate investigator, reimbursement of dependency counsel fees, etc. Many times the parties are ordered to each pay half of the costs. The Tyler Odyssey system makes this possible and will greatly assist the court in improving our ability to collect money owed.
- The additional components of the Odyssey CMS solution are: *Financial Manager* addressing all of a courts financial needs/requirements; *Content Manager* - document management including batch processing, auto-attach of documents, e-signatures, *Citation Auto-Zoom*, record on appeal creator, and workflow queue management; *Session Works Judge Edition* used by bench officers to consume and navigate the contents of the electronic case file; *Enterprise Custom Reporting* allows power users to create custom reports using Microsoft SQL Server Reporting Services for ad-hoc reporting or customized reports for repeated use; *Odyssey Portal* for public use e-filing tools, e payment solutions, public case information, including documents; *DataXchange* allows courts to share critical information at key decision points with other Odyssey courts across county lines and state borders; *California Standard Interfaces and Statistical Reports* for integration with DMV, DOJ, Franchise Tax Board, JBSIS reporting.

The court's current CMS lacks substantially in the following areas:

- Its software code is written in Cobol; there is one programmer that does all updates and/or modifications to the system. Each year presents new challenges with legislative changes, especially in the area of fine/fee distributions and reporting requirements. There is and has been a concern among all Ciber courts the lack in number of support staff. There are seven courts participating in the NCCP collaborative project. Out of these seven five are Ciber courts. This also presents a concern for ongoing support should a court be unable to purchase an alternative CMS. Will the remaining courts be expected to share the costs proportionately as it is now? If so, it would be cost prohibitive.
- Security – there are no checks and balances relating to clerk activity within any given case; a clerk can enter a waiver where there was none or can enter any code the system takes with no log trail of who entered and when. It has no edits to assist with entry error, is not intuitive and lacks severely in all aspects of security.
- The financial package is very limited. The A/R reporting cannot be done by designating a specific time frame, rather, it prints all due from the implementation of the system (1995). There is no way to print in batch past due notices. It is on a case by case basis rendering it time consuming and costly.
- The Trust accounting module is archaic and dysfunctional at best. Our court uses a separate software program (Black Baud) in order to manage its trust accounts.
- No on line payment options – clerks enter payments from a report provided by a third party vendor.
- To become JBSIS compliant would cost our court approximately \$45,000 in development costs.

- Its notice program is very limited. It cannot batch notice; each notice is produced by entering each case separately.

#### 1.4 Outcomes and Accountability

Glenn Superior Court expects to see the improvement of case processing including quality and speed of service to the public and other agencies, operational cost savings, convenience to the public and agencies with the availability and implementation of e-filing and file management programs. Additionally, the accuracy and timeliness of reporting data both statistical and financial is expected to improve with the technology and functionality of the Odyssey program. This program is expected to prevent an anticipated backlog that will likely build with the potential failing case management system, its limitations and potential for near future failures. The Odyssey system will allow the public to easily electronically pay fines or fees a service that is currently not available.

Project management reports as well as the state court accounting system will track the progress of each expected outcome. A project code will be assigned in the state court accounting system (SAP) to track all related expenditures to the funding resource and monitored on a monthly basis or more often if necessary. Monthly project meetings, more frequently when the height of activity is taking place, shall occur for teams to discuss progress, measure budget and ensure results.

## 2 ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION)

#### 2.1.1 DESCRIPTION

The Glenn Superior Court is looking to partner with Tyler Technologies to implement a comprehensive Odyssey Case Management System (CMS) under a single collaborative project with 6 other similarly sized Northern California superior courts (7 courts in total). Tyler Technologies is one of the approved CMS vendors under the California Master Services Agreement (MSA).

This project is called the NorCal Collaboration Project, and the current participating courts are provided in the table below:

Court	Population	Users
Tehama	63,463	40
Glenn	28,061	23
Calaveras	45,578	30
Colusa	21,419	17
Alpine	1,180	5
Lassen	34,895	39
Yuba	72,155	55
TOTAL	266,751	209

The scope of the solution for the NorCal Collaboration Project includes all of the Odyssey products for a comprehensive court case management system for all participating NorCal courts. The CMS encompasses all case types and includes functionality for court case management, content (document) management, financial management, portal for public and justice partner access, in-courtroom tools, electronic filing, reporting, and statewide interfaces.

The NorCal Collaboration Project involves implementation of the Odyssey CMS as a Software as a Service (SaaS) solution that is completely hosted by Tyler in their secure data center located in Dallas, TX.

## 2.1.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

1. **Proven Solution:** The Odyssey CMS solution offered by Tyler Technologies is a highly configurable product suite with robust functionality that has been proven in in hundreds of other courts. Odyssey is a proven Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) solution and thus there will be very minimal software development necessary, if any, to implement Odyssey in our court. This offers our court the peace of mind that the solution can be implemented successfully in our court.
2. **Comprehensive Solution:** The solution offered by Tyler Technologies is comprehensive and encompasses all case types. The solution includes functionality for court case management, content (document) management, financial management, portal for public and justice partner access, in-courtroom tools, electronic filing, reporting, and statewide interfaces.
3. **Hosted Solution:** By implementing Odyssey as a Tyler-hosted solution (SaaS), our court gains the ability to better predict future CMS expenses, as we will be invoiced annually, at a fixed cost for a defined period of time. This enables our court to better manage and plan for future budget needs. Additionally, there are no additional costs for purchasing hardware, Maintenance and Support, or for software licenses.
4. **Significant Cost Savings:** Our court has been offered the lowest available per user SaaS rate as defined under the CA MSA. This rate is less than half of the rates identified under the CA MSA for a court of our size. Additionally, by collaborating with the other NorCal courts, we are able to save on implementation costs by conducting the effort required together for shared project activities.
5. **Reduced burden on Court Resources:** Given the size of our court, we have significant constraints on resources. By having an experienced team from Tyler Technologies leading the effort, and having fellow courts participating in the collaborative project, our court believes that we can accomplish more with the resources we have.
6. **Technical Support:** As part of our Odyssey implementation, Tyler will be designating a Personal Support Representative (“PSR”) who provides the initial response and routing for each issue. Tyler’s support team includes over 50 professionals who work exclusively with Tyler’s Courts and Justice partners. In addition to help desk assistance, Tyler provides technical server and systems support, 24x7 emergency support, and weekend technical support for planned IT maintenance functions. This is a significant benefit to our court given our limited IT resources.
7. **Long-term Solution:** Tyler’s perpetual software solution assures that our Court will remain current with the latest technology and features through annual software releases, eliminating the need to re-license the next version or pay exorbitant fees to migrate customizations. This enables our court to focus budget on other operational areas without the need to save money for a future CMS.
8. **Completion of CMS implementation prior to new courthouse move:** Our court is scheduled to initiate the new courthouse move in April, 2015. The proposed project schedule under the recommended approach enables our court to complete implementation of the new Odyssey CMS prior to the move, as it would be too overwhelming for our court to conduct both a new CMS implementation and new courthouse move at the same time.

## Disadvantages:

1. **Risk:** As with any project that involves multiple courts, there are inherent risks associated with collaboration as it requires effort from all participating courts and for some project decisions to be made jointly. However, the selection of Tyler Technologies for implementing this project reduces these risks given their significant experience across the county for implementing similar multi-court projects (including 11 statewide implementations). Additionally, the participating courts in the NorCal Collaboration Project are all similar in size and have a history of working together and sharing of knowledge and resources. This relationship amongst the NorCal participating courts will serve well towards mitigating risks.
2. **Significant effort:** Given the size of our court, as well as the other courts participating in the NorCal Collaboration Project, we have very limited access to resources. We understand that implementation of a new CMS is a significant endeavor. Through collaboration, there is an expectation that each of the participating courts will support one another throughout the duration of the project. Additionally, Tyler Technologies has provided a structured implementation approach that clearly identifies when our court resources will be needed.
3. **Cost:** Although the cost the Odyssey solution is slightly higher than the costs of our current CMS, we believe that we will be gaining much more functionality that will enable us to be more efficient and allow us to better serve our community and justice partners with the resources we have.

### 2.1.3 COSTS

#### Assumptions:

- Year columns represent California fiscal years and column 1 represents FY 13-14 given that the NorCal Collaboration Project will begin in January, 2014.
- The costs represented under the “Software Purchase/License” row for one-time costs of the Alternative 1 (Recommended Option) tab represent the total project costs for Tyler Technologies to implement Odyssey.
- Actual breakdown of costs over fiscal years will be determined by the timing of project activities as the project commences, and assumes a January 2014 project start date and Go-Live in October 2015.
- The \$34,500 in the “Software Maintenance/License” row represents the annual SaaS fee for operating Odyssey in our court.
- Given that Alternative 1 (Recommended Option) represents a SaaS implementation, there are no separate one-time costs for infrastructure hardware, software licenses, or data center services.

### 2.1.3.1 COST TABLES

#### Glenn Alternative 1 - Recommended <Odyssey NorCal Collaboration Project> Costs

<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY13-14</b>	<b>FY14-15</b>	<b>FY15-16</b>	<b>FY16-17</b>	<b>FY17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	34,450	82,700	27,600			144,750
Hardware Purchase						-
Software Purchase/Licenses		194,722				194,722
Telecommunications	650					650
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight	330	660	165			1,155
IV&V Services	660	1,320	330			2,310
Other Contract Services						-
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>36,090</b>	<b>279,402</b>	<b>28,095</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>343,587</b>

  

<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY13-14</b>	<b>FY14-15</b>	<b>FY15-16</b>	<b>FY16-17</b>	<b>FY17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						-
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses	34,500	34,500	34,500	34,500	34,500	172,500
Telecommunications		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>34,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>176,500</b>

  

<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY13-14</b>	<b>FY14-15</b>	<b>FY15-16</b>	<b>FY16-17</b>	<b>FY17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	36,090	279,402	28,095	-	-	343,587
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>34,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>176,500</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>70,590</b>	<b>314,902</b>	<b>63,595</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>520,087</b>

### 2.1.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

#### Assumptions:

- E-filing adoption will transition over time. However the Court assumes a transition to mandatory adoption as quickly as possible. For the purposes of this BCP, the Court is assuming mandatory adoption of 85% starting Year 3.
- For the purposes of this BCP, it was assumed a \$10 fee per filing, where \$5 serves as a cost to Tyler Technologies, and \$5 is remitted back to the Court as revenue. The \$10 filing fee is just for the purposes of this BCP – the Court reserves the right to change this fee as necessary.
- Calculation of e-filing benefits is based on our court’s case filing volume in fiscal year 2010-2011, as reported in the 2012 Court Statistics Report for Statewide Caseload Trends. Only volume for Civil and Family/Probate case types are used. This is based on the estimating practices recommended to us by Tyler Technologies for the purposes of this BCP.

- Tyler has the ability to create statements on past due accounts, as well as send case information to the Franchise Tax Board in the required electronic format, which will allow us to improve our collections by an estimated \$80,000 - \$120,000 annually.
- Given the technological limitations of the Court's current CMS, it is reasonable to assume it will need to be replaced within the next five (5) years. It is also reasonable to assume this would be a single user implementation and the Court would not realize any of the economies of scale provided by the NCCP collaboration. Therefore, the Court considers the difference in the cost of a collaborative implementation and the cost of a single user implementation (\$241,278) a cost savings.
- The Court expects the costs of maintenance and support of the CIBER system will increase as the other user courts transition to new systems. The Court estimates it will realize total cost savings of \$42,194 over the implementation years FY15-16 and FY16-17 when the SaaS fees charged by Tyler are compared to the expected increases in CIBER's annual maintenance charges. The amounts shown are the difference between the CIBER annual maintenance and the Tyler SaaS fees.

**Alt 1 <Proj Name> Recommended : Estimated Benefits**

	FY13-14	FY14-15	FY15-16	FY16-17	FY17-18	5 Year Estimate
<b>IT Cost Savings/Avoidance</b>						
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						\$ -
Software Maintenance/Licenses			5,694	34,500	241,278	281,472
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Telecommunications						-
Data Center Services						-
Justice Partner costs						-
Facilities						-
Other						-
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,694</b>	<b>\$ 34,500</b>	<b>\$ 241,278</b>	<b>\$ 281,472</b>
<b>Revenue Opportunities</b>						
eFiling fees			\$ 11,000	\$ 13,200	\$ 15,840	\$ 40,040
Other fees			80,000	120,000	120,000	320,000
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 91,000</b>	<b>\$ 133,200</b>	<b>\$ 135,840</b>	<b>\$ 360,040</b>
<b>Total Estimated Benefits</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 96,694</b>	<b>\$ 167,700</b>	<b>\$ 377,118</b>	<b>\$ 641,512</b>

### 2.1.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Solution ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Alternative 1: Five Year Total</b>
Total 5 Year Estimated Benefits	\$641,512
Total 5 Year Costs	520,087
<b>Estimated 5 Yr Benefits Less 5 Yr Costs</b>	<b>\$121,425</b>

<b>ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>ROI</b> (Total 5 Year Benefit - Total 5 Year costs)/Total 5 year costs	23%

### 2.1.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR RECOMMENDED SOLUTION

The NorCal Collaboration Project will consist of five major phases that cover all 7 courts, with each phase consisting of tasks and deliverables. The total project duration is scheduled for approximately 21 months from project initiation through completion. Project start date and completion is estimated at January 2014 – October 2015.

The project timeline has been divided into five major phases:

- Phase 1: Project Initiation and Planning
- Phase 2: Solution Design and Development
- Phase 3: Pilot Implementation (Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine)
- Phase 4: Group 1 CMS Solution Deployment (Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba)
- Phase 5: Project Conclusion

Summaries of each of the major phases are described below:

Phase 1: Project Initiation and Planning involves project initiation, infrastructure planning, and the Fit Analysis. This phase feeds many of the subsequent activities in the project: configuration, application refinements, infrastructure, integration, etc. It also facilitates verifying that the sequencing, timing, and scope for the project are correct.

Phase 2: Solution Design and Development is focused on the infrastructure setup and installation, system-wide configuration, and application and integration development for the overall solution. The phase will establish the detailed specifications and development of application refinements identified in Phase 1; development and testing of integrations identified in Phase 1; establishing the technical infrastructure and application installation processes; system-wide configuration of the Odyssey application to meet the courts' specific needs; and iterative refinement and testing of business processes and procedures.

Phase 3: Pilot Implementation (Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine) will complete the deployment of the Odyssey case management and eFiling solution for the superior courts of Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine as the pilot implementation. This phase includes activities for configuration, data conversion, testing, and cutover efforts

(Go-Live events) for all case types. The phase will include each courts' sign-off of each corresponding project milestone/deliverable for User Acceptance Testing, training, final cutover, extended go-live support, and transition support to normal court operations. The results of this phase, such as configuration, and data conversion scripts, will be used as the foundation for the remaining courts' Odyssey implementations that are conducted in the project's subsequent phases.

Phase 4: Group 1 CMS Solution Deployment (Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba) will complete the deployment of the Odyssey case management and eFiling solution for Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba. This phase will build upon the results of the previous pilot implementation and includes activities for configuration, data conversion, testing, and cutover efforts (Go-Live events) for the all four participating courts for all case types. The phase will include each courts' sign-off of each corresponding project milestone/deliverable for User Acceptance Testing, training, final cutover, extended go-live support, and transition support to normal court operations.

Phase 5: Project Conclusion will include the steps to formally complete and close out the project, including efforts to finalize any remaining documentation and knowledge transfer to the participating courts.

Full Statement of Work, project schedule, and deliverable milestones for the NorCal Collaboration Project will be included in our Court's Participation Agreement (contract under the CA MSA) with Tyler Technologies. Our Court anticipates receiving these materials for review in mid-December 2013.

## 2.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING)

### 2.2.1 DESCRIPTION

This would require maintaining our court's current CMS until it inevitably fails, requiring a more costly replacement due to the lack of the benefits of the collaboration.

### 2.2.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

The primary risk involved with maintaining status quo for our court is that 5 of the 6 Superior Courts that operate the CIBER CMS are looking to migrate to Tyler Technologies and the Odyssey CMS. This presents a real risk to our Court given the unknown nature of CIBER's longevity in the CMS market place.

Additionally, there are numerous functional capabilities that we do not have access to today with our current system, such as document management, and e-filing. By staying on our antiquated CMS, we are prolonging operational risks that would be difficult to recover from.

## 2.2.3 COSTS

### Assumptions

This alternative assumes that our court continues to operate, and pay for, our current CIBER CMS, ultimately resulting in a failure and an emergency replacement in year 5.

#### 2.2.3.1 Cost Tables

##### Glenn Alternative 2: Do Nothing Costs

<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY13-14</b>	<b>FY14-15</b>	<b>FY15-16</b>	<b>FY16-17</b>	<b>FY17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)					144,640	144,640
Hardware Purchase					25,000	25,000
Software Purchase/Licenses					436,000	436,000
Telecommunications					650	650
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight					10,500	10,500
IV&V Services					21,000	21,000
Other Contract Services						-
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>637,790</b>	<b>637,790</b>

  

<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY13-14</b>	<b>FY14-15</b>	<b>FY15-16</b>	<b>FY16-17</b>	<b>FY17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						-
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses	25,725	32,156	40,195	69,000	69,000	236,076
Telecommunications	1,058	1,058	1,058	1,000	1,000	5,174
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>26,783</b>	<b>33,214</b>	<b>41,253</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>241,250</b>

  

<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY13-14</b>	<b>FY14-15</b>	<b>FY15-16</b>	<b>FY16-17</b>	<b>FY17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	-	-	-	-	637,790	637,790
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>26,783</b>	<b>33,214</b>	<b>41,253</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>241,250</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>26,783</b>	<b>33,214</b>	<b>41,253</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>707,790</b>	<b>879,040</b>

#### 2.2.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

There are no identifiable benefits of this alternative.

#### 2.2.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

N/A

### 2.3 RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it provides the six courts with a more modern case management system which has the functionality needed to allow the courts to increase operational efficiencies and provide greater access to the public and justice partners.

### 3 GLOSSARY

Term	Description

## 4 APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS

The Cost Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for costs for Business Case.



COSTS TYLER.xlsx

The Benefits Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for the benefits for Business Case.



Benefits Tyler.xlsx

The Return On Investment (ROI) spreadsheet below must be filled out using the total 5 year costs and benefits for each alternative included in the BCP.



ROI TYLER.xlsx

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 03/13)

Fiscal Year 2014-2015	BCP No. TC3	Org. Code 0250	Department JUDICIAL BRANCH	Priority No. 3
Program 45			Element 10	Component

Proposal Title  
 Foundation for Digital Courts – Phase One (Case Management System Replacement – Lassen Superior Court)

Proposal Summary  
 The Judicial Council proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$521,825 one time costs to fund a replacement case management system for the Superior Court of Lassen. The requested funding will be used for the implementation and deployment costs for this system. There is no staffing augmentation.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date
---	----------------	------

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the California Technology Agency, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR     SPR                      Project No.                                      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?     Yes     No  
*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	Date	Agency Secretary	Date

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Technology Agency

BCP Type:                       Policy                       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
------	-----------------------------------



# Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Request

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL  
COURTS - PHASE ONE (CASE  
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
REPLACEMENT - LASSEN  
SUPERIOR COURT)

VERSION 2

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18,  
2013

## DOCUMENT REVISIONS

<Once the document is finalized, any subsequent changes must be noted in the table below.>

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Change Description</b>	<b>Sections</b>
<1.0>	<i>November 27, 2013</i>	<i>Virginia Sanders-Hinds, David Koon, and Jessica Craven</i>	<i>Streamline template from standard Business Case</i>	<i>Entire document</i>
2	<i>December 18, 2013</i>	<i>Andi Ashby</i>	<i>Update revisions, provide additional information</i>	<i>Entire document</i>

## RELATED DOCUMENTATION

*<Complete this optional section to reference any other documents that might provide additional context, information, etc. related to the document.>*

Version	Date	Name	Description	Location

## APPROVALS

*<Document review of this document and approval of the project by obtaining sign-offs in this section or providing a link to the repository in which electronic approvals (e.g., emails) are archived.>*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature/Link to Electronic Approval</b>	<b>Date</b>

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>PROPOSAL SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1.2	STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
1.3	JUSTIFICATION .....	9
1.4	OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....	10
<b>2</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1	ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION) .....	11
2.1.1	Description .....	11
2.1.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	12
2.1.3	Costs .....	12
2.1.4	Estimated Benefits .....	14
2.1.5	Return on Investment .....	15
2.1.6	Implementation Plan for recommenDed solution.....	16
2.2	ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING) .....	17
2.2.1	Description .....	17
2.2.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	17
2.2.3	Costs .....	17
2.2.4	Estimated Benefits .....	19
2.2.5	Return On Investment .....	19
2.3	RECOMMENDATION .....	19
	<b>GLOSSARY</b> .....	<b>20</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS</b> .....	<b>21</b>

## 1 PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Lassen Superior Court is seeking funding in the amount of \$371,825 for the replacement of our current antiquated Case Management System (CMS). The new CMS, Tyler Odyssey, a vendor-hosted, Software as Service (SaaS) model, encompassing all case types and includes functionality for court case management, content (document) management, financial management, portal for public and justice partner access, in-courtroom tools, electronic filing, reporting, and statewide interfaces. This proposed project is part of a seven court collaborative project leveraging funding, staffing, project planning, program design and AOC master agreements. The cost savings as a result of this collaborative project make this the lowest cost alternative.

This funding is for all actual implementation costs including one-time software and implementation costs, IT costs, minimal equipment enhancements, and telecommunications costs of the project. The savings generated by a multi-court collaboration of seven courts and potential e-filing revenue is expected to mitigate additional four year shared software services fees leveraging resources in an efficient manner and extending the initial resource allocation requested for a full five-year period, therefore the court is not requesting funding for on-going costs.

	FY13-14	FY14-15	FY 15-16	FY16-17	FY17-18
Hardware		\$ 14,000			
Software		\$330,325			
Telecommunications		\$ 2,500			
Other Contract Services		\$ 25,000			
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$371,825</b>			

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

Our current case management system is not able to adapt or integrate with the technological efficiencies, user friendly or business standards of today's world such as Microsoft or simple PDF files. The Ciber case management system we currently utilize is COBOL based, was installed in the early 1990's, and is limited to one programmer. Often programming changes are delayed due to the limited staffing provided by the vendor, the cost prohibitive nature of programming changes and the outdated technology. The current system cannot easily interface with other statewide systems such as the Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Justice, local Sheriff or other agencies without time consuming, cost prohibitive programming limited to one individual's extensive experience and knowledge within the vendor's organization.

Therefore, the courts began to pursue options presented by the recently approved master agreements for case management systems. Having a reliable and functional CMS is critical to our court's operations in order to meet the demands and mandates of statutes, rules of court and the Judicial Branch's strategic plan. The limitations of our current system prohibit our court to serve the community effectively and efficiently causing potential backlogs and case processing delays as our budget reductions continue.

On-going budget reductions have forced our court to look for options to increase efficiency and reduce costs. This system will assist in accomplishing that goal by utilizing less paper products, decrease processing time, allow exchange of information with the justice partners, allow for e-payments that will increase the speed of payments to the court, decrease staff time for processing payments and provide for improved access to case and calendar information to the public. Our current system does not allow for e-filing or effective, useful financial management. Querying of financial information is not available. Financial information available from our current system is very basic and limited, only providing general reporting functions at best.

After responding to a statewide RFP and undergoing a rigorous selection process, Tyler Technologies entered into a master service agreement (MSA) to provide its Odyssey CMS to all California trial courts. Lassen, in collaboration with six (6) other courts have chosen the Tyler software as a service product. Each court will enter into an individual participation agreement with Tyler pursuant to the terms of the MSA and a proposal from Tyler.

A new CMS will allow the Court to increase the level of service it currently provides to the public, court staff, attorneys and justice partners.

Recent and continuing budget reductions require the Court to do more with fewer resources. The court has decreased public filing hours wherein a clerk is available, decreased public service hours of our self-help center, and contracted services where possible. The court has eliminated positions, consolidated services and tasks within allowable job titles, collaborated with other courts to deliver services, eliminated the use of all unnecessary copies, duplicate documents reviewed processes and procedures and implemented streamlining of procedures wherever possible. The impact has been noted in delays in services, longer court calendars, increase in case continuations and inadequate information provided to litigants.

A new CMS would allow the Court to mitigate the adverse impacts of the on-going budget reductions by leveraging technology which will create efficiencies in the Court's business processes and allow greater public access through online services the current system cannot support.

The requested statistics for our court is provided below:

- Judgeships: 2, plus 0.3 commissioner
- Users: 39
- Population: 34,895
- Annual cases: 11,586

## 1.2 STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS

Our court's intentions of implementing the Odyssey CMS solution offered by Tyler Technologies under the NorCal Collaboration Project is consistent with the Judicial Branch's strategic goals of leveraging advances in technology to better serve our community. By implementing Odyssey, our court will be joining a growing judicial community in California (with 6 Odyssey implementations taking place currently) for a total of seven courts in our collaboration. Our participation in this group will enable our Court to share information with our justice partners, court users and state agencies in a seamless manner without requiring expensive hardware or software costs to those agencies. Through the collaboration effort with the 6 other NorCal courts in this project, we will be jointly working together to achieve a common goal increasing that leverage already beginning to be obtained by the California justice system. A new CMS is consistent with the following goals of the Judicial Branch's strategic plan:

- Goal 1 – Access, Fairness and Diversity – The Odyssey CMS promotes the goal of increasing access to the judicial system through the available online services. The system will provide online access to case information such as dockets and events, which will allow court users to determine the status of filings or confirm dates for upcoming hearings without visiting the clerk's office. The system allows parties to e-file documents with the court and, once integrated with the Court's document management system, review documents from a remote location.
- Goal 2 – Independence and Accountability – A new CMS will allow the Court to maintain and capture data in a more comprehensive and reliable manner. By increasing the availability and quality of its data the judicial branch becomes more transparent, accountable and credible as it promotes its various policy positions.
- Goal 3 – Modernization of Management and Administration – The Tyler product includes calendaring, docketing, and document production functionality not available with the current systems. The system supports workflow processes, which can reduce the number of discrete processing tasks and create the efficiencies needed to operate with fewer resources. It also allows management to generate productivity reports and other data which can be used as tools to more effectively manage resources and improve performance and customer service.

- Goal 4 – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public – There are many examples of how a new CMS will improve the quality of justice and service to the public. The Court anticipates it be able to operational efficiencies through the development of workflow processes, which will allow staff to provide a higher level of service to the public. The availability of online case information will eliminate the need for a party or attorney to call a clerk to find out whether a pleading was filed or when the next is hearing is scheduled. In turn, that clerk can focus on processing case documents or serving a customer filing a document at the window.
- Goal 6 – Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence – A new CMS will support this goal as it provides a stable platform for greater technological access and integration within the branch, as well as local and state justice partners.

The proposed CMS will impact other state agencies inasmuch as it should help to facilitate integration with other systems and improve data exchange capability. There are no known or anticipated adverse impacts.

The Court expects strong support from local justice partners. Through a grant from the State Justice Institute, the Court initiated a countywide strategic planning process for an integrated justice information system (IJIS). The strategic plan notes that Court’s current CMS does not support the technology needed for the most basic data exchanges. A fully integrated system requires the Court to upgrade its CMS to electronically exchange information with its local justice partners.

The Court does not anticipate any opposition to the project.

### 1.3 JUSTIFICATION

Our court’s intentions of implementing the Odyssey CMS solution offered by Tyler Technologies under the NorCal Collaboration Project will address our court’s need to replace our antiquated CMS, offer shared solutions for our justice partners, integrated systems with other state agencies, provide access to information to the public and increase operational efficiencies, in turn providing overall cost savings in various operational areas. If this funding request is not approved, the current case management system cannot provide e-filing, the court would continue to process all case types via paper filings with a solution not in sight for years to come. Existing budget reductions would build a backlog, cause cases not to be addressed timely, and potentially increase court expense. Additionally, the system programming is supported only by one individual employed by the vendor, often these changes are cost prohibitive and time consuming. With only one programmer, multiple courts and numerous changes, the requirements are more than our current vendor is able to service. In essence, the need has outgrown the capability of service that can be provided. This causes court staff to conduct changes manually impacting the public by unnecessary case processing delays, court continuances and inaccurate information. Court staff may be forced to manually pull binders, manually calculate fines or fees only after determining the system did not appropriately calculate an accurate fee, all the while the member of the public is waiting in line or their documents have been filed, a fee taken and processed, only to find out it was incorrect. The court then must notice any parties and re-calendar court events.

Most importantly, the public will benefit from this implemented solution in that an operationally efficient, cost effective, technologically updated, user friendly, integrated case management system would be implemented, information will be accessible through a web-hosted system, easily shared with justice partners, and state agencies. E-filing and file management (electronic storage) will be available saving resources and allowing for quicker access to information.

The overall five year investment in this system \$783,005, the benefits of this system are estimated at \$719,494 saving increased maintenance and programming of the outdated system that would only manage to attempt to keep up while case processing slows, case logs back up and public service diminishes while the court faces on-going budget reductions. However, if implemented the new case management system would provide benefits of mitigating budget reductions with an easy to use, updated technologically sound system, providing automation, e-filing, information sharing along with meeting statewide judicial goals and improving public service and access to information.

One-time costs of staff, IT, software, contract services:	\$529,805
Continuing IT costs:	\$253,200
Total Project costs:	\$783,005

If the court does nothing, it will cost the court approximately \$1,271,275 in five years due to the current system failures, programming costs, potential unavailability of the system, potential operational failures, likelihood of forcible replacement without benefit of collaboration and reduced costs. The savings of participating in the collaboration will save the court approximately \$219,000 in software implementation costs. Without the benefit of the collaboration, the implementation costs would be \$540,000, and the SaaS fees would increase to \$75,000 annually versus 58,500.

#### 1.4 OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Lassen Superior Court expects to see the improvement of case processing including quality and speed of service to the public and other agencies, operational cost savings, convenience to the public and agencies with the availability and implementation of e-filing and file management programs. Additionally, the accuracy and timeliness of reporting data both statistical and financial is expected to improve with the technology and functionality of the Odyssey program. This program is expected to prevent an anticipated backlog that will likely build with the potential failing case management system, its limitations and potential for near future failures. The Odyssey system will allow the public to easily electronically pay fines or fees - a service that is currently not available. Project management reports, as well as, the state court accounting system will track the progress of each expected outcome. A project code will be assigned in the state court accounting system (SAP) to track all related expenditures to the funding resource and monitored on a monthly basis or more often if necessary. Monthly project meetings, more frequently when the height of activity is taking place, shall occur for teams to discuss progress, measure budget and ensure results.

## 2 ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION)

#### 2.1.1 DESCRIPTION

Lassen Superior Court is looking to partner with Tyler Technologies to implement a comprehensive Odyssey Case Management System (CMS) under a single collaborative project with 6 other similarly sized Northern California superior courts (7 courts in total). Tyler Technologies is one of the approved CMS vendors under the California Master Services Agreement (MSA). The NorCal Collaboration Project involves implementation of the Odyssey CMS as a Software as a Service (SaaS) solution that is completely hosted by Tyler in their secure data center located in Dallas, TX. This allows for the most cost efficient and effective use of a new case management system as no additional hardware or other capital equipment is needed. Given the courts in the project are small courts and most do not have “on-site” fulltime IT staff, this system is ideal. If the court does not receive funding the potential for not resolving some of the vital issues related to budget reduction impacts on the public will likely be difficult to resolve. The court has identified this case management implementation as a potential and unique solution to assist in mitigating some of the budget reduction issues while also meeting Judicial Branch goals. Some of the identified impacts are caseload backlogs, case processing delays, inaccurate information and calculation of fines and fees as well as improvements and implementation of e-filing, electronic information sharing without the cost of additional hardware purchases.

This project is called the NorCal Collaboration Project, and the current participating courts are provided in the table below:

<b>Court</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Users</b>
Tehama	63,463	40
Glenn	28,061	23
Calaveras	45,578	30
Colusa	21,419	17
Alpine	1,180	5
Lassen	34,895	39
Yuba	72,155	55
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>266,751</b>	<b>209</b>

The scope of the solution for the NorCal Collaboration Project includes all of the Odyssey products for a comprehensive court case management system for all participating NorCal courts. The CMS encompasses all case types and includes functionality for court case management, content (document) management, financial management, portal for public and justice partner access, in-courtroom tools, court calendaring and management, electronic filing, reporting, and statewide interfaces.

### 2.1.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

The advantages Odyssey provides are flexibility in either an internally hosted or Tyler hosted system keeping cost to a minimum and providing the ability for courts of varying size, budget and staffing levels to utilize their system. Lassen would utilize the hosted system keeping costs to a minimum and allowing for the most effective technical assistance. This option also allows for no-cost upgrades as they occur. The Odyssey system provides e-filing, integrated file management, financial management and web portals for the public and other agencies such as the Department of Justice, Department of Motor Vehicles, and the ability to interface with JBSIS for statistical reporting. This is all provided in one robust hosted system so there is no cost for expensive initial hardware or the need to upgrade hardware in the future. Additionally with a collaborative effort, our smaller courts can share our subject matter experts and information technology staff when necessary, continually collaborating into the future.

The disadvantages are few and difficult to pin-point, however, could be described as time and effort devoted to implementation of a new case management system when budgets are restricted at this time, potentially stretching staff time and resources, however, this would be for a limited time as typical with any project or conversion project and then any, unknown or unintended consequences, however, the advantages far out weigh the disadvantages.

### 2.1.3 COSTS

#### 2.1.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS

*Assumptions:*

- Year columns represent California fiscal years and column 1 represents FY 13-14 given that the NorCal Collaboration Project will begin in January, 2014 and Go-Live in October 2015.
- The \$330, 325 represented under the “Software Purchase/Licenses” row for one-time costs of the Alternative 1 (Recommended Option) tab represent the total project costs for Tyler Technologies to implement Odyssey.
- The \$58,500 represented in the “Software Maintenance/License” row represents the annual SaaS fee for operating Odyssey in our court.

- Given that Alternative 1 (Recommended Option) represents a SaaS implementation, there are no separate one-time costs for infrastructure hardware, software licenses, or data center services.
- Our assumption is that this court will appoint a project manager devoted to work on the implementation (.50 for 6 months) along with the CEO (.25 for six months) and Administrative Manager (.25 for six months) and three subject matter experts (.25 for six months). Our court will then provide SME(s) to collaborate with Calaveras and Glenn to implement at each court. (1.0 for three months.)
- It is anticipated that additional IT contract staff may be necessary for initial project implementation, deployment and three months of initial operation. This \$25,000 is identified as Other Contract Services in FY14-15.
- This court may purchase approximately three additional back up devices to increase storage capacity for the file management system. This \$14,000 is identified in FY 14-15 as Hardware Purchase.
- The court will also need to install an additional T1 line. This \$2,500 is identified in FY 14-15 as Telecommunications.

## 2.1.3.2 COST TABLES

### Alternative 1 - Recommended <Odyssey NorCal Collaboration Project>

<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		150,000				150,000
Hardware Purchase		14,000				14,000
Software Purchase/Licenses		330,325				330,325
Telecommunications		2,500				2,500
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight		1,995				1,995
IV&V Services		5,985				5,985
Other Contract Services		25,000				25,000
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>529,805</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>529,805</b>

  

<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						-
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses		58,500	58,500	58,500	58,500	234,000
Telecommunications		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	19,200
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>253,200</b>

  

<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	-	529,805	-	-	-	529,805
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>253,200</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>593,105</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>63,300</b>	<b>783,005</b>

## 2.1.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

### Assumptions:

- E-filing adoption will transition over time. However the Court assumes a transition to mandatory adoption as quickly as possible. For the purposes of this BCP, the Court is assuming mandatory adoption of 85% starting Year 3.
- For the purposes of this BCP, it was assumed a \$10 fee per filing, where \$5 serves as a cost to Tyler Technologies, and \$5 is remitted back to the Court as revenue (of approx. \$45,000 annually). The \$10 filing fee is just for the purposes of this BCP – the Court reserves the right to change this fee as necessary.
- Calculation of e-filing benefits is based on our court's case filing volume in fiscal year 2010-2011, as reported in the 2012 Court Statistics Report for Statewide Caseload Trends. Only volume for Civil and Family/Probate case types are used. This is based on the estimating practices recommended to us by Tyler Technologies for the purposes of this BCP.

- The Court expects the costs of maintenance and support of the CIBER system will increase as the other user courts transition to new systems. The Court estimates it will realize a cost savings of \$9,858 over the implementation year FY16-17 when the SaaS fees charged by Tyler are compared to the expected increases in CIBER's annual maintenance charges. The amount shown is the difference between the CIBER annual maintenance and the Tyler SaaS fees.
- Given the technological limitations of the Court's current CMS, it is reasonable to assume it will need to be replaced within the next five (5) years. It is also reasonable to assume this would be a single user implementation and the Court would not realize any of the economies of scale provided by the NCCP collaboration. Therefore, the Court considers the difference in the cost of a collaborative implementation and the cost of a single user implementation (\$219,675) a cost savings.
- The Court estimates that their need for Contract IT services will decrease over time as the Tyler Odyssey CMS is fully implemented. This total savings is estimated at \$97,733 over four fiscal years.

**Alt 1 Tyler Odyssey Recommended : Estimated Benefits**

IT Cost Savings/Avoidance	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	5 Year Estimate
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)				\$ 98,250	\$ 98,250	\$ 196,500
Software Maintenance/Licenses				9,858	219,675	229,533
Hardware Lease/Maintenance				25,000	75,000	100,000
Telecommunications				2,500	2,500	5,000
Contract Services		23,437	29,296	20,000	25,000	97,733
Telecommunications						-
Data Center Services						-
Justice Partner costs						-
Facilities						-
Other						-
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 23,437</b>	<b>\$ 29,296</b>	<b>\$ 155,608</b>	<b>\$ 420,425</b>	<b>\$ 628,766</b>
<b>Revenue Opportunities</b>						
eFiling fees				\$ 45,364	\$ 45,364	\$ 90,728
Other fees						-
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 45,364</b>	<b>\$ 45,364</b>	<b>\$ 90,728</b>
<b>Total Estimated Benefits</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 23,437</b>	<b>\$ 29,296</b>	<b>\$ 200,972</b>	<b>\$ 465,789</b>	<b>\$ 719,494</b>

2.1.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Alternative 1 - Recommended Solution ROI Calculation	Alternative 1: Five Year Total
Total 5 Year Estimated Benefits	<b>\$719,494</b>
Total 5 Year Costs	783,005
<b>Estimated 5 Yr Benefits Less 5 Yr Costs</b>	<b>\$(63,511)</b>
<b>ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>ROI</b> (Total 5 Year Benefit - Total 5 Year costs)/Total 5 year costs	-8%

## 2.1.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR RECOMMENDED SOLUTION

The NorCal Collaboration Project will consist of five major phases that cover all 7 courts, with each phase consisting of tasks and deliverables. The total project duration is scheduled for approximately 21 months from project initiation through completion. Project start date and completion is estimated at January 2014 – October 2015.

The project timeline has been divided into five major phases:

- Phase 1: Project Initiation and Planning
- Phase 2: Solution Design and Development
- Phase 3: Pilot Implementation (Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine)
- Phase 4: Group 1 CMS Solution Deployment (Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba)
- Phase 5: Project Conclusion

Summaries of each of the major phases are described below:

**Phase 1: Project Initiation and Planning** involves project initiation, infrastructure planning, and the Fit Analysis. This phase feeds many of the subsequent activities in the project: configuration, application refinements, infrastructure, integration, etc. It also facilitates verifying that the sequencing, timing, and scope for the project are correct.

**Phase 2: Solution Design and Development** is focused on the infrastructure setup and installation, system-wide configuration, and application and integration development for the overall solution. The phase will establish the detailed specifications and development of application refinements identified in Phase 1; development and testing of integrations identified in Phase 1; establishing the technical infrastructure and application installation processes; system-wide configuration of the Odyssey application to meet the courts' specific needs; and iterative refinement and testing of business processes and procedures.

**Phase 3: Pilot Implementation (Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine)** will complete the deployment of the Odyssey case management and eFiling solution for the superior courts of Tehama, Glenn, and Alpine as the pilot implementation. This phase includes activities for configuration, data conversion, testing, and cutover efforts (Go-Live events) for all case types. The phase will include each courts' sign-off of each corresponding project milestone/deliverable for User Acceptance Testing, training, final cutover, extended go-live support, and transition support to normal court operations. The results of this phase, such as configuration, and data conversion scripts, will be used as the foundation for the remaining courts' Odyssey implementations that are conducted in the project's subsequent phases.

**Phase 4: Group 1 CMS Solution Deployment (Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba)** will complete the deployment of the Odyssey case management and eFiling solution for Calaveras, Lassen, Colusa, and Yuba. This phase will build upon the results of the previous pilot implementation and includes activities for configuration, data conversion, testing, and cutover efforts (Go-Live events) for the all four participating courts for all case types. The phase will include each courts' sign-off of each corresponding project

milestone/deliverable for User Acceptance Testing, training, final cutover, extended go-live support, and transition support to normal court operations.

**Phase 5: Project Conclusion** will include the steps to formally complete and close out the project, including efforts to finalize any remaining documentation and knowledge transfer to the participating courts.

Full Statement of Work, project schedule, and deliverable milestones for the NorCal Collaboration Project will be included in our Court's Participation Agreement (contract under the CA MSA) with Tyler Technologies. Our Court anticipates receiving these materials for review in mid-December 2013.

## 2.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING)

### 2.2.1 DESCRIPTION

This alternative involves maintaining our court's current CIBER CMS.

### 2.2.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

The primary risk involved with maintaining status quo for our court is that 6 of the 7 Superior Courts that operate the CIBER CMS are looking to migrate to Tyler Technologies and the Odyssey CMS. This presents a real risk to our Court given the unknown nature of CIBER's longevity in the CMS marketplace.

Additionally, there are numerous functional capabilities that we do not have access to today with our current system, such as document management and e-filing. By staying on our antiquated CMS, we are prolonging operational risks that would be difficult to recover from. These risks include operational failures, insurmountable costs associated with attempting to maintain programming for a system that is maintained by one resource within the vendor system, potentially replacing the system in year 5 should maintaining it be unrealistic. These costs potentially could reach over \$1,271,000 making the viable, practical, pre-emptive solution a sensible investment in the Tyler Odyssey case management system in order to 1) mitigate budget reduction impacts 2) improve operational efficiencies and 3) implement specific, statewide judicial goals.

### 2.2.3 COSTS

#### 2.2.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS

This alternative assumes that our court continues to operate, and pay for, our current CIBER CMS, potentially risking catastrophic operational failure and large undue future expenditures for replacement. If the court does

nothing, it would be irresponsible to assume it would cost nothing and therefore this court assumes the cost of doing nothing will include increased programming, maintenance and the potential of replacement in year 5 of the failed system.

**Assumptions:**

- In FY 16-17 the court will likely need to replace failing hardware and/or begin implementing a new CMS due to the failure of the existing CIBER CMS. Therefore, we have estimated costs for staff assigned to the project, new hardware, new T1, and contract IT services.
- Without the benefit of the collaboration, the software implementation costs increase to \$540,000.
- Continuing costs include staff assigned to maintaining the CIBER system of one person at .25, for approximately \$18,000 annually.
- We estimate the CIBER maintenance fees will increase year to year due to other courts leaving the system. We will also need to continue paying this during the implementation of the new CMS, until we fully cut over.

**2.2.3.2 COST TABLES**

**Alternative 2: Do Nothing**

<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)				98,250	98,250	196,500
Hardware Purchase				25,000	75,000	100,000
Software Purchase/Licenses					540,000	540,000
Telecommunications				2,500	2,500	5,000
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight				1,995		1,995
IV&V Services				5,985		5,985
Other Contract Services				20,000	25,000	45,000
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>153,730</b>	<b>740,750</b>	<b>894,480</b>

  

<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000		72,000
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses	35,000	43,750	54,687	68,358	75,000	276,795
Telecommunications	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	24,000
Contract Services				2,000	2,000	4,000
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>57,800</b>	<b>66,550</b>	<b>77,487</b>	<b>93,158</b>	<b>81,800</b>	<b>376,795</b>

  

<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 13-14</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	-	-	-	153,730	740,750	894,480
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>57,800</b>	<b>66,550</b>	<b>77,487</b>	<b>93,158</b>	<b>81,800</b>	<b>376,795</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>57,800</b>	<b>66,550</b>	<b>77,487</b>	<b>246,888</b>	<b>822,550</b>	<b>1,271,275</b>

#### 2.2.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

*Assumptions:*

- There are no benefits to this alternative. Costs are higher due to lack of participation in the collaboration, with more impacts to staff.

#### 2.2.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

N/A

### 2.3 RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it provides the six courts with a more modern case management system which has the functionality needed to allow the courts to increase operational efficiencies and provide greater access to the public and justice partners.

GLOSSARY

Term	Description

## APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS

The Cost Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for costs for Business Case.



**Cost table 2.xlsx**

The Benefits Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for the benefits for Business Case.



**Benefits table.xlsx**

The Return On Investment (ROI) spreadsheet below must be filled out using the total 5 year costs and benefits for each alternative included in the BCP.



Lassen ROI Table -  
12.18.13.xlsx

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 03/13)

Fiscal Year 2014-2015	BCP No. TC3	Org. Code 0250	Department JUDICIAL BRANCH	Priority No. 3
Program 45			Element 10	Component

Proposal Title

Foundation for Digital Courts – Phase One (Case Management System Replacement – Los Angeles Superior Court)

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$666,800 for one time costs to fund a replacement case management system for the Superior Court of Los Angeles. The requested funding will be used for the implementation and deployment costs for this system. There is no staffing augmentation.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date
---	----------------	------

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the California Technology Agency, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR       SPR      Project No.      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?       Yes       No  
*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	Date	Agency Secretary	Date

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Technology Agency

BCP Type:       Policy       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
------	-----------------------------------



# Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Request

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL  
COURTS - PHASE ONE (CASE  
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
REPLACEMENT - LOS ANGELES  
SUPERIOR COURT)

VERSION 1

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2013

## DOCUMENT REVISIONS

Version	Date	Name	Change Description	Sections

## RELATED DOCUMENTATION

Version	Date	Name	Description	Location

## APPROVALS

Name	Title	Signature/Link to Electronic Approval	Date

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>PROPOSAL SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND .....	6
1.2	STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS.....	7
1.3	JUSTIFICATION .....	8
1.4	OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....	11
<b>2</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1	ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION) .....	14
2.1.1	Description .....	14
2.1.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	14
2.1.3	Costs .....	15
2.1.4	Estimated Benefits .....	18
2.1.5	Return on Investment.....	20
2.1.6	Implementation Plan for recommended solution .....	20
2.2	ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING) .....	21
2.2.1	Description .....	21
2.2.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	21
2.2.3	Costs .....	21
2.2.4	Estimated Benefits .....	22
2.2.5	Return On Investment .....	22
2.3	Recommendation .....	23
	<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS.....</b>	<b>25</b>

# 1 PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Los Angeles Superior Court (LASC) faces significant operational and technical challenges with its Probate case management system (CMS) that has been in operation for 18 years and that was expected to be replaced by CCMS. The existing CMS product's limited functionality will neither support LASC's planned business processing reengineering efforts intended to improve efficiencies in court operations, nor will it provide a platform to allow the court to expand its electronic filing and online public access capabilities or pursue information sharing opportunities. The most immediate technical challenge relates to the existing CMS product's incompatibility with the Windows 7 operating system, which LASC is deploying to mitigate the risks associated with Windows XP support being discontinued on April 8, 2014. As such, LASC is requesting \$666,800 in onetime funding (*Refer to Table 2.1.3.3*) to replace its Probate CMS with a more contemporary solution to address these and other critical problems described in this proposal. This funding will be utilized toward the cost of initial licensing for both Court and Public users, a Probate configuration for Los Angeles and data migration from 10 existing Probate databases to the new CMS; in addition, it will cover Infrastructure costs such as hardware and storage since the system will be locally hosted in Los Angeles. No changes are required to current statutes or regulations in conjunction with this request.

A contemporary CMS will not only improve technology efficiencies by centralizing multiple systems that currently support Probate into a single system with a single database, but it will also allow the Court to improve its case processing efficiency and effectiveness by automating workflow, reducing manual processing and eliminating redundant data entry and system support. The return on investment for the initial 5 years is calculated at 18%; the ongoing benefits realized after project completion in FY 16-17 is calculated at \$790,633 each year. (*Refer to Table 2.1.4*). Intangible benefits that have not been quantified include the improved quality, timeliness and level of service delivery to the public, other courts and agencies, the convenience of expanded online services that provide remote access to court records and services, and the opportunities to share data with other courts and relevant agencies.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

LASC serves the 10 million people of Los Angeles County with courtrooms spread throughout the 4,000 square mile County. In fiscal year 2012-2013, 10,676 Probate cases were filed in Los Angeles. More than 65,000 hearings are currently scheduled and approximately 10,000 Probate Investigations are completed annually.

Over the past several years, LASC implemented a series of budget saving measures that included a 24% reduction in staffing and the closure of 8 courthouses to address the annual \$187 million budget shortfall resulting from State funding reductions. Effective April 8, 2013, LASC's Probate operation was restructured as part of LASC's Court Consolidation Plan. This restructuring reduced the number of courthouses processing Probate cases from 10 to 2 and the number of courtrooms hearing Probate cases from 13 to 5. Additionally,

LASC reduced the number of courtroom and office staff who processed Probate cases from 68.9 to 54.4 positions. As a result, processing backlogs have accumulated, the most significant of which are a 3-week delay in recording the filing of non-petition documents and a delay of over 6 months in recording courtroom dispositions.

LASC has long recognized the need for a contemporary CMS to effectively support Probate cases, but opted not to upgrade to Sustain Justice Edition when work commenced on CCMS. Since the Judicial Council opted to cease the deployment of CCMS in March of 2012, LASC is submitting this proposal to identify and deploy an alternative solution.

LASC currently manages Probate cases using the Sustain DOS case management system that was developed by Sustain Technologies, Inc. circa 1988. LASC is currently the only court that utilizes Sustain DOS, which is no longer actively supported by the vendor. With respect to functionality, Sustain DOS is extremely limited by any current measure. For example, it includes only rudimentary minute order capturing, reporting, and form generating capabilities; cannot be customized to support local business rules; does not include automated workflow capabilities; does not integrate with LASC's document management and financial systems; does not provide an application programming interface (API) to facilitate interfacing the product with other internal and external systems operated by LASC and its justice partners; and does not support the electronic filing of cases and documents. To address a small subset of these functional shortcomings, LASC developed two additional custom applications to augment Sustain DOS's functionality to support the work of LASC's Probate Attorneys and Probate Investigators.

Architecturally, Sustain DOS is a client-server product consisting of a Microsoft DOS-based client application and Pervasive SQL as its backend database management system. LASC currently operates 10 distinct Sustain DOS product instances using a dedicated database for each courthouse that currently processes (or historically processed) Probate cases. Beginning with the Windows 7 operating system, Microsoft no longer supports 16-bit applications such as Sustain DOS. As a result, LASC is currently delaying the rollout of Windows 7 to the subset of judicial officers and staff that require Sustain DOS to perform their job functions.

## 1.2 STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS

This proposal aligns with three goals outlined in the Judicial Council's strategic plan: Goals III, IV and VI.

Goal III – Modernization of Management and Administration – calls for the administration of justice “in a fair, timely, efficient, and effective manner by using modern management practices that implement and sustain innovative ideas and effective practices.” LASC's implementation of a contemporary CMS will allow the Court to manage its Probate cases with greater efficiency and effectiveness, utilize its staffing resources more effectively, and expand online services and integration opportunities. LASC will improve data acquisition efficiencies through electronic filing, online form templates, and data exchange opportunities. A contemporary CMS will allow the court to improve operational efficiencies by providing a platform to support business

process re-engineering initiatives; automating workflow; and integrating case management, financial management and document management into a single system. This will in effect eliminate redundant data entry, eliminate redundant system support, and reduce manual processing and tracking. In addition, a new CMS will provide LASC with a foundation for expanding online services and opportunities to share its data with other courts and agencies. Furthermore, the new system will allow LASC to collect and analyze data to generate reports to measure workload, assess results and gain insight into court operations. The outcome of all this will be the timely and efficient processing of Probate cases.

Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public – promotes the delivery of the “highest quality of justice and service to the public.” The proposed solution will allow LASC to improve the level of service to the public, other courts, and agencies. Online services will be available 24/7 to provide electronic access to Probate indexes, calendar information, and electronic documents as allowable by statute. In addition, electronic filing services, online hearing reservation services, and programs to facilitate form completion will be available to provide remote access to services and eliminate the need to travel to a courthouse.

Goal VI – Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence – is intended to “enhance the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological, and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the needs of the public, the branch, and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity.” The technological infrastructure improvements resulting from this project will help LASC meet several of the Judicial Council’s stated objectives for this goal by providing:

- “greater technological access and integration”
- “coordinated and effective case management systems”
- “systems for measuring court performance and accounting for the use of resources”
- “systems for sharing appropriate information throughout the branch and with other partners”

This proposal will not negatively impact other state entities. Potential support for this proposal may be found in other counties who may wish to leverage LASC’s resulting Probate configuration for the chosen replacement CMS. Beyond the obvious and expected competition for limited funds, LASC is not aware of areas of potential opposition to this proposal.

### 1.3 JUSTIFICATION

With the reduction of judicial and staffing resources assigned to Probate cases, it is critical that LASC implement a contemporary CMS that will support business processing reengineering efforts to achieve operational efficiencies, integrate functions of multiple systems into a single system, expand online electronic filing and public access capabilities, promote information sharing initiatives, and be compatible with the

Windows 7 operating system. Since LASC's current CMS does not provide the foundation to move forward on any of these fronts, the quality and timeliness of services will suffer and continue to result in backlogs.

The new CMS will automate manual tasks and work processes which will allow the Court to manage its Probate cases with greater efficiency and effectiveness and to utilize its staffing resources more effectively. This will support the Access 3D dimension of Equality as it will allow LASC to strategically assign staff to tasks to serve the public more effectively. The implementation of electronic filing and online form template applications will improve data acquisition efficiencies by enforcing input rules and by eliminating the indexing and scanning of documents. The reduction in case processing costs from electronic filing is calculated at \$43,700 for 10,582 documents each year (*Refer to Operational Benefits Table 2.1.4.1: Item A & B*). Documents submitted to the Court will be placed in work queues and routed based on processing rules. Work queues will also be implemented to track the issuance of letters for guardianships, track cases with submitted matters, and check the annual compliance certification for Probate Volunteer Panel Attorneys. As manual tasks are eliminated, staff will become available to complete tasks to eliminate areas of backlog.

Probate Examiners will also benefit from a new CMS, which will flag cases with a delinquent submission of documents. The use of templates and CMS data will further facilitate the Probate Examiner's preparation of citations and Order to Show Cause documents. A program for electronic submission of simple accountings may allow the system to assess entries and flag potential issues to facilitate the review of these documents; the reduction in accounting review costs is calculated at \$129,755 per year (*Refer to Operational Benefits Table 2.1.4.1: Item G.*) The new CMS will allow Probate Attorneys to create templates and macros that will facilitate the creation of notes, thus eliminating redundant data entry. The associated reduction in Probate Notes preparation costs is calculated at \$62,638 per year (*Refer to Operational Benefits Table 2.1.4.1: Item E & F*). Furthermore, the new CMS will allow LASC to collect and analyze data to generate reports to measure workload, assess results and gain insight into court operations.

The new CMS will also improve technology efficiencies by integrating functions of disparate systems into a single system and a single database for Probate. Currently, a myriad of systems and applications are utilized to support Probate case processing: Sustain DOS CMS, Probate Notes Application (PNA), Probate Investigator Management System (PrIMS), Payment Revenue Distribution (PRD) system, and General Statistics System (GSS). Since these external systems will no longer be utilized and reports will be run from a single database, the associated support tasks performed by IT staff will also be eliminated. This will result in a reduction in \$86,597 of system support costs each year. This integration to a single system will not only eliminate the redundant data entry of CMS data into PNA and PrIMS, but will also eliminate the need to enter payment information from PRD into the CMS. It will also eliminate the need to image documents, such as Probate Notes and Probate Investigator reports, which are currently generated outside the CMS. The associated reduction in case processing costs is calculated at \$58,082 per year (*Refer to Operational Benefits Table 2.1.4.1: Item H & I*). Finally, the integration of a new CMS with LASC's document management system (DMS) will provide LASC judicial officers and Probate staff with a more readily accessible and complete view of court records.

The new CMS will support the Access 3D Dimension of Remote Access by providing LASC with a foundation for expanding online services and opportunities to share its data with other courts and agencies. This is critical since Probate services previously provided at 9 courthouses were centralized to a Central Probate courthouse; online services eliminate the need to travel to the centralized Probate courthouse for services. Electronic filing facilities will make it more convenient for the public to submit documents to LASC, while also facilitating LASC's efficient intake and review of documents from self-represented and other parties using standards-based electronic filing approaches and electronic filing service providers (EFSPs) that have proved successful for Riverside and Orange Counties. Considering that LASC's newly centralized Probate division partners with two legal aid agencies to assist self-represented litigants, the majority of whose petitions could be filed electronically in the future by providing electronic filing services to these two partners alone. In addition, LASC will facilitate the completion of forms with online form templates and the scheduling of hearings with online hearing reservation programs. These online self-service options will not only eliminate data entry and document imaging tasks, but will also reduce the volume of telephone and in-person inquiries handled by LASC staff. The associated reduction in customer services tasks is calculated at \$24,742 each year (*Refer to Operational Benefits Table 2.1.4.1: Item K & L*). .

The proposed solution's centralized database and API will also allow LASC to more easily provide the public with access to Probate case data and documents, and will also allow LASC to explore opportunities to share data with relevant agencies such as the Office of the Public Guardian to further streamline the flow of cases through our respective operations.

With respect to supportability, the recommended solution is compatible with the Windows 7 operating system, which Microsoft will support until January 14, 2020. Microsoft has been very clear about its intent to no longer provide security patches for Windows XP after April 8, 2014. Moreover, the recommended solution is a web-based application that is supported on any client device that includes a mainstream web browser. With respect to architectural considerations, the recommended solution was designed using conventional approaches to multi-tier, web-based applications. These approaches provide for centralized deployment and administration of the solution and eliminate the need to install software components other than a web browser on individual users' computers.

A new CMS will benefit the Court by facilitating business process reengineering efforts intended to improve LASC's operational efficiency which, in turn, will benefit the public, other courts and agencies by facilitating LASC's ability to provide improved services and to interact more effectively with its justice partners and other courts. As LASC's line-of-business system, a new CMS will benefit LASC judicial officers and administrators who will use the system to manage cases effectively and utilize the system's data and reports for business insights; Probate staff who will process tasks efficiently; LASC programmers who will build interfaces to the system; LASC partners who will participate in the end-to-end justice processes; and the public who will benefit from enhanced online access and services and the timely and effective delivery of justice. Since LASC currently handles approximately 27% of the state's Probate filings, there is a high probability that an

implementation of a new Probate CMS that will accommodate LASC's case load will also be serviceable for other courts wishing to leverage the branch's and LASC's investment for this case type.

In summary, the proposed solution will address LASC's short-term goal of migrating our remaining user base to Windows 7 approximately 6 months after the CMS replacement project is initiated. And, having all Probate case data in a centralized database will provide immediate benefits to all constituents who rely on this data. The proposed solution will also provide LASC with the necessary technology to begin reengineering its business processes to achieve operational efficiencies over the longer term.

While LASC has many CMSs that warrant replacement, LASC has given priority to replacing Sustain DOS due to its incompatibility with Windows 7, which may expose LASC's network to potential security vulnerabilities, and its inability to complete case processing in a timely manner, which is resulting in a growing backlog and overtime costs. Additionally, replacing the Probate CMS is more readily achievable than replacing the CMS for some other case types due to its smaller user base, lower transaction volumes, and lack of external system interfaces that LASC would otherwise need to adapt to a new CMS. Collectively, these risk factors make a Probate CMS replacement project an attractive first step to establishing a new CMS platform upon which other case types can be consolidated in the future.

There are no known legal implications associated with this proposal, which is consistent with the use and purpose of the funding sources requested. Furthermore, this proposal is the only currently identified financial vehicle for LASC to proceed with the proposed solution.

#### 1.4 OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The expected outcomes of LASC's implementation of a contemporary Probate case management system include:

##### 1) Operational efficiencies

- Automated workflow  
*Measurable by number of work queues established.*
- Reduction in data entry and scanning tasks  
*Measurable by number of e-filed documents, number of system-generated documents, and reduction of staffing hours assigned to data entry and scanning.*
- Reduction in time required to create Probate Notes and review Accountings  
*Measurable by a time study.*
- Reduction in backlogs and overtime  
*Measurable by backlog tracking report and hours of overtime completed by staff.*

- Enhanced access to electronic case file

## 2) Technological efficiencies

- Integration of financial payment record functionality and electronic documents into CMS
- Integration of Probate Notes creation functionality into CMS and elimination of existing Probate Notes Application and related support  
*Visible by termination of access to the application.*
- Integration of Probate Investigator management functionality into CMS and elimination of existing non-integrated Probate Investigators Management System  
*Visible by termination of access to the system.*
- Migration to a single Probate database  
*Visible by elimination of Sustain DOS databases.*
- Compatibility with Windows 7

## 3) Expanded remote access and online services

- Electronic filing services  
*Measurable by the number of documents e-filed.*
- Online form templates  
*Measurable by the number of online forms completed.*
- Online hearing reservation services  
*Measurable by the number of hearings reserved.*
- Data-sharing opportunities with relevant agencies

Many of these outcomes will be fully realized at the time the proposed solution is operational.

The Expenditures and Resource Management Unit of the Financial Services Department, which reports to the LASC Deputy Executive Officer of Administration and Finance, will coordinate with the AOC to account for and monitor the funds and confirm that industry standards and best practices are employed. A distinct account will be established to track resources and expenditures and to facilitate the preparation of required financial and performance reports. Accounting records will be supported by appropriate documentation, which may include receipts, employee time and attendance records, payroll records, etc. Employee compensation for time devoted and identified specifically to this project will be documented on a timesheet that indicates the employee's name, the specific project time is charged to, the dates on which time is charged, and the number of hours charged to the project each day. Equipment and other capital expenditures will be tracked with the following information: a description of the property, serial number or other identification, the source of the property, acquisition date, cost, the location, cost or invoice amount and receipt information. LASC will comply with its established policies and procedures for procurements.

LASC will be responsible for monitoring the day-to-day activities of this project and will make periodic reports regarding program performance and financial status. Upon written request, LASC will provide information regarding any and all fund and expenditures to the AOC. The information requested may include, but is not limited to, performance and financial reports. Performance reports shall contain a comparison of actual accomplishments to the objectives established for the reporting period. Results will be quantified wherever possible. If established objectives were not met, the reasons for underperformance will be included.

## 2 ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION)

#### 2.1.1 DESCRIPTION

The recommended solution is to upgrade the current Sustain DOS product to Sustain eCourt or replace the system with Tyler Technologies Odyssey. The assessment of the two systems and product selection will be completed in the third quarter of fiscal year 2013-2014.

#### 2.1.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

In all aspects of their features, design, and architecture, eCourt and Odyssey are vastly superior products to Sustain DOS. Most notably, these contemporary CMSs provide the following advantages over Sustain DOS:

- Customizable data fields, screens, forms, and reports
- Role-based access control to data and records
- Enhanced minute order creation and party check-in functionality for hearings
- Ability to consolidate, relate, and join cases
- Configurable register of action entries
- Business rules engine
- Enhanced forms generation functionality
- Functionality for Judicial officers, Probate Attorneys and Probate Investigators
- Integrated financial and document management
- Workflow and electronic filing capabilities
- Application Programming Interfaces (APIs)

Both eCourt and Odyssey will also address LASC's challenges with respect to Sustain DOS's incompatibility with supported operating systems and LASC's need for a single system with a centralized application and database deployment model. And, unlike Sustain DOS, both products are under active development and supported by their vendors.

The new CMS will not only automate manual tasks and work processes, but will also allow the Court to manage its Probate cases with greater efficiency and utilize its staffing resources more effectively. For example, the volume of data entry and scanning tasks will be reduced with the implementation of electronic filing, online form templates and the centralization of Probate into a single system. Automated workflow will route tasks that cannot be fully automated to the appropriate resource efficiently. The new case management system will also facilitate the creation of Probate Notes, citations and the review of accountings submitted to the Court. All these operational efficiencies will not only eliminate the current case processing backlogs and overtime costs, but will also improve Probate operations.

In terms of disadvantages, the initial costs for software licensing, professional services, hardware, and LASC resources required to implement a new system exceed the current annual licensing costs for Sustain DOS. However, while Sustain DOS is inexpensive to operate, the product's limitations are largely responsible for operational inefficiencies that are resulting in backlogs and the need for personnel overtime. Intangible benefits such as providing better service to the public cannot be quantified, yet are important business drivers for proceeding with the recommended solution.

In terms of risk, eCourt and Odyssey are both new products for California courts.

### 2.1.3 COSTS

#### 2.1.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS

The costs for the proposed solution are based on the following assumptions:

- Software licensing and professional services costs are based on estimates provided by Sustain Technologies. Although the allocation of costs across the various categories may vary, the total implementation costs for Tyler Odyssey will be comparable to that of eCourt.
- LASC will continue to utilize the IBM FileNet document management system and will not incur the additional costs associated with the implementation of a new DMS.
- No annual software license maintenance costs will be incurred until the replacement CMS is being used in a production capacity.
- Sustain DOS licensing costs will be eliminated after implementation of the new CMS.

- IT staff costs for the support of the new CMS will be reduced since the 10 existing databases will be centralized into a single database.
- IT staff costs for the support of the Probate Notes Application (PNA) and Probate Investigator Management System (PrIMS) will be eliminated after implementation of the new CMS.
- Hardware maintenance costs will be 20% of the initial capital investment per year.

### 2.1.3.2 COST TABLES

Table 2.1.3.2.

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Probate CMS Replacement</b>						
<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	760,027	190,007				950,034
Hardware Purchase	100,000					100,000
Software Purchase/Licenses						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight	6,000	1,500				7,500
IV&V Services	12,000	3,000				15,000
Other Contract Services	325,000					325,000
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>1,203,027</b>	<b>194,507</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,397,534</b>
<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		34,779	34,779	34,779	34,779	139,116
Hardware Lease/Maintenance		20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
Software Maintenance/Licenses		241,800	241,800	241,800	241,800	967,200
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>1,186,316</b>
<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	1,203,027	194,507	-	-	-	1,397,534
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>1,186,316</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>1,203,027</b>	<b>491,086</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>296,579</b>	<b>2,583,850</b>

## DETAILS OF 5-YEAR COSTS

**TABLE 2.1.3.3 FUNDING REQUEST DETAILS**

CATEGORY	AMOUNT	DETAILS
One-Time Costs - Year 1 Hardware Purchase	100,000	Servers, SAN storage
One-Time Costs - Year 1 Other Contract Services	325,000	Professional services for Probate configuration and migration of existing cases from 10 databases
Ongoing IT Project Costs - Year 2 Software Maintenance/Licenses	241,800	New CMS Maintenance/Licenses for Court users and Public users for first year of implementation

Sub-Total      666,800

### COURT COST DETAILS

CATEGORY	AMOUNT	DETAILS
One-Time Costs - Year 1 Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	87,051	Project Manager
	387,615	Technical lead, 2 IT staff, System Administrator, Database Administrator
	285,361	SME lead, 2 SME staff
One-Time Costs - Year 2 Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	21,763	Project Manager (3 months)
	96,904	Technical lead, 2 IT staff, System Administrator, Database Administrator (3 months)
	71,340	SME lead, 2 SME staff (3 months)
One-Time Costs – Year 1 Project Oversight	6,000	Project oversight
One-Time Costs – Year 2 Project Oversight	1,500	Project oversight (3 months)
One-Time Costs – Year 1 IV&V Services	12,000	IV&V services
One-Time Costs – Year 2 IV&V Services	3,000	IV&V services (3 months)
Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 2 Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	34,779	New CMS IT support
Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 3 Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	34,779	New CMS IT support
Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 4 Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	34,779	New CMS IT support
Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 5 Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	34,779	New CMS IT support
Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 2 Hardware Lease/Maintenance	20,000	New CMS server maintenance
Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 3 Hardware Lease/Maintenance	20,000	New CMS server maintenance
Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 4 Hardware Lease/Maintenance	20,000	New CMS server maintenance

Continuing IT Project Costs - Year 5 Hardware Lease/Maintenance	20,000	New CMS server maintenance
Ongoing IT Project Costs – Year 3 Software Maintenance/Licenses	241,800	New CMS maintenance/licenses
Ongoing IT Project Costs - Year 4 Software Maintenance/Licenses	241,800	New CMS maintenance/licenses
Ongoing IT Project Costs - Year 5 Software Maintenance/Licenses	241,800	New CMS maintenance/licenses

Sub-Total 1,917,050

**TOTAL 5 YEAR COSTS 2,583,850**

#### 2.1.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

In addition to the eliminating the costs of supporting the existing CMS and multiple Probate applications, the new CMS will deliver substantial ongoing operational benefits. LASC will realize a significant reduction of labor hours spent on manual processing tasks such as data entry, scanning and document preparation. All these operational efficiencies will not only eliminate the current case processing backlogs and overtime costs, but will also improve the efficiency of Probate operations.

Table 2.1.4.

Alt 1 Probate CMS Replacement Recommended : Estimated Benefits							5 Year Estimate
IT Cost Savings/Avoidance	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19		
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		\$ 375,475	\$ 500,633	\$ 500,633	\$ 500,633	\$ 1,877,374	
Software Maintenance/Licenses		250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000	
Hardware Lease/Maintenance		40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	160,000	
Telecommunications						-	
Contract Services						-	
Telecommunications						-	
Data Center Services						-	
Justice Partner costs						-	
Facilities						-	
Other						-	
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 665,475</b>	<b>\$ 790,633</b>	<b>\$ 790,633</b>	<b>\$ 790,633</b>	<b>\$ 3,037,374</b>	
<b>Revenue Opportunities</b>							
eFiling fees						\$ -	
Other fees						-	
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>Total Estimated Benefits</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 665,475</b>	<b>\$ 790,633</b>	<b>\$ 790,633</b>	<b>\$ 790,633</b>	<b>\$ 3,037,374</b>	

**TABLE 2.1.4.1 ONGOING OPERATIONAL BENEFITS**  
Annual Savings

**ELECTRONIC FILING**

A. Elimination of redundant CMS data entry	20,145
B. Elimination of imaging documents	23,555
Subtotal	43,700

**OTHER DOCUMENT PROCESSING**

C. Elimination of imaging other documents	79,764
D. Reduction in hardcopy document handling	15,336
E. Facilitation of Probate Notes preparation	40,212
F. Facilitation of citation and Order to Show Cause preparation	22,425
G. Facilitation of simple accountings review	129,775
Subtotal	287,512

**SYSTEM INTEGRATION & SINGLE DATABASE**

H. Elimination of redundant PNA data entry	10,890
I. Elimination of imaging documents	47,192
J. Elimination of system support	86,597
Subtotal	144,679

**REDUCTION IN IN-PERSON & TELEPHONE SERVICE**

K. Reduction of telephone call volume	16,495
L. Reduction of in-person service	8,247
Subtotal	24,742

**TOTAL                    500,633**

## 2.1.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Table 2.1.5

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Solution ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Alternative 1: Five Year Total</b>
Total 5 Year Estimated Benefits	\$ 3,037,374
Total 5 Year Costs	2,583,850
<b>Estimated 5 Yr Benefits Less 5 Yr Costs</b>	<b>\$ 453,524</b>
<b>ROI Calculation</b>	
<b>ROI (Total 5 Year Benefit - Total 5 Year costs)/Total 5 year costs</b>	<b>18%</b>

## 2.1.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR RECOMMENED SOLUTION

- The plan assumes funds would be available in July 2014 to initiate the project.
- LASC is not requesting additional staff in this proposal.
- This project will result in a new CMS for Probate that replaces the current CMS and ancillary applications that were developed to augment its limited functionality.
- The estimated Project Schedule:

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Estimated Duration</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>
Initiating	1 month	August 2014
Planning	1 month	September 2014
Executing	12 months	September 2015
Infrastructure Build Out		
Requirements Analysis		
Design		
Implementation		
Testing		
Training		
Deployment		
Closing	1 month	October 2015

## 2.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING)

### 2.2.1 DESCRIPTION

The alternative solution is to continue using Sustain DOS.

### 2.2.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

There are no advantages to continuing to use Sustain DOS other than to avoid the costs associated with replacing this system. The disadvantages are many including its incompatibility with supported operating systems and its limited functionality that preclude LASC from leveraging technology to improve operational efficiencies, to enhance the services provided to the public, and to more effectively exchange data with business partners.

As previously noted, requiring a subset of LASC users to remain on the Windows XP operating system will expose LASC's network to future security vulnerabilities.

### 2.2.3 COSTS

#### 2.2.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS

The costs for maintaining the status quo are based on the following assumptions:

- Sustain will continue to support both Sustain DOS and SJE for \$250,000 annually.
- IT staff will continue to support the 10 existing Sustain DOS databases, Probate Notes Application (PNA) and Probate Investigator Management System (PrIMS).
- IT support tasks performed by LASC staff will be limited to code table updates and report generation.

### 2.2.3.2 COST TABLES

Table 2.2.3.2

Alternative 2: Do Nothing						
One-Time Costs	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	Total Recommended
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						-
Hardware Purchase						-
Software Purchase/Licenses						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight						-
IV&V Services						-
Other Contract Services						-
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
Continuing IT Project Costs	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	Total Recommended
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	121,376	121,376	121,376	121,376	121,376	606,880
Hardware Lease/Maintenance	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	200,000
Software Maintenance/Licenses	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,250,000
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>2,056,880</b>
Summary Costs	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	Total Recommended
Total One-Time Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>2,056,880</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>411,376</b>	<b>2,056,880</b>

### 2.2.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

There are no Estimated Benefits.

### 2.2.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

There is no Return on Investment.

## 2.3 RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it provides the six courts with a more modern case management system which has the functionality needed to allow the courts to increase operational efficiencies and provide greater access to the public and justice partners.

# GLOSSARY

Term	Description

# APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS

The Cost Table Spreadsheet:



Costs Table  
FINAL.xlsx

The Benefits Table Spreadsheet:



Benefits Table  
FINAL.xlsx

The Return On Investment (ROI) spreadsheet.



ROI Corrected v1  
(5).xlsx

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 03/13)

Fiscal Year 2014-2015	BCP No. TC3	Org. Code 0250	Department JUDICIAL BRANCH	Priority No. 3
Program 45			Element 10	Component

Proposal Title

Foundation for Digital Courts – Phase One (Case Management System Replacement – Monterey Superior Court)

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$500,000 for one time costs to fund a replacement case management system for the Superior Court of Monterey. The requested funding will be used for the implementation and deployment costs for this system. There is no staffing augmentation.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date
---	----------------	------

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the California Technology Agency, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR       SPR      Project No.      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?       Yes       No  
*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	Date	Agency Secretary	Date

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Technology Agency

BCP Type:       Policy       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
------	-----------------------------------



# Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Request

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL  
COURTS - PHASE ONE (CASE  
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
REPLACEMENT - MONTEREY  
SUPERIOR COURT)

VERSION 1

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2013

DOCUMENT REVISIONS

Version	Date	Name	Change Description	Sections

RELATED DOCUMENTATION

Version	Date	Name	Description	Location

APPROVALS

Name	Title	Signature/Link to Electronic Approval	Date

# CONTENTS

1	PROPOSAL SUMMARY.....	6
1.1	BACKGROUND.....	7
1.2	STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
1.3	JUSTIFICATION.....	9
1.4	OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....	12
2	ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....	14
2.1	ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION).....	14
2.1.1	Description .....	14
2.1.2	Advantages/Disadvantages .....	16
2.1.3	Costs.....	18
2.1.4	Estimated Benefits .....	21
2.1.5	Return on Investment.....	22
2.1.6	Implementation Plan for recommended solution .....	23
2.2	ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING) .....	25
2.2.1	Description .....	25
2.2.2	Advantages/Disadvantages .....	26
2.2.3	Costs.....	27
2.2.4	Estimated Benefits .....	28
2.2.5	Return On Investment.....	29
2.3	RECOMMENDATION.....	29
	GLOSSARY .....	30
	APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS .....	31

# 1 PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Court is requesting \$500,000 in this Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to partially offset (seed money) the costs to replace the existing CMS for the civil case category, which includes civil limited, civil unlimited, family law, probate and small claims case types. The \$500,000 in BCP funding will be used for the acquisition of contract services which includes, implementation, data conversion, technical and project services for a locally hosted CMS. The total CMS replacement costs for the civil case category are as follows:

<b>Odyssey Case Management System (Civil)</b>	
Staff (Salaries and Benefits)	\$285,760
Software Licensing	\$433,714
Contract Services (Implementation, Data Conversion and Technical Services)	\$732,400
Hardware	\$38,886
<b>Total Solution of CMS Acquisition (Civil)</b>	<b>\$1,490,760</b>
Annual Maintenance & Support (M&S)	\$87,701

The Court proposes to fund the balance of the onetime CMS acquisition and implementation costs of \$990,760 and ongoing annual maintenance and support costs of \$87,701.

Monterey County Superior Court (the Court) has a critical and urgent need to replace its current case management system (CMS), Sustain Justice Edition (SJE). The SJE system is antiquated, expensive to support and maintain, and technologically deficient in extending court services to meet the expectations of the public and the justice partner community for online and anytime access to court records and services.

The Court proposes initial deployment of CMS in the civil case types. The Court has strategically selected the civil case type for initial CMS deployment to: Focus implementation on a single courthouse facility; relieve burdened staff and resources; receive positive and near term financial results; and allow for immediate improved public access.

The Court has performed extensive due diligence in its review and analysis of case management systems. A team of judicial officers, operations, finance, and information technology subject matter experts conducted in-depth evaluations of competing CMS products. The team participated in the statewide Case Management System RFP process. The team further evaluated preferred vendor solutions for operational efficiencies and cost savings. Tyler Technologies Odyssey case management system was overwhelmingly preferred.

The deployment of the replacement CMS is estimated at 12 months (Year 1) in a locally hosted environment. This investment has a positive return on investment (ROI) of 65% annually, evaluated over a five-year period. (See Table 2.1.5)

The CMS replacement affords the Court an opportunity to save an estimated \$1.89 million in costs (personal services and contracts) and generate an estimated \$1.33 million of cost recovery (new revenue from electronic filing and online document access fees). The total estimated benefits, cost savings and new revenue, by implementing the Odyssey CMS is \$3.2 million based on a five-year analysis. Refer to the table in section 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits. The ROI would begin after two years.

During implementation of the civil case management category the Court plans a phased approach to the replacement of the current case management system with Odyssey for all other case types.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

Monterey County Superior Court serves the County of Monterey which spans an area totaling 3,321.95 square miles and is geographically the 16<sup>th</sup> largest county in California. There are 12 incorporated cities in Monterey County and 2 state prisons located in the Soledad area. As of 2012, Monterey County's population was 420,668.

The Court's bench consists of 22.2 judicial officers, comprised of 19 funded judgeships, one unfunded judgeship (authorized pursuant to AB 159) and 2.2 commissioners. The Court assigns 5 judges and 1.2 commissioners to the civil case category calendars. The Court has 186.2 authorized employees working in four court locations in Salinas (2), Monterey and Marina.

The Monterey County Superior Court is a mid-sized court with a successful history of delivering technology-enabled business solutions to advance the Court's mission. The Court has received five Ralph N. Kleps Awards, the highest accolades for Judicial Branch innovation in solving common court problems. The Court has a talented and seasoned team with a proven track record of driving and executing business projects from conception to fruition.

The Court is currently using SJE as its CMS for the civil case category including civil limited, civil unlimited, family law, probate and small claims case types. There was an annual average of 12,251 civil category cases filed with the court over the past three years.

SJE was first implemented in the Court in 2002, replacing the DOS version of Sustain in the civil case category area; prior to implementation in 2002, the Court was using Sustain DOS for civil calendaring purposes only. SJE was intended as an interim solution as trial courts anticipated the transition to the statewide California Case Management System. The Court utilized the services of the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) until the CMS was transferred to a local-supported environment in December 2012. Over the past several years and currently, the enhancements and support for SJE have

been extremely limited due to the vendor, Sustain Technologies, focusing their resources and efforts on their new web-based application. Consequently, the Court is left with an antiquated CMS that is limited in functionality, extensibility and integration options.

## 1.2 STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS

Monterey County Superior Court's request for funding through this BCP aligns with the Judicial Branch's strategic and operational plans and the Chief Justice's 3-D Access goals for improving access to court services and enhancing the quality of justice. This request will enable the Court to implement leading-edge technological solutions that meet the needs of the Judicial Branch; enhance the access to court information for the public, law enforcement agencies, judicial officers and justice partners; and provide information to all in a timely manner.

This project aligns with Judicial Council's strategic goals as follows:

**Goal I: ACCESS, FAIRNESS, AND DIVERSITY. All Californians will have equal access to the courts and equal ability to participate in court proceedings, and will be treated in a fair and just manner. Members of the judicial branch community will reflect the rich diversity of the state's residents.**

Recent economic challenges have resulted in a reduction of 25% in Court staff, a reduction in business hours at all court branches and temporary closure of the King City Courthouse. Limited public access to court services has resulted from business hour reduction and temporary branch closure. By way of example, public access to documents in our single civil court facility in Monterey is currently limited to 18 hours per week. Lines during these time periods are frustrating for the public and overwhelming for court staff. It is imperative that the Court implement innovative and cost-effective ways to resume and enhance public access to necessary court services.

The Court's implementation of a web-based CMS will greatly enhance customer access to court services, including online records and documents. This need is especially critical for South County residents with the temporary closing of our King City courthouse. Some of our community's most economically challenged residents, living in south Monterey County, currently must travel 1.5 hours each way to reach a courthouse to file, review and respond to civil and family law matters. The Odyssey CMS solution will provide online access to many court services and anytime, anywhere access to the Court for residents throughout the county.

**Goal III: MODERNIZATION OF MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION. Justice will be administered in a timely, efficient, and effective manner that utilizes contemporary management practices; innovative ideas; highly competent judges, other judicial officers, and staff; and adequate facilities.**

A civil division web-based CMS will transform civil case processing from an outdated, time consumptive practice to a contemporary automated and efficient service. Electronic access to filing and review of Court documents will allow users to access court documents without consuming precious staff time and court resources and produce cost efficiencies. Instant remote access to court documents will assist court users in timely access to court information and provide cost recovery options.

**Goal IV: QUALITY OF JUSTICE AND SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC. Judicial branch services will be responsive to the needs of the public and will enhance the public's understanding and use of and its confidence in the judiciary.**

The Odyssey CMS solution provides a foundation for the Court to implement a comprehensive set of services for public interaction with the Court. It will also improve the quality of justice to the residents of Monterey County by being responsive and transparent to their needs.

**Goal VI: TECHNOLOGY. Technology will enhance the quality of justice by improving the ability of the judicial branch to collect, process, analyze, and share information and by increasing the public's access to information about the judicial branch.**

The Court will be replacing obsolete technology with modern technology which will allow for more efficient collection, processing and analyzing of data. This in turn will improve public access information about the work of the Court thereby increasing the Court's transparency to the public.

Addressing other state agency involvement, the Court will provide the ability for electronic exchanges with other agencies and will address these areas at a future time. Additionally, the Court anticipates that other agencies operating within the civil and family law arenas will welcome opportunities to automate their processes and interaction with the Court.

### 1.3 JUSTIFICATION

The Court's CMS application is the backbone of Court operations. The replacement of the antiquated CMS by a modern, web-based CMS in the civil case types will allow anytime, anywhere access to court services. A modern civil CMS will improve public accessibility, enhance Court operations and increase collaboration with justice partners.

Deployment of the civil CMS application will impact justice partners, including the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) and law enforcement, in the following manners: The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) will benefit from the ability to file cases electronically with the Court

and receive real-time updates; law enforcement will be updated instantly on vital civil restraining order information .

Recent economic challenges have resulted in significant stress and continuing reduction in court operations staff. The current results are a reduction of 25% in Court staff; reduction in business hours at all court branches; and temporary closure of the King City Courthouse. Business hour reduction and branch closure have limited access to court services for the public. By way of example public access to documents in our single civil court facility is currently limited to 18 hours per week. Lines during these time periods are frustrating for the public and overwhelming for court staff. It is imperative that the Court implement innovative and cost-effective ways to resume and enhance public access to necessary court services.

The deployment of the replacement CMS to relieve staff overload, improve communication and increase accessibility is estimated to take 12 months (Year 1) and the investment has a positive return on investment of 65% annually, evaluated over a five-year period. The ROI would begin after two years.

The objectives of the project are to:

- Deploy a replacement CMS built on leading-edge technology, commercially available, highly configurable and will enable the Court to relieve staff overload, automate court functions and establish the foundation necessary to transition to electronic records and electronic filing.
- Provide long-term cost savings through reduction in staff time, contract services and vendor support costs required to maintain the Court's CMS.
- Establish a mechanism for the Court to collect ongoing cost recovery revenues that offset the technological costs required to support anytime, anywhere online access to court services and records.
- Implement a common CMS platform that enables collaborative opportunities for enhancements, cost savings and service offerings within the California Judicial Branch.

### **Benefits of the proposal**

- *Improved and expanded electronic access to court services*

The web-based application, Odyssey CMS, allows the Court to adapt to changing expectations of the public, justice partners and court users, utilizing online services, electronic filing, and anytime anywhere access. Court users are increasingly sophisticated in the daily use of technology, relying on a variety of computing devices, such as laptops, handheld and mobile computing devices to

conduct various business and personal transactions. The expectation is that government services, including court services, provide the same ease and flexibility available in the private business sector, demanding that courts be effective, efficient, and responsive.

▪ *Automate court functions*

The proposed solution, Odyssey CMS, will use leading edge technology, commercially available off the shelf software, which is highly configurable and will enable the Court to automate Civil court functions, drive operational efficiencies and cost savings critical in times of reduced funding and resources. Automated document filing through e-filing will facilitate electronic records for civil case types resulting in a reduction in paper handling, data entry, cashiering, scheduling, file storage and related material costs.

The functions and features available in the replacement CMS will drive automation in the following areas:

- Combines advanced functionality with ease -of-use
- Straightforward: Users are able to intuitively navigate the system quickly and easily
- Efficient: e-filing and online document availability
- Flexible: Customize to fit the Court's specific needs
- Seamless: Integrate document management and workflow
- Secure: Protects sensitive data
- Enables management of all aspects of court administration
- Locating case information and attaching multiple file types
- Creating and viewing dockets in various ways
- Generating forms, letters and a variety of reports with advanced tools
- Calculating fees, fines and distributing payments automatically
- Fast data searches, using many different criteria

▪ *Increase cost efficiencies*

The investment in a replacement CMS will reduce the Court's current maintenance and support (M&S) costs by \$1.24 million and an estimated \$1.89 million in staffing and contract costs over a five-year period. (See tables.)

▪ *Reduce risk associated with technological obsolescence and support costs*

The Court's current case management system, SJE, with its use of a non-relational database (Btrieve), is antiquated, limited in functionality, extensibility and integration options. The limitations of the current CMS render the introduction of new functions and services such as electronic records, e-filing and data sharing either very difficult, extremely costly, or in some situations, impossible.

Without implementing a web-based CMS, the Court will be forced to remain “status-quo”, unable to leverage many of the opportunities to optimize operational efficiencies, realize cost savings, and utilize the additional functionality that a web-based CMS would provide.

The Court’s current CMS is expensive to maintain due to the costs associated with supporting an antiquated technological environment and several disjointed peripheral systems which are essential to supplement the core CMS system to achieve the required functionality. The average cost to maintain and support the current system is \$350K annually or \$1.7 million over five years.

Since our current CMS vendor, Sustain Technologies, is currently focused on their new web based CMS solution, eCourt, no significant upgrades to the current CMS application will be available. With the lack of modernization or upgrades to the current CMS, the Court will be forced to continue to assume significant risks of system performance and failure and face the challenges of software obsolescence and operational inefficiencies.

- Cost recovery options

CMS replacement affords the Court the opportunity to generate cost recovery revenue approximating \$1.33 million from electronic filing and online document access fees over a 5 year period.

#### 1.4 OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The Court, in collaboration with the vendor partner and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) will employ industry standards and best practices for project management and organizational change management to ensure a successful project completion.

The Court will manage resources in accordance with the Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual and the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual. The Project Team will report to Executive Management monthly about project progress and budget to ensure the appropriate use of the requested resources. A project code will be assigned in the state court accounting system (SAP) to track all related expenditures to the funding resource and monitored on a monthly basis or more often if necessary.

The following criteria will be used to measure the overall project:

- The proposed solution, replacement CMS, will be implemented within the twelve (12) month period. This includes the business process configuration changes and data conversion from the legacy systems.
- The public will have the ability to electronically file (e-filing) civil cases with the Court.

- In recent years due to funding and workforce reductions, civil case backlogs have reached up to two (2) months for certain case types. This backlog is anticipated to be reduced considerably through automated data entry and reduction in manual processes. This improvement will be measured by tracking and reporting of backlogs and from feedback from our stakeholders.
- Reduction in SJE software licensing fees and contract support by transitioning 43 users to the new case management system.
- In Year 2 of the Project, it is anticipated that up to 50% of civil category files will be e-filed, and 80% in subsequent years by mandating e-filing in Monterey County.
- Reports generated from the new case management system detailing the number of electronic documents and electronically filings.
  
- Reporting on operational efficiencies realized by the business process reengineering effort in implementing the new system. (Efficiencies gained by TO-BE (Odyssey System) in comparison to the AS-IS (SJE System)).
  
- Project meetings shall occur for the team to discuss progress, measure budget and ensure results.

## 2 ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION)

The Court's recommended solution is to replace its current CMS, Sustain Justice Edition, the current antiquated CMS, with a web-based CMS. The Court's CMS replacement methodology is a phased approach, beginning with the civil case category.

#### 2.1.1 DESCRIPTION

The Court's recommended solution is to replace its current CMS, SJE, with Tyler Technologies Odyssey CMS for the civil case category, which includes civil, family law, probate, and small claims case types.

The Court has selected the civil case type for initial CMS deployment for a number of reasons:

All civil case types are consolidated to a single court facility in the Monterey courthouse, simplifying the efforts required.

Deployment of a new technology in a single facility, acknowledging the potential challenges related to technology implementation, staff training and user adoption is considered a strategic advantage.

Staff, resource and public access constraints in the Monterey courthouse are vitally restricted and in need of relief.

Civil case type deployment will result in immediate cost efficiencies and cost recoveries not available in other case types resulting in greater positive financial impact.

Implementation of the civil CMS solution will be quicker than criminal resulting in earlier constructive results.

Civil case type users have already expressed an eagerness to adopt and embrace the technology.

The Court has performed extensive due diligence in its review and analysis of case management systems, including the following activities:

- Participation in the statewide competitive case management system request for proposal (RFP) process. A total of six potential CMS vendors were evaluated by a diverse group following presentations of their respective systems; the top ranked three vendors were awarded master service agreements with the Judicial Branch.

- A local Court team comprised of judicial officers, operations, finance, and information technology subject matter experts conducted an in-depth evaluation of various CMS product features and functionalities. The vendor evaluation included observing and participating in demonstrations of CMS applications from Monterey’s current CMS vendor, Sustain Technologies, as well as Tyler Technologies and Thomson Reuters, with the latter two selected through the competitive statewide RFP process. Tyler’s Odyssey system received the highest ranking by the court team.
- At a subsequent meeting and demonstration and after observing the local Court’s case flow processes and courtroom operations, Tyler was able to successfully demonstrate that the Odyssey application possesses the capabilities and configurability to meet the Court’s operational and business needs for case management.
- The Court made a reference call to San Luis Obispo Superior Court, where Tyler’s Odyssey product is currently in the final stages of deployment with the system scheduled to go-live in early 2014. San Luis Obispo Superior Court provided a favorable evaluation about the product functionality and Tyler’s project management, with the project currently on schedule. San Luis Obispo Superior Court represents the first California trial court to use Tyler’s Odyssey CMS.

Tyler’s Odyssey web-based platform is a widely adopted nationwide commercial CMS. Tyler has thirty (30) years of experience with a strong corporate organization and depth of resources supporting their product. Odyssey’s product includes case management, financial management, E- filing, and DMS capabilities. Tyler Technology’s Odyssey platform is highly configurable and enables courts to use technology to simplify processes, improve workflow and ensure efficient and consistent operations.

Tyler’s Odyssey system has been selected for deployment in San Luis Obispo, Kings, Merced, Kern, and Orange trial courts and is under consideration for selection in several other California trial courts. A standard CMS selection, Tyler’s Odyssey, will present collaboration and cost savings opportunities for not only Monterey County Superior Court, but other courts adopting Odyssey. Trial courts, either contracted with Tyler or interested in the Odyssey product, met in San Luis Obispo recently to form an Odyssey User Group to share experiences and best practices with contracting and CMS implementations – a preliminary example of the benefits of California trial courts collaborating in the technological arena.

The Court is requesting \$500,000 in this Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to partially offset (seed money) the costs to replace the existing CMS for the civil case category, which includes civil limited, civil unlimited, family law, probate and small claims case types. The \$500,000 in BCP funding will be used for the acquisition of contract services which includes, implementation, data conversion, technical and project services. The total CMS replacement costs for the civil case category are as follows:

Odyssey Case Management System (Civil)	
Staff (Salaries and Benefits)	\$285,760
Software Licensing	\$433,714
Contract Services (Implementation, Data Conversion and Technical Services)	\$732,400
Hardware	\$38,886

<b>Total Solution of CMS Acquisition (Civil)</b>	<b>\$1,490,760</b>
--	--------------------

Annual Maintenance & Support (M&S)	\$87,701
------------------------------------	----------

The Court proposes to fund the balance of the onetime CMS acquisition and implementation costs of \$990,760 and ongoing annual maintenance and support costs of \$87,701.

The deployment of the replacement CMS is estimated to take approximately 12 months (Year 1) and the investment has a positive return on investment of 65%, evaluated over a five-year period. Furthermore, the CMS replacement affords the Court the opportunity to save an estimated \$1.89 million dollars in costs (staffing and contract) and will generate an estimated cost recovery with new revenues of \$1.33 million from electronic filing and online document access fees. These cost savings and new revenue numbers reflect a five-year analysis.

#### 2.1.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

##### **Advantages of the Tyler Odyssey Case Management System**

- Improves court operations by reducing manual processing of civil case filings.
- Reduces burden on current staff workload.
- Reduction in workforce needed to staff civil operations.
- Eliminates ongoing document storage issues.
- Instant and remote access to Court documents and facilities.
- Reduction of filing delays and Court backlog.
- Ability to implement technology based fee recovery.
- Enables the Court to implement and maintain technology-enabled solutions that better meet the needs of the public, by administering timely and efficient justice, enhancing court operations and collaborating with justice partners.
- The web-based application allows the Court to adapt to the changing expectations of the public, justice partners and court users, utilizing online services, electronic filing, service and anytime anywhere access.

- The Odyssey application is leading-edge technology, commercially available off the shelf software, which is highly configurable and will enable the Court to automate court functions, drive operational efficiencies and cost savings critical in times of reduced funding and resources.
- Provides enterprise licensing with unlimited users, at no additional cost for justice partner users.
- Short deployment period of 12 months, realistic assumption for project completion within a single fiscal year (FY 14-15)
  - Combines advanced functionality with ease-of-use
  - Straightforward: Users are able to intuitively navigate the system quickly and easily
  - Efficient: Will eliminate duplicate data entry
  - Flexible: Customize to fit individual courts' specific needs
  - Seamless: Integrate document management and workflow
  - Secure: Protects sensitive data
  - Enables management of all aspects of court administration
  - Locating case information and attaching multiple file types
  - Creating and viewing dockets in various ways
  - Generating forms, letters and a variety of reports with advanced tools
  - Calculating fees, fines and distributing payments automatically
  - Fast data searches, using many different criteria
- Built in Document Management System (DMS) and integration for Electronic Filing. These two components provide the foundation for the Court to transition to electronic records with an estimated cost recovery of new revenue of \$1.33 million and an estimated \$1.89 million dollars in costs savings over a five-year period. These revenues and cost savings dollars will fully fund the ongoing costs associated with the Odyssey CMS civil implementation and will provide funding for future CMS case type conversions in criminal.
- Built in workflow function, enabling the Court to reengineer and automate case flow processes. The workflow function will eliminate manual steps, input of data, and streamline work processes through automation leading to case processing efficiencies, such as:
  - Reduces time to perform day-to-day processes.
  - Ensure tasks are carried out by the right people.
  - Get more work done in less time.
  - Gain easier access to data.
  - Reduce paper and printing costs.
  - Analyze worker productivity.

- Ensure regulatory requirements are met.
- Reduce required staff training of processes.
- In-depth set of functionality which enables the Court to eliminate several stand-alone, disjointed peripheral systems: examples are, electronic appeals generation, exhibit management, courtroom resource scheduling, and restraining orders exchange with justice partners.
- This strong functionality will significantly reduce ongoing support and maintenance costs.
- In recent years due to funding and workforce reductions, civil case backlogs have reached up to two (2) months for certain case types. This backlog is anticipated to be reduced considerably through automated data entry and reduction in manual processes. This improvement will be measured by tracking and reporting of backlogs and from feedback from our stakeholders.

### **Disadvantages of the Tyler Odyssey Case Management System**

- The current temporary disadvantage of the Tyler Odyssey CMS, which will soon be remedied, is that Odyssey does not have a presence in California trial courts. However, the San Luis Obispo (SLO) implementation in all case types is scheduled to occur in early 2014.
- The initial outlay of funds is a strategic opportunity cost that is necessary to increase access to court services.

### 2.1.3 COSTS

Table 2.1.3.2 includes the total cost of ownership, which includes software and hardware acquisition, staffing, professional services and maintenance. The deployment period for the CMS Civil replacement will be 12 months.

#### **2.1.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS**

- The Court will continue to use Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) for all other case types, criminal, traffic and juvenile case categories and will plan to replace these case types with Odyssey in a phased approach after the civil case category is implemented.
- The estimated period for the civil case type solution implementation is 12 months, within FY 14-15 (Year 1).

- The Court will transition to electronic documents for all civil case types in FY 15-16 (Year 2) by selectively converting active paper case files to electronic documents (scanning) and promoting electronic filing with court customers.
- Pursuant to AB2703 and California Rules of Court, the Court will mandate electronic filing for all civil case types commencing in Year 3, FY 16-17.

**2.1.3.2 COST TABLES**

<b>Recommended: Tyler Technologies Odyssey Case Manager (Civil)</b>						
<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	285,760					285,760
Hardware Purchase	38,886					38,886
Software Purchase/Licenses	433,714					433,714
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight	6,000					6,000
IV&V Services	12,000					12,000
Other Contract Services	714,400					714,400
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other	-					-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>1,490,760</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,490,760</b>
<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		27,485	27,485	27,485	27,485	109,940
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses		87,701	87,701	87,701	87,701	350,802
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>460,743</b>
<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	1,490,760	-	-	-	-	1,490,760
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>460,743</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>1,490,760</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>115,186</b>	<b>1,951,503</b>

**Assumptions/Notes**

Other Contract Services	Vendor professional services costs which includes, implementation, data conversion, travel, training, project and technical services.  <b>\$500,000 of the requested funds will go toward this cost.</b>
-------------------------	--

## 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits

<b>Alt 1: Tyler Odyssey Case Management System Recommended : Estimated Benefits</b>							<b>5 Year Estimate</b>
<b>IT Cost Savings/Avoidance</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>		
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		\$ 324,857	\$ 370,069	\$ 370,069	\$ 370,069	\$ 370,069	\$ 1,435,064
Software Maintenance/Licenses		40,396	40,396	40,396	40,396	40,396	161,585
Hardware Lease/Maintenance							-
Telecommunications							-
Contract Services		72,500	72,500	72,500	72,500	72,500	290,000
Telecommunications							-
Data Center Services							-
Justice Partner costs							-
Facilities							-
Other							-
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 437,753</b>	<b>\$ 482,965</b>	<b>\$ 482,965</b>	<b>\$ 482,965</b>	<b>\$ 482,965</b>	<b>\$ 1,886,648</b>
<b>Revenue Opportunities</b>							
eFiling fees		\$ 199,693	\$ 319,509	\$ 319,509	\$ 319,509	\$ 319,509	\$ 1,158,220
Other fees			37,500	56,250	75,000	75,000	168,750
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 199,693</b>	<b>\$ 357,009</b>	<b>\$ 375,759</b>	<b>\$ 394,509</b>	<b>\$ 394,509</b>	<b>\$ 1,326,970</b>
<b>Total Estimated Benefits</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 637,446</b>	<b>\$ 839,974</b>	<b>\$ 858,724</b>	<b>\$ 877,474</b>	<b>\$ 877,474</b>	<b>\$ 3,213,619</b>

### Assumptions/Notes

<b>Savings</b>	
Staff (Salaries and Benefits)	Workload savings of \$2.39 per document from efficiencies gained from e-Filing and conversion to electronic records (elimination of data entry, cashiering, creation, storage, retrieval, searches retention and destruction).  Based on an average of 167,452 documents for the civil case category.
Software Maintenance/Licenses	43 Licenses which equates to 25% annual reduction in SJE leasing costs.
Contract Services	Reduction in SJE contract services, which include professional and support services.
<b>Revenues</b>	
e-Filing	Cost recovery revenues from e-filing transactions. Based on average annual e-filing transactions of 79,877 and a filing fee of \$5 per e-filing transaction.
Other Services	Cost recovery revenues from online document requests

2.1.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Table 2.1.5

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Solution ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Alternative 1: Five Year Total</b>
Total 5 Year Estimated Benefits	\$ 3,213,619
Total 5 Year Costs	1,951,503
<b>Estimated 5 Yr Benefits Less 5 Yr Costs</b>	<b>\$ 1,262,116</b>
<b>ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>ROI</b> (Total 5 Year Benefit - Total 5 Year costs)/Total 5 year costs	65%

## 2.1.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR RECOMMENDED SOLUTION

The Court will take the following steps to optimize funding sources and ensure a successful deployment within the projected 12 month period by:

- Procuring the solution under the currently executed Master Services Agreement which allows the vendor to offer technology solutions and favorable pricing to courts statewide;
- Execute a contract in mid-to-late Year 0 (FY 13-14) with the implementation starting in Year 1 (FY 14-15);
- Funding the project over two fiscal years
  - FY 14-15 BCP Funds and Trial Court Funds

If the BCP funds are not granted, implementation of CMS in the civil case type will be delayed until funds become available. The impact on Court operations and public access will continue to be severely constrained and further reduced.

### MAJOR MILESTONES & KEY DELIVERABLES

The following outlines the project phases, major milestones and key deliverables:

	Milestones	Deliverables	Est. Timeframe
<b>Phase I</b>	1. Project Initiation and Planning		<b>2 – 3 Months</b>
	1.1. Project Kickoff	Project Management Plan includes the following components <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Charter</li> <li>• Communication Plan</li> <li>• Statement of Work</li> <li>• Project Work Plan</li> </ul>	
	1.2. Project Operation Plan	Project Operation Plan which includes three major components <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• User Acceptance Testing Plan</li> <li>• Training Plan</li> <li>• Change Management Plan</li> </ul>	
	1.3. Business Process Review	Business Process Review Report which includes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of business process</li> <li>• Prioritized listing of critical items</li> <li>• Listing of process redesign and</li> </ul>	

Phase II		business practice	
	1.4. Infrastructure Planning	Solution Design includes document the planned Odyssey environments and necessary underlying infrastructure Production, Testing and Staging	
	2. Design and Develop		<b>5 - 6 Months</b>
	2.1. Infrastructure Setup and Installation	Install, setup the Odyssey environments, build and deployment	
	2.2. Data Conversion	Deliverables are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Conversion Plan</li> <li>• Staging database populated</li> <li>• Court Data Import into IFL Database</li> <li>• Final push to conversion environment</li> <li>• Go-Live Push to production</li> <li>• Acceptance criteria</li> </ul>	
	2.3. Application and Integration Development	Conceptual process design for each approved application and integration development project	
	2.4. User Acceptance Testing	User Acceptance Testing Report and Acceptance Criteria	
	Phase III	3. Deployment	
3.1. Go-Live Transition Plan		Go-Live Transition Plan	
3.2. Training		Training Plans and Materials	
3.3. Go-Live		Go-Live Status Reports	

<b>Phase IV</b>	4. Project Conclusion		<b>0.3 Months</b>
	4.1. Close Project	Project Closeout Report	
<b>Total</b>			<b>12 Months</b>

## 2.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING)

The Court’s alternative two or status quo/do nothing solution is to remain on the SJE CMS for the civil case category.

### 2.2.1 DESCRIPTION

The alternative to the recommended solution is to do nothing and will require that the Court continue to use SJE for the civil category, including civil, family law, probate, and small claims. The Court implemented the SJE in the civil division in 2002, almost 11 years ago, which replaced an aging legacy CMS application. Since the Judicial Branch anticipated transitioning all courts to the statewide California Case Management System (CCMS), the SJE was intended to be an interim solution when implemented in 2002.

The Status Quo or Do Nothing alternative will result in the following situations:

- The Court will continue using the current CMS which is antiquated, limited in functionality, extensibility and integration options;
- Although the SJE platform is stable and currently supported, the application has severe performance issues and the Court will assume the risk of maintenance if vendor support were to be terminated in the future;
- The current application, SJE, does not support the Judicial Branch and Court’s future strategic initiatives to establish digital courts by investing in necessary foundation applications, a modern case management and document management system, which will allow the Court to efficiently deliver services to the public and the justice partners;
- SJE uses a ‘non-relational database’ which is prone to record errors resulting in system slowness which impacts productivity;

- The current implementation of SJE does not provide for the exchange of electronic case data with the justice partners and law enforcement agencies without the development of costly interfaces;
- SJE is not able to realize cost savings through automation of workflows and work queues;
- The Court will continue incurring other material costs, such as for paper and record storage due to ongoing need to use paper files with the antiquated CMS.
- Since our present CMS vendor, Sustain Technologies, is currently focused on their new web based CMS solution, eCourt, no significant upgrades to the current Sustain SJE CMS are anticipated. With the lack of modernization or upgrades to the current CMS, the Court will be forced to continue to assume risks of system performance and failure and face the challenges of software obsolescence and operational inefficiencies.

## 2.2.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

### **Advantages of the Sustain Case Management System**

- The Court will not incur implementation costs required to replace the current CMS and BCP funds would not be needed;
- Staff are familiar with SJE and how to navigate the system, so “doing nothing” will not require an investment in additional training or change management; and
- The system is currently stable and vendor supported; however, the CMS has severe performance issues, is limited in functionality, and is inadequate to meet the expectations of the public and the justice partner community for online and anytime access to court records and services.

### **Disadvantage of Sustain Case Management System**

- SJE is expensive to support and maintain due to the costs associated to support an antiquated technological environment and several disjointed peripheral systems which are essential to supplement for the required functionality. The average cost to maintain and support the current system is \$350K annually or \$1.7 million dollars over five years.
- SJE CMS is built on antiquated technology based on today’s innovations and standards. The SJE CMS is a non-relational database structure utilizing Btrieve files (Btrieve is the database structure), as the backend, with no integration with a Document Management System.
- **The Non-Relational Database creates the following ongoing issues for court users:**
  - The Btrieve files continuous occurrences of locked pages causes users to experience many “Record in Use” system errors throughout the day, negatively impacting productivity.

- The database can only effectively handle one year of financial data. Prior year financial data has to be archived and maintained outside of SJE.
- **Data Reporting Issues:**
  - Reports require inordinate amounts of time to generate data. Due to this situation, a separate reporting environment has been established and maintained by the Court. Critical case statistical reports required by the State require data reporting that requires reports to generate on an average of 3-5 days.
  - Financial and other reports can take several hours to run causing application slowness and impacting user experience and productivity.
- **Electronic Filing (e-Filing) is not provided with the SJE CMS:**
  - SJE does not provide a Document Management System; therefore, the Court is unable to adopt e-Filing functionality to assist with providing greater access to court services to the public and to mitigate the reduced court workforce due to ongoing funding reductions.
  - Availability and scheduling of the calendar for Law and Motion for Attorneys and in pro per clients is time consuming and difficult to manage as court personnel must manually track and communicate the future calendars settings.
  - With no e-Filing of the court documents, the public is unable to perform document searches. This results in the Court spending additional resources in pulling cases for the public.
- **No Workflow features available**
  - Calendaring and Daily/Weekly planning cannot be done. The Court has to rely on manual processes.
  - Case dispositions take an average of 10 days to complete, due to the lack of a courtroom proceedings workflow.
- **Data Exchange Limitations**
  - Critical data exchanges are not available with the Attorneys and our Justice Partners within the CMS.
  - Critical restraining orders exchanges between the Sheriff's Office and the Court are not within the SJE CMS.

### 2.2.3 COSTS

Table 2.2.3.2 includes the total cost of ownership, which includes maintenance and support costs for software and hardware, staffing, and contract services.

**2.2.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS**

- The vendor, Sustain Technologies, will continue to support the current version of the case management system for the next 5 years.
- Court’s existing contractors will be available and continue to support the case management and peripheral systems
- Costs to maintain the system will be remain constant during the next 5 years.

**2.2.3.2 COST TABLES**

<b>Alternative 2: Do Nothing</b>						
<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						-
Hardware Purchase						-
Software Purchase/Licenses						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight						-
IV&V Services						-
Other Contract Services						-
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	117,546	117,546	117,546	117,546	117,546	587,731
Hardware Lease/Maintenance	11,520	11,520	11,520	11,520	11,520	57,600
Software Maintenance/Licenses	40,396	40,396	40,396	40,396	40,396	201,981
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services	170,900	170,900	170,900	170,900	170,900	854,500
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>1,701,812</b>
<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>1,701,812</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>340,362</b>	<b>1,701,812</b>

**2.2.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS**

There are no quantifiable fiscal or operational benefits to doing nothing.

### 2.2.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

There is no quantifiable return on investment.

## 2.3 RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it provides the six courts with a more modern case management system which has the functionality needed to allow the courts to increase operational efficiencies and provide greater access to the public and justice partners.

## GLOSSARY

Term	Description

## APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS

The Cost Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for costs for Business Case.



Master Monterey  
BCP Cost Table 12-18

The Benefits Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for the benefits for Business Case.



Master Monterey  
BCP Benefits Table 12

The Return On Investment (ROI) spreadsheet below must be filled out using the total 5 year costs and benefits for each alternative included in the BCP.



ROI Corrected v1  
(7).xlsx

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 03/13)

Fiscal Year 2014-2015	BCP No. TC3	Org. Code 0250	Department JUDICIAL BRANCH	Priority No. 3
Program 45			Element 10	Component

Proposal Title

Foundation for Digital Courts – Phase One (Case Management System Replacement – San Diego Superior Court)

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$3,424,429 for one-time costs to fund a replacement case management system for the Superior Court of San Diego. The requested funding will be used for the implementation and deployment costs for this system. There is no staffing augmentation.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date
---	----------------	------

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the California Technology Agency, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR       SPR      Project No.      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?       Yes       No

*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	Date	Agency Secretary	Date

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Technology Agency

BCP Type:       Policy       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature
------	-----------------------------------



# Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Request

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL  
COURTS - PHASE ONE (CASE  
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
REPLACEMENT - SAN DIEGO  
SUPERIOR COURT)

VERSION 1

MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 2013

## DOCUMENT REVISIONS

<Once the document is finalized, any subsequent changes must be noted in the table below.>

Version	Date	Name	Change Description	Sections
<1.0>	November 27, 2013	Virginia Sanders-Hinds, David Koon, and Jessica Craven	Streamline template from standard Business Case	Entire document
2.0	December 6, 2013	Celeste Schwartz, Jake Pison	Draft San Diego BCP – Work in Progress	
3.0	December 11, 2013	San Diego Team	Updated all sections. Draft for review.	
4.0	December 12, 2013	Jake Pison	Updated in response to AOC feedback.	
5.0	December 12, 2013	Jake Pison	Update with feedback from Court Admin/Finance  Ready for submission.	
6.0	December 16	AOC Team	Comments updated and updated thru section 1.3.	
7.0	December 17, 2013	Jake Pison	Updated sections. Accepted AOC changes. Addressed comments from AOC Team	
8.0	December 19, 2013	Jake Pison	Updated Alternative 2 Cost section to clarify workaround solution. Updated Alternative 1 cost section to reflect proper FY spending cost.	

## RELATED DOCUMENTATION

*<Complete this optional section to reference any other documents that might provide additional context, information, etc. related to the document.>*

Version	Date	Name	Description	Location

## APPROVALS

*<Document review of this document and approval of the project by obtaining sign-offs in this section or providing a link to the repository in which electronic approvals (e.g., emails) are archived.>*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature/Link to Electronic Approval</b>	<b>Date</b>

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>PROPOSAL SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND .....	6
1.2	STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
1.3	JUSTIFICATION .....	9
1.4	OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....	12
<b>2</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1	ALTERNATIVE ONE - IMPLEMENT NEW FAMILY LAW CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....	14
2.1.1	Description.....	14
2.1.2	Advantages/Disadvantages .....	14
2.1.3	Costs .....	16
2.1.4	Estimated Benefits.....	18
2.1.5	Return on Investment .....	20
2.1.6	Implementation Plan for recommenDed solution .....	20
2.2	ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING) .....	22
2.2.1	Description.....	22
2.2.2	Advantages/Disadvantages .....	22
2.2.3	Costs .....	23
2.2.4	Estimated Benefits.....	24
2.2.5	Return On Investment.....	24
2.3	RECOMMENDATION .....	24
	<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>25</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS.....</b>	<b>26</b>

## 1 PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Due to the decision of the Judicial Council in 2012 to end deployment of the CCMS V4 system, we have a critical need to replace these systems today. Specifically, our Family Law CMS, called 'Fastrack,' is a vintage, DOS-based legacy system that currently supports 375 staff court wide in all areas of the Court including Family Law, Family Law Facilitators, Family Court Services, Accounting and Finance, and Judicial Services. This system also supports 27 Judicial Officers handling Family Law matters across San Diego County.

This Budget Change Proposal (BCP) requests funding of \$3.4 million for costs associated with the replacement of our Family Law CMS. This request covers a portion of the costs needed to implement the project. *Please refer to the cost section of Alternative One for a breakdown of the \$3.4 million funding request in Table 2.1.3.1.* In addition, the new CMS project requires the backfilling of current positions, as we envision taking seasoned, decision-making staff off the front lines and out of our business offices to act as subject matter resources during the life of the project, which is estimated to take 18 months to complete.

The Court has determined that replacing the existing 'Fastrack' CMS with the Family Law Case Management system from Tyler Technologies, called 'Odyssey', is the best solution to meet the Court's goals and objectives. In summary the benefits are as follows:

- Enable saving through efficiencies gained in case processing
- Improve electronic access to case information for the public
- Enable revenues from public access and e-Filing implementation
- Gain efficiencies and savings with Local Justice Partner and Agency Integration
- Ability to leverage and support a reliable technology infrastructure

A 5-year ROI analysis concludes that this proposal will result in ROI of 10 percent.

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

San Diego's Family Law CMS was built in 1973 on a DOS-based platform. This platform is no longer supported today due to defunct software. Our one internal programmer plans to retire within the next two years, leaving the Court in a tenuous position in regards to support.

It had been the Court's plan to implement a new Family Law CMS under the CCMS State-based, V4 system. It was believed that this new system would have been ready for implementation and use in 2012, allowing us to meet the public and internal goals of the Court. Since that option was removed, San Diego is forced to look for alternative options.

In an already challenging climate due to reductions in state funding to the trial courts and therefore a drastically reduced local budget, the Court has been required to reduce court wide staff costs by \$33 million annually. The

Court has been forced to move staff, in many cases in the Family Law area, while still being required to support the Judicial Officers and to provide timely access to justice for the public and court users. It continues to be the Court's goal to implement more electronic, on-line services to implement more efficient and improved operational practices to meet the access-to-justice needs of our communities. Automation would have been used to fill the staffing reductions by using electronic processing where a staff person had been previously doing the work.

In 2012, the San Diego Superior Court received 100,417 family law filings (initial and subsequent). However, the timeliness in processing these filings at time of judgment fell from 48 hours to 4 months, requiring the public to wait for critical life decisions.

Automation was slated to play a significant role in expanding the ability of the Court in areas such as e-filing and online case information lookups that would not require staff intervention, enabling the Court to reallocate staff into other areas, to provide in-person, critical need services to those areas in family law that do require more in-person services.

In addition, services were reduced in the Family Court Services (FCS) program. In 2009, the program had 35 counselors available to provide child custody recommending counseling sessions. By January 2013 the court had only 27 counselors, a 23 percent decrease. As a result of these vacancies, FCS has seen a reduction in the number of child-custody-recommending counseling sessions it is able to conduct. In 2007 FCS provided 8,684 sessions and in 2012 FCS provided 8,121 sessions, a decrease of 6.5 percent.

When it takes longer to have appointments, hearings may not move forward to determine custody issues with children. Families are then left with unresolved issues regarding visitation schedules and parenting plans. In some cases, this is a danger to the child, because drugs, alcohol, abuse, neglect or other poor parenting is alleged. These issues cannot be permanently determined until after the mandatory appointment, which is required by law in all custody issues. School and medical issues, moves out of county, and escalating domestic violence are also factors.

At times, there have been long lines of the public wrapping around the Family Court buildings as wait times have increased to obtain appointments in the business offices and with Family Court Counselors, from an average of two weeks to beyond 10 weeks today. This means that parties have to wait approximately three-months to have their child custody matters heard by a Family Court Counselor so that either a custody agreement can be reached or a recommendation can be returned to the Court for further hearing. These delayed appointments significantly impact and delay crucial decisions in Family Law cases involving the children and their families.

Today, the Family Law division has roughly 174 FTEs and 27 Judicial Officers hearing approximately 93,000 hearing matters and processing 110,417 paper-based filings annually. These filings and hearings could be processed, calendared and heard in a more timely manner, better serving the greater needs of our public through automation support provided by a new Court Case Management system.

San Diego is the third largest court in the country, the second largest in the state, with a county population of over 3.2 million people. We are still relying 100 percent on paper to process Court paperwork and filings in the

Family Law area, which doesn't help the issue of how to serve a growing population in legal need of the Family Law justice system.

## 1.2 STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS

This Budget Change Proposal that is requesting funding for the Implementation of Tyler's Odyssey Case Management System for Family Law directly aligns with the goals of the Judicial Branch:

- **Modernization of Management and Administration** by leveraging electronic case processing and e-Filing features of a modern case management system therefore resulting in the timely administration of justice.
- **Quality of Justice and Service to the Public** by providing family law case information online (Court website and kiosks).
- **Branch wide Infrastructure for Service Excellence** by maintaining a supported family law case management system.

The implementation of a new family law case management system also aligns with the Chief Justice's vision of 3D access (Improve access, administer timely, efficient justice, gain case processing efficiencies and improve public safety through electronic services for public interaction and collaboration with justice partners).

It is the intention of the Court to meet and exceed these goals, where possible, if given the funds needed to implement this much needed and critical system.

Other areas where the Court will benefit and will serve the strategic plan for technology will be:

- Through leveraging a reliable and supported technology model, the Odyssey CMS.
- By encouraging innovation, collaboration and professional court case processing development.
- By maximizing the use of staffing resources to allow modernization to drive the way the Court does business .
- By facilitating the use of "best practices" through automation and business process engineering.

### 1.3 JUSTIFICATION

As stated in the Proposal Summary, the Court has determined that replacing the existing 'Fastrack' CMS with the Family Law Case Management system from Tyler Technologies, called 'Odyssey', is the best solution to meet the Court's goals and objectives. In summary the benefits are as follows.

- Enable saving through efficiencies gained in case processing
- Improve electronic access to case information for the public
- Enable revenues from public access and e-Filing implementation
- Gain efficiencies and savings with Local Justice Partner and Agency Integration
- Ability to leverage and support a reliable technology infrastructure

The methodology used to quantify the proposal objectives will illustrate the benefits from cost savings. Minor revenues were derived from benchmark analysis using data specific to Family Law cases. This includes the volume of Family Law filings per year, the court clerk's effort to process Family Law cases (case initiation, adding filings), an average salary of a Court Operation Clerk, the volume of public requests annually, and the benchmark from costs used by other courts to on-board EFSPs. Cost avoidance is a big factor given the potential risk of our legacy CMS system, Fastrack.

The Court has determined that the Family Law Case Management system from Tyler Technologies (Odyssey) is the best solution to meet the Court's goals and objectives. The benefits will be realized by the following factors below:

- ***Ability to Leverage and Support a reliable technology infrastructure.*** This can also apply to a case management system. The funding of this request would allow the Court to avoid the risks associated with an unsupported Family Law Case management system. Our current CMS system, Fastrack, lacks industry support. The Court's current support staff resource will be retiring, and the programming language is archaic. Much like any case management system, issues, defects, and problems occur with the program. Our legacy CMS is no exception. The Court receives predictable calls each week regarding support questions pertaining to incidents per year ranging from data inaccuracies, processing anomalies, and application unavailability. The impacts of the legacy Family Law CMS are:
  - An increase in staffing triggered by manual case processing. The Court believes it will need to increase the Family Law staff manpower by 102 staff if the Family Law CMS becomes unavailable. We estimate that beginning in year 2 this will cost the Court approximately \$6.9 million annually for a total 4-year cost of approximately \$27.7 million. *Please refer to Table 2.2.3.* It is unlikely that we will get funding for 102 staff nor it would be prudent to perform manual case processing, therefore this will lead to untimely justice, increasing backlog, staff reorganization as well as reducing access to case information for the public and justice partners.
  - An unavailable 'Fastrack' case management system will cause an increase in effort to capture case data (such as case filing and case participants), to schedule and to generate calendars, and to produce statistical reports. It would also result in delays in preparing cases for hearings, inaccurate and unreliable case information. An online electronic case index and calendar information will no longer be available to the public via the Court website.

- The current legacy application is not compatible with the rest of the Court’s information technology environment. Being that Fastrack is a 16-bit DOS application, it increases the cost to the Court by finding a ‘workaround solution’ to continue providing case processing services with the Court’s newer 64-bit operating system platform. One such workaround the Court is considering is using terminal emulation solutions such as ‘Citrix Xen Servers’ in order to continue Family Law (Fastrack) services when the Court migrates to a 64 bit Windows 8/9 desktop. We estimate this will cost the Court approximately \$160,496 over a 5 year period. This amount is a sum of the One Time IT Costs (\$94,720) and Software Licensing Cost (\$65,776) in the Cost Table. *Please refer to Table 2.2.3.*
- **Enable Court Improvements through Efficiencies:** Apply known efficiencies in case processing, business process reviews and reengineering, promote online ways to do business with the Court. These high level points offer an improved administration of justice, improve public access to case information and public safety, and bring the Court more in alignment with the Branch and the Chief Justice's vision of 3D access (Improve access, administer timely, efficient justice, gain case processing efficiencies and improve public safety through electronic services for public interaction and collaboration with justice partners).
  - The new Odyssey CMS supports integrated e-Filing services. The benefits of e-Filing are tremendous as it reduces the data capture tasks related to case processing. We estimate this will save the Court approximately \$2.5 million over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System, Table 2.1.4.*
- **Incorporate Electronic Case Access:** The new Odyssey CMS supports imaging, intelligent workflow capabilities and a comprehensive docket information option for online and in-house data. Access to case information is immediate and accurate which is so critical to administering timely justice. For example, the Court can eliminate the manual effort to pull case files/folders for hearings, legal research and public inquiries. In addition, this will eliminate the clerks looking for misplaced paper documents. This will also eliminate the need to physical storage of files and the cost of paper file folder. We estimate this will save the Court approximately \$4.5 million over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System, Table 2.1.4.*
- The combination of 5 year cost savings as stated above from efficiencies gained in e-Filing (\$2.5 million) and electronic access to images and case information (\$4.5 million) equates to a total cost savings of \$7 million as reflected in the Benefits table of Alternative One.
- **Improved and Timely Back Office and Courtroom Processing:** Improved, efficient case processing leads to the elimination of backlogs resulting in faster decision making in the courtroom thus shorter case lifecycles which equates to timely justice. The Court will be able to dispose of cases faster with a new FL CMS. For instance, the Court currently has a backlog in the processing of family law cases. We

would be able to eliminate this backlog and process judgments timely thereby reducing the processing time from approximately 4 months to 48 hours.

- **Online Services Versus Inline Status Quo:** The new Odyssey CMS supports a comprehensive case information store such as the register of actions and the electronic documents. This information will be provided to the public via online application such as an online Register of Actions and Calendars. The result is in the reduction of time it takes to service public inquiries (i.e. copies, research) and allow for more quick access capabilities that the public requests of the Court system today. This will significantly reduce or eliminate the need for our local family law attorneys and the public to come to the courthouse and to wait in line to file documents, to access case files and documents, or to receive updates on hearings. We can provide this option for those that choose to use automation. The benefits align with the goals of administering timely and efficient justice.
  - Providing online access (via the Court web site and kiosks) to case information and to documents will result in the Court being able to generate revenue by charging a fee to print case docket information and documents. These revenues can be used to assist in funding the cost of maintaining and supporting the CMS. This benefit aligns with goals of improving public access. This promotes our goals of serving the public 'online rather than inline'. It is estimated that this will generate revenues of \$798,193 over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System, Table 2.1.4..*
  - A benefit of providing online access (via the Court web site and kiosks) to case information and documents is that the public can readily access information.
- **Minor Revenue To Support Complex Technology Services:** Revenues from e-Filing is another area where the Court can benefit from implementing the Odyssey CMS. A cost recovery model from onboarding EFSPs may be employed. We estimate this will generate revenues of \$360,000.00 over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System, Table 2.1.4.*
- **Local Justice Partner and Agency Partnership Benefit:** In San Diego, our County stake holders (Justice Partners, Department. of Child Support Services (DCSS), San Diego Sheriff will benefit from new CMS implementation. Currently the Court and the DCSS have a paper-intensive process. The DCSS has a state electronic system and in order to maintain their electronic files, they have stationed one FTE (full time staff equivalent) Child Support Officer to sit in our Court office and image files that come in to the Court so that they will be able to have an 'electronic' record in their paperless system today. Having a new Family Law CMS will eliminate the need for our local partner to have a staff person sit in our Court area and image documents. We estimate this will save the DCSS \$67,932 annually. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case*

*Management System, Table 2.1.4.* Electronic submittals via e-filing will be the main transport removing the paper handicap by the Court not being able to add any automation to our legacy system.

The benefits far outweigh the impact of our 'status quo' option of today.

There are risks associated with an unsupported Family Law Case Management system. As described in the background section, the Court's Family Law CMS system called 'Fastrack' is based on the Advanced Revelation platform, a legacy platform that lacks industry support (there is no vendor that supports this platform) and it's DOS-based with its last software patch being applied over ten years ago. Moreover, the Court's one existing staff programmer who supports Fastrack is at retirement age and is planning to retire in less than 2 years. The possibility of training another programmer has been eliminated as there is no longer a language to learn in the industry today or a recruitable skill in finding a replacement.

An unsupported 'Fastrack' Family Law CMS poses a direct threat to court operations and public service. The impact of an unsupported Fastrack application has negative ramifications such as delays in case processing, increase in staffing and delaying public access to Court information. Paper processing in every form would be used to keep the Court's cases updated, to manage calendars, to manage minutes, etc.

The existing 'Fastrack' application lacks many of the new case management features offered by contemporary case management system efficiencies. The Court is not able to use automation to transmit information, files, update calendars, offer an online Register of Action to the public etc.

The replacement of the Court's Family Law CMS is a priority of the Court.

#### 1.4 OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The expected outcomes from implementing a new Family Law Case Management System are:

- Staff savings from effective case management. The combination of 5 year cost savings as described in the justification section from e-Filing (\$2.5 million) and electronic access to images and case information (\$4.5 million) equates to a total cost savings of \$7 million as reflected in the Benefits table of Alternative One, Table 2.1.4.
- Eliminating the backlog and improving processing of judgments thereby reducing the processing time from approximately 4 months to 48 hours.
- Improving public access to family law case information and documents by providing the information online (Court website or kiosks). This promotes our goals of serving the public 'online rather than inline'. We estimate this will generate revenues of \$798,193 over 5 years. Refer to Table 2.1.4.
- Revenues from onboarding e-Filing service providers (EFSP). We estimate this will generate revenues of \$360,000.00 over 5 years. Refer to Table 2.1.4.
- Ability to improve justice partner collaboration of family law case information. For example, we anticipate this will save the DCSS \$67,932 annually. Refer to Table 2.1.4.

These outcomes will be measured by performing time studies on case processing and calendar preparation, workload post implementation, monthly monitoring of backlog filing volumes, gathering usage statistics from the online and kiosk Register of Actions applications.

The project will be measured using Earned Value Management.

## 2 ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE - IMPLEMENT NEW FAMILY LAW CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

#### 2.1.1 DESCRIPTION

The recommended solution is to replace the existing legacy system with the Tyler Technologies Odyssey Case Management System. This is the best alternative that will address the Court needs and will allow us to focus on long-term goals and objectives for our Court staff and in meeting the demands of the public. This system will allow our Court to better align with the Strategic and Organization goals of the Judicial Branch.

#### 2.1.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

##### **Advantages**

- A new system will avoid the risk of being tied to an unsupportable and unreliable legacy case management system.
- The Court will gain efficiencies in Family Law operations by improving the automated generation of case minute orders and calendars, automated event alert notifications, automated work queues and work load monitoring.
- The new Odyssey CMS supports integrated e-Filing services. The benefits of e-Filing are tremendous as it reduces the data capture tasks related to case processing. An estimated saving for the Court will be approximately \$2.5 million over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System, Table 2.1.4.*
- The new Odyssey CMS supports imaging, intelligent workflow capabilities and a comprehensive docket information option for online and in-house data. Access to case information is immediate and accurate which is so critical to administering timely justice. For example, the Court can eliminate the manual effort to pull case files/folders for hearings, legal research and public inquiries. In addition, this will eliminate the clerks looking for misplaced paper documents. This will also eliminate the need to physical storage of files and the cost of paper file folder. We estimate this will save the Court approximately \$4.5 million over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System Table 2.1.4.*
- Improved, efficient case processing leads to the eliminating backlogs resulting in faster decision making in the courtroom thus shorter case lifecycles which equates to timely justice. Cases will be disposed

faster with a new FL CMS. For instance, the Court currently has a backlog of family law processing. We would be able to eliminate this backlog and process judgments timely thereby reducing the processing time from approximately 4 months to 48 hours.

- Improve public access to case information by providing an accurate, secure and comprehensive case Register of Actions (aka docket) via the Court web site and kiosks.
- Providing online access (via the Court web site and kiosks) to case information and documents the Court will be able to generate revenue by charging a fee to print case docket information and documents. These revenues can be used to assist in funding the cost of maintaining and supporting the CMS. This benefit aligns with goals of improving public access. It is estimated that this will generate revenues of \$798,193 over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System, Table 2.1.4..*
- Revenues from e-Filing is another area where the Court can benefit from implementing the Odyssey CMS. A cost recovery model from onboarding EFSPs may be employed. This will generate estimated revenues of \$360,000.00 over 5 years. *Please refer to 2.1.4 Estimated Benefits section of Alternative One-Implement New Family Law Case Management System, Table 2.1.4..*
- Allow our bench officers, quick access to case information using the Judge View feature therefore supporting decision making in the Courtroom.
- Gain efficiencies exchanging information with Justice Partners therefore resulting in immediate availability of data to Justice Partners, the County agencies, and the Court. Having a new Family Law CMS will eliminate the need for our local partner, DCSS, to have a staff person sit in our Court area and image documents. This will save the DCSS and estimated \$237,731 over 5 years.
- Improves the data needed for reporting accurate information and legitimacy to Court management, the Bench, the Judicial Branch and our funding authority.

#### Disadvantages

- Requires longer term, project staff resources from all areas of the Court (Operations, IT, Accounting, Business Offices, Courtroom support) from the Court which is currently understaffed.
- Requires an initial financial investment to implement.

### 2.1.3 COSTS

Table 2.1.3

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Implement New Family Law Case Management System</b>						
<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	1,483,091	407,538				1,890,629
Hardware Purchase	98,920					98,920
Software Purchase/Licenses	1,372,116					1,372,116
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management	333,000	333,000				666,000
Project Oversight	6,000	3,000				9,000
IV&V Services	12,000	6,000				18,000
Other Contract Services	629,947	629,947				1,259,893
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services	27,500					27,500
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>3,962,574</b>	<b>1,379,485</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,342,058</b>
<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		367,303	275,477	275,477	275,477	1,193,735
Hardware Lease/Maintenance		13,784	13,784	13,784	13,784	55,136
Software Maintenance/Licenses		140,397	280,794	280,794	280,794	982,779
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>521,484</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>2,231,650</b>
<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	3,962,574	1,379,485	-	-	-	5,342,058
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>521,484</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>2,231,650</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>3,962,574</b>	<b>1,900,969</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>570,055</b>	<b>7,573,708</b>

### Cost Assumptions/Notes

<b>One Time Costs</b>	<b>Assumptions/Notes</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	Based on project staff from IT and Operations. The Court estimates 4 IT staff and 12 Family Law Operations staff are required to implement the project.  Includes staff cost to back scan family law cases
Hardware Purchase	Server and network equipment. This includes both production and non-production environments.

	Includes cost such as scanners and desktop to back scan family law cases.
Software Purchase/Licenses	Tyler SW License, Server SW cost such as operating system and database server license costs.
Contract Services	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Management</li> </ul>	Tyler Project Management cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Oversight</li> </ul>	AOC Project Oversight cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IV&amp;V Services</li> </ul>	AOC IV&V Project cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other Contract Services</li> </ul>	Tyler Technical and Data Conversion cost
Data Center Services	Cost to build server and network equipment
<b>Continuing Costs</b>	
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	Ongoing IT cost to support CMS. Reduction in IT staff from 4 to 3 for ongoing maintenance and support of the application.
Hardware Lease/Maintenance	Server and network equipment vendor maintenance and support cost
Software Maintenance/Licenses	Tyler's maintenance and support cost for Odyssey application Server operating system vendor maintenance and support cost

- 18 month project therefore one-time cost reflected in year 1 and 2.
- As stated in the background section, the Court is requesting \$3.4 million for this proposal. This cost will only cover a portion of the total one time project cost of \$5.4 million reflected in the cost table of Alternative One. This \$3.4 million is delineated below in Table 2.1.3.1.

Table 2.1.3.1

<b>Cost Breakdown of \$3.4 million Requested</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>
Hardware Purchase	98,920.00	
Software Purchase/Licenses (Tyler license cost and server operating license cost)	1,372,116.00	

Contract Services		
Tyler Project Management	333,000.00	333,000.00
Tyler - Other Contract Services (Technical Implementation, Data Conversion)	629,946.50	629,946.50
Data Center Services (Court server build cost)	27,500.00	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2,461,482.50</b>	<b>962,946.50</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,424,429.00</b>

#### 2.1.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

Table 2.1.4

<b>Alt 1 Implement New Family Law Case Management System Recommended : Estimated Benefits</b>						
						<b>5 Year Estimate</b>
<b>IT Cost Savings/Avoidance</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>	<b>FY 18-19</b>	
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		\$ 994,085	\$ 1,988,171	\$ 1,988,171	\$ 1,988,171	\$ 6,958,597
Software Maintenance/Licenses						-
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Telecommunications						-
Data Center Services						-
Justice Partner costs		33,962	67,923	67,923	67,923	237,731
Facilities						-
Other						-
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,028,047</b>	<b>\$ 2,056,094</b>	<b>\$ 2,056,094</b>	<b>\$ 2,056,094</b>	<b>\$ 7,196,328</b>
<b>Revenue Opportunities</b>						
eFiling fees		\$ 240,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 360,000
Other fees		114,028	228,055	228,055	228,055	798,193
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 354,028</b>	<b>\$ 268,055</b>	<b>\$ 268,055</b>	<b>\$ 268,055</b>	<b>\$ 1,158,193</b>
<b>Total Estimated Benefits</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,382,074</b>	<b>\$ 2,324,149</b>	<b>\$ 2,324,149</b>	<b>\$ 2,324,149</b>	<b>\$ 8,354,521</b>

## Benefits Table Assumptions/Notes

<p>Staff (Salaries &amp; Benefits)</p>	<p>Staff (Salaries &amp; Benefits)-Workload savings from efficiencies gained from mandatory e-Filing (elimination of data entry). Based on the total number of 110,417 family law initial and subsequent filings per year and the time saved as a result of mandatory e-Filing. Efficiencies will be realized from reducing the Court clerk's time to process transactions to 5 minutes from 15 minutes by not having to enter relevant data such as filing types, participants, attorneys; by not having another clerk ring fees in another system (San Diego has a separate application for financial information which is handled by a separate cashier clerk), and by not having to create a case folder and file this to the file storage area. We anticipate we can save 21,757 hours annually or \$2.5 million over 5 years.</p> <p>In addition, another area where savings can be realized is from reducing the time for searching for misplaced case files/folders; savings from eliminating the need for the Court clerk to serve the public requesting information such as copies, inquiries because case information will be available from the online Register of Action and Kiosks applications; savings from eliminating pulling paper case files/folders daily for hearing events or legal research, and savings from not having to order case folders; we estimate we can save approximately \$4.5 million over 5 years by having electronic copies of case information and documents readily available and accessible to Court staff and the public.</p> <p>The combination of 5 year cost savings from e-Filing (\$2.5 million) and electronic access to images and case information (\$4.5 million) equates to the total staff savings of \$7 million as reflected in the Benefits table.</p>
<p>Justice Partner costs</p>	<p>Savings from reduction of DCSS staff to image documents. DCSS can eliminate imaging and use the integrated e-Filing features instead. We estimate this will save DCSS \$237,731 over 5 years.</p>
<p>e-Filing fees</p>	<p>Revenues from on-boarding EFSPs. Anticipate 4 EFSPs. Estimate one-time cost of \$50,000 for each EFSP to on-board with Court e-Filing. Estimate \$10,000 per EFSP annually. We estimate revenues of \$360,000 over 5 years.</p>
<p>Other fees</p>	<p>Revenues from the online Register of Action and Kiosk applications for self-service inquiries and document requests. We estimate based on our benchmark using our existing Civil Register of Actions and Kiosk applications that we would receive approximately 2,200 purchase request for document copies and register of action (aka case docket) copies in Family Law. This equates to approximately \$798,193 in revenues over 5 years.</p>

- Additionally, the coordination effort between the Court and the Sheriff is critical in family law in that the Restraining Orders need to be scanned and sent to the Sheriff’s electronic warrant enforcement system through an attachment on email. Having a new CMS would allow for a confidential and electronic file to be sent through an engineered interface directly in to their system. The Court could better coordinate efforts between our two systems to ensure timely and critical sharing of information
- California Rules of Court 2.503 restricts any family law documents from being viewed online via the Court website but are viewable from courthouse kiosks.
- California Rules of Court 2.502 allows the register of actions, calendar and indexes of Family case types of dissolution, legal separation, and nullity of marriage; child and spousal support proceedings; child custody proceedings; and domestic violence prevention proceedings to be available online via the Court website.
- Benefits will be realized after the project is implemented in year 2.
- Supporting documentation for how these savings were derived are found in the ‘Supporting Documentation’ section of Appendix A.

### 2.1.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Table 2.1.5

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Solution ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Alternative 1: Five Year Total</b>
Total 5 Year Estimated Benefits	\$ 8,354,521
Total 5 Year Costs	7,573,708
<b>Estimated 5 Yr Benefits Less 5 Yr Costs</b>	<b>\$ 780,813</b>
<b>ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>ROI (Total 5 Year Benefit - Total 5 Year costs)/Total 5 year costs</b>	10%

### 2.1.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR RECOMMENDED SOLUTION

If funded, the Court plans to begin the project planning activities in the coming months. Court staff have taken proactive steps to ensure that they are ready to implement the CMS for Family Law in the Court as soon as possible. The steps are as follows:

- Staff have completed Judicial Officer demos from Tyler Technologies. This will help to create open communication relating to CMS and to ensure that our bench officers have had the opportunity to view the CMS features and functionality to be able to ask questions about the product.

- Demos geared more towards our Court Operations staff have been provided so that they too could participate in the planning and decision-making process.
- Staff have planned and considered early communication and change management strategies to ensure a successful project.
- General ‘State of the Court’s CMS Systems’ Review meetings with Judicial and Court Operations staff to discuss the need for legacy replacement planning in the area of Family Law as well the Court’s other legacy CMS systems.

Moving forward towards project planning activities, the Court has had high level meetings with Tyler Technologies, obtained a clear understanding of the implementation and professional services they offer, and the clearly-defined roles and responsibilities that our local Court staff will perform in order to achieve a successful implementation. This is based on successful CMS implementations that Tyler has managed previously from ‘like’ Courts across the country and in California.

This will be a Court-wide project ensuring that staffing at all levels will play a part to ensure acceptance and change management considerations. Training, along with the support of Tyler Technologies, will enable that the support staff will learn how the system works, and how to configure and support it within our Court business processing model. The goal is for the support staff to be as self-sufficient as possible.

The Court will back-fill our seasoned staff, with more entry, and journey-level staff as the project progresses so that there will be a staff development option included in the learning and implementation of the project work streams. Existing Court space and facilities will be used for the duration of the project.

Over the coming months, the Court expects to engage Tyler Technologies in more thorough discussions to create a more detailed project scope, timeline, schedule, and communication and change management plan. In addition, a continuous internal and external, I V & V methodology will be used to mitigate any risk that may develop during the project.

The following deliverables will be realized as the project becomes finalized through the use of funding and contract development and finalization:

- Conduct a Fit analysis. This will be done to review and understand the current processes and procedures. How these dovetail into the new CMS will be the critical first step as we begin the project.
- Create a detailed project timeline with deliverables focusing on data conversion, software modifications and customization, integration, configuration, business process, training and support. As with any high-level plan, details will be added with large scale project milestone planning.
- It is envisioned that it will be an eighteen (18) month implementation timeline, however, alternative project plan timelines will be established based on target milestone planning allowing us to establish benchmarks which will ensure that we consider higher-risk areas and account for those complexities should they arise either through project status reporting or through comprehensive IV & V activities and monitoring. Conversion of data generally takes more time and is complex especially as we move from a very old system into a new platform, but this is expected and will be planned accordingly..
- A Go-Live Preparation Plan and Post Go Live activities will also be integral to the overall plan and acceptance by our bench officers, Executive Officer and Court Management teams.

## 2.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING)

### 2.2.1 DESCRIPTION

This alternative means that the Court will ‘do nothing/maintain status quo’ with its existing Family Law CMS called ‘Fastrack’. The business process performed by Family Law Operations will remain as it is today.

### 2.2.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES

#### **Advantages**

- That there will be ‘no change’ in the organization and the current staffing model will remain consistent as it is now.

#### **Disadvantages**

- Risks associated with an unsupported Family Law Case Management system, a legacy platform that lacks industry support.
- The Court's one existing staff programmer that supports Fastrack is at retirement age and is planning to retire in less than 2 years.
- An unsupported 'Fastrack' Family Law CMS poses a threat to justice and public service. The impact of an unsupported Fastrack application has negative ramifications such as delays in case processing, increase in staffing and delaying public access to Court information. All of these delays do not promote meeting our Judicial Branch goals or help in delivering services to the public. Paper processing in every form would be used to keep our cases updated, manage the calendars, and the use of paper minutes, etc.
- Increase in staffing triggered by manual case processing due to the demise of the current legacy system would occur. The Court believes it will need to double the Family Law staff manpower if the Family Law CMS becomes unavailable. This has an estimated cost of \$6.9 million annually.
- The current legacy application that is not compatible with the rest of the Court’s information technology environment is an issue. Being that Fastrack is a 16-bit DOS application, it increases the cost to the Court by finding a ‘workaround solution’ to continue providing case processing services with the Court’s newer 64-bit operating system platform. We estimate this will cost the Court approximately \$160,496 over a five (5) year period. This amount is a sum of the One Time IT Costs (\$94,720) and Software Licensing Cost (\$65,776) in the Cost Table. *Please refer to Table 2.2.3.*

## 2.2.3 COSTS

Table 2.2.3

Alternative 2: Do Nothing						
One-Time Costs	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	Total Recommended
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		15,000				15,000
Hardware Purchase		67,220				67,220
Software Purchase/Licenses						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight						-
IV&V Services						-
Other Contract Services		5,000				5,000
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other		7,500				7,500
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>94,720</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>94,720</b>
Continuing IT Project Costs	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	Total Recommended
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)		6,928,148	6,928,148	6,928,148	6,928,148	27,712,594
Hardware Lease/Maintenance						-
Software Maintenance/Licenses		16,444	16,444	16,444	16,444	65,776
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>27,778,370</b>
Summary Costs	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	Total Recommended
Total One-Time Costs	-	94,720	-	-	-	94,720
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>27,778,370</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,039,312</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>6,944,592</b>	<b>27,873,090</b>

### Cost Assumptions/Notes

One Time Costs	Assumptions/Notes
Hardware Purchase	Server hardware cost for Citrix Xen Server solution
Software Purchase/Licenses	Citrix Xen Server and Citrix client licenses Server operating system cost
Data Center Services	Server engineering labor cost to design and build Citrix Xen Server solution

Other	Citrix Xen Server administration training
<b>Continuing Costs</b>	
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	Estimated staffing cost (102 staff) to perform manual case management processing.
Hardware Lease/Maintenance	Server vendor HW maintenance cost
Software Maintenance/Licenses	Citrix Xen Server ongoing software maintenance cost

- The total estimated cost for the ‘work around solution’ is approximately \$160,496 over a five (5) year period. This is indicated in the Alt 2 Cost Table as the sum of the one time cost of \$94,720 and the 5 year on-going SW maintenance cost of \$65,776

#### 2.2.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

Note that doing nothing/maintaining status quo will result in no benefits to the Court, the Branch and the Chief Justice’s vision of 3D access.

#### 2.2.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

There is no Return on Investment.

### 2.3 RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it provides the six courts with a more modern case management system which has the functionality needed to allow the courts to increase operational efficiencies and provide greater access to the public and justice partners.

## GLOSSARY

Term	Description
<i>CMS</i>	<i>Case Management System</i>
<i>DCSS</i>	<i>Department of Child Support Services</i>
<i>FL</i>	<i>Family Law</i>
<i>ROA</i>	<i>Register of Action. San Diego intends to have an online ROA and a kiosk based ROA for access to family law case information and documents.</i>

## APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS

The Cost Table Spreadsheet.



Cost table 2.xlsx

The Benefits Table Spreadsheet.



Benefits table.xlsx

The Return On Investment (ROI) spreadsheet.



ROI Corrected v1  
(5).xlsx





# **Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Request**

FOUNDATION FOR DIGITAL  
COURTS - PHASE ONE  
(EXPANSION OF LAN/WAN  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
PROGRAM TO ALPINE, LOS  
ANGELES, ORANGE AND SAN  
DIEGO COURTS)

VERSION 1.37

JANUARY 2, 2014

## DOCUMENT REVISIONS

<Once the document is finalized, any subsequent changes must be noted in the table below.>

Version	Date	Name	Change Description	Sections
<1.0>	November 27, 2013	Virginia Sanders-Hinds, David Koon, and Jessica Craven	Streamline template from standard Business Case	Entire document
1.1	December 12, 2013	Raul Ortega	Initial draft	Entire document
1.2	December 13, 2013	Raul Ortega	Second draft	Section 1
1.21	December 14, 2013	Raul Ortega	Second draft	Section 2.1 except cost tables
1.31	December 17, 2013	Raul Ortega	Added Resource History to Background and narrative Updated cost tables Updated all sections based on feedback	All sections
1.34	December 18, 2013	Raul Ortega	Added benefits table	Section 2.1.4
1.35	December 19, 2013	Raul Ortega	Updated cost tables	Section 2.1
1.37	January 2, 2014	David Koon	Updated Cost Information	Entire Document

## RELATED DOCUMENTATION

*<Complete this optional section to reference any other documents that might provide additional context, information, etc. related to the document.>*

Version	Date	Name	Description	Location

## **APPROVALS**

*<Document review of this document and approval of the project by obtaining sign-offs in this section or providing a link to the repository in which electronic approvals (e.g., emails) are archived.>*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Signature/Link to Electronic Approval</b>	<b>Date</b>

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>PROPOSAL SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND .....	6
1.2	STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
1.3	JUSTIFICATION .....	9
1.4	OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....	11
<b>2</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION) .....	13
2.1.1	Description .....	13
2.1.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	13
2.1.3	Costs .....	14
2.1.4	Estimated Benefits .....	15
2.1.5	Return on Investment .....	16
2.1.6	Implementation Plan for recommened solution .....	16
2.2	ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING) .....	17
2.2.1	Description .....	17
2.2.2	Advantages/Disadvantages.....	17
2.2.3	Costs .....	18
2.2.4	Estimated Benefits .....	19
2.2.5	Return On Investment .....	19
2.3	RECOMMENDATION.....	19
	<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS.....</b>	<b>21</b>

## **1 PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

The network and security infrastructure at four trial courts – Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego – must be replaced consistent with a judicial branchwide technology refresh schedule in order to maintain a secure, robust, reliable and flexible computing environment for all court operations. The Telecommunications “LAN WAN” program is requesting \$3,550,778 in one-time General Funds and \$2,498,412 per year in ongoing General Funds to maintain the same level of performance and stability year after year. This request includes annual funding for the design, procurement, deployment and management of the technology refresh and maintenance for these four courts including two permanent positions dedicated to these four court projects. The funding also provides managed network security services and court network technology training.

No changes are required to current statutes or regulations in conjunction with this request.

### **1.1 BACKGROUND**

The Telecommunications Trial Court LAN/WAN Architecture program was initiated in 2001, subsequent to the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (AB 233) in support of improving court operations.

A Request for Proposal, “Trial Court Local and Wide Area Network Architecture Request for Proposal,” was issued on September 18, 2001 to assist the Judicial Council, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the trial courts of California in defining and implementing a statewide Local and Wide Area Network (LAN/WAN) standard architecture for all the trial courts. The objective of this project was to define the standard and determine how it would scale across the different courts. The RFP process consisted of a collaboration of trial courts and included court executives and IT leaders from courts around the state. SBC Communications (AT&T) and Cisco Systems were selected as the primary technology vendors.

The core objective of the Telecommunications LAN/WAN initiative is to provide a separate, secure, robust, reliable and flexible network infrastructure aligned with emerging needs of enterprise court services. The LAN/WAN initiative was responsible for providing the trial courts with the infrastructure required to physically separate from their dependence on county infrastructure. The initiative also allowed courts to have basic technologies absent prior to state funding such as workstations on every desk, a branchwide financial and human resource system, modern case management systems, etc. The Technology Refresh component of the program continually replaces equipment that is no longer supported by vendors due to aging technology. The program forecasts the budget by working with our service integrators and hardware vendors to create an annual technology roadmap identifying the technology requiring replacement. The goal is for the trial courts to offer the public a secure, robust, reliable and flexible access to a court data and operations.

The core component of the LAN/WAN program is the annual Technology Refresh projects which replace equipment that is deemed to be “end-of-life” or “end-of-support” by the manufacturing vendors. These products and devices are considered obsolete and are no longer sold, manufactured, improved, repaired,

maintained, or supported by the manufacturer. Products that are end-of-life are also not eligible for security patches or maintenance contracts. This ineligibility leaves daily courthouse operations vulnerable to security breaches and connectivity failures. Courts would have to research, procure and deploy new replacement devices on their own in the event of a failure. During such an event, court operations may be impacted adversely for the duration of the procurement process depending on the type and function of that device. From the initial outage until restoration, it may take up to ten business days for a court to regain full operational status. Additionally, courts looking to deploy new technology systems, such as VOIP (Voice-over-IP,) videoconferencing and streaming, building automation, video surveillance, etc., may be limited due to lack of functionality and compatibility of older end-of-life products.

The program consists of three additional critical components: managed network security services, a master maintenance agreement for Cisco devices and court network technology training.

The master maintenance agreement affords the trial courts critical vendor support coverage for all Cisco network and security infrastructure. The program negotiated a branchwide agreement with the vendor that saves the judicial branch 31% over five years.

The managed network security services maintain network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention, vulnerability scanning, and web browser security. These network security tools mitigate the risk of court data being purposely breached or erroneously exposed without proper authority and ensure continuous court operations to the public.

Network technology training affords court IT staff the opportunity to attend foundational and specialized network training courses via state-of-the-art training centers and comprehensive on-line courses. This ensures that local courts IT staff have the necessary skill set to operate, maintain, and expand their infrastructure in response to local and enterprise needs.

Three courts not part of the original program – Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego – lack the funding to complete their technology refresh cycle due to budget constraints and an increase in scale and complexity of those court network environments. Alpine court – also not part of the original program – has been unable to participate in the LAN/WAN program due to lack of power and cooling at their current historic building since the initial infrastructure assessment in 2002. Fortunately, the courthouse is now being retrofitted with the required facilities upgrade which will accommodate a complete LAN/WAN infrastructure deployment with sufficient power and cooling. However, Alpine also lacks the funding to implement a secure and robust network infrastructure equivalent to the rest of the judicial branch.

The program currently utilizes contractors annually to provide project management, oversight and subject matter expertise; the number of resources varies depending on the number and complexity of court projects each year.

## **Resource History**

*(Dollars in thousands)*

<b>Program Budget</b>	<b>PY - 4</b>	<b>PY - 3</b>	<b>PY - 2</b>	<b>PY - 1</b>	<b>PY</b>
Authorized Expenditures	\$7,769,622	\$7,478,849	\$0	\$3,295,103	TBD <sup>1</sup>
Actual Expenditures	\$7,766,630	\$7,386,325	\$0	\$3,294,932	\$579
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Authorized Positions	0	0	0	0	0
Filled Positions	0	0	0	0	0
Vacancies	0	0	0	0	0

#### **Workload History**

<b>Workload Measure</b>	<b>PY - 4</b>	<b>PY - 3</b>	<b>PY - 2</b>	<b>PY - 1</b>	<b>PY</b>
Courts with end-of-life network and security devices	51	52	0	23	16
Network devices refreshed <sup>2</sup>	N/A	N/A	0	144	548

## **1.2 STATE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS**

This proposal aligns with four goals outlined in the Judicial Council's strategic plan: Goals I, II, III and VI.

### **GOAL I: ACCESS, FAIRNESS, AND DIVERSITY**

Network technology increases the equal access and diversity of court proceedings and programs to constituents who may not otherwise have readily available court resources. These constituents include non-English speaking individuals, the hearing impaired and those requiring additional assistance from specialized institutions. A secure, robust, reliable and flexible network infrastructure is the key foundation to provide additional technologies such as video remote interpretation for court interpreters of spoken language and American Sign Language or remote video arraignments for those requiring assistance from specialized

---

<sup>1</sup> The current baseline amount is \$3,199,000; however, additional funding is being considered by the Judicial Council in January 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Specific device numbers were not tracked prior to FY 2012/2013.

institutions such as mental hospitals or high security prisons. These network technologies create the ability to provide a more cost-effective and time-efficient delivery of court proceedings for all constituents.

## **GOAL II: INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

The judiciary is accountable for all aspects of the judicial decision-making process including the entry, maintenance and archival of all electronic court records. A secure network infrastructure ensures that the integrity and confidentiality of all court data is maintained throughout the judicial process. A robust information security architecture ensures that constituent data is secure and free from unauthorized alteration before, during and after all court proceedings.

## **GOAL III: MODERNIZATION OF MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION**

The judicial branch is tasked with providing modern management practices in a fair, timely, efficient and effective manner by using modern management practices. The network infrastructure is the foundation for all court technologies such as case management systems, online court access, justice partner integration, automation workflow, financial management and document management.

## **GOAL VI: BRANCHWIDE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR SERVICE EXCELLENCE**

The primary objective of the LAN/WAN program is to provide a consistent judicial branchwide network and security architecture that is secure, robust, reliable and flexible to meet future court operational requirements. This proposal enhances the quality of justice by providing an administrative, technological, and physical infrastructure that supports and meets the emerging enterprise needs of the public, the judicial branch, and its justice system and community partners, and that ensures business continuity. The funds requested directly impact the technical capabilities of court operations by increasing accessibility, ensuring data integrity and enhancing data flow to its constituents, justice partners and law enforcement agencies.

This proposal does not negatively impact other state agencies.

## **1.3 JUSTIFICATION**

The LAN/WAN program focuses on the annual technology refresh of equipment that is deemed to be “end-of-life” or “end-of-support” by the manufacturing vendors. These products are considered obsolete and are no longer sold, manufactured, improved, repaired, maintained, or supported by the manufacturer. Additionally, products that are end-of-life are no longer eligible for security patches or maintenance contracts. This ineligibility leaves daily courthouse operations vulnerable to security breaches and connectivity failures both within and outside the court operational environment. Courts would have to research, procure and deploy new replacement technology in the event of a failure. During such an outage, court operations may be impacted adversely for the duration of the procurement process depending on the type and function of that device. From the initial outage until restoration, it may take up to ten business days for a courthouse to regain full operational status. Additionally, courts looking to deploy new technology systems, such as video remote interpretation, video arraignments, VOIP (Voice-over-IP,) multimedia streaming, building automation, video surveillance, etc., may be limited due to lack of functionality and compatibility of older end-of-life products.

Most vendors maintain a five year outlook on product end-of-life cycles that coincides with technology innovation and hardware mean time between failures which provides a five year technology roadmap including product end-of-life projections. The program leverages this information annually to determine the scheduled refresh of all court network technology within the judicial branch. Every year, the team produces a new five year technology road map and budget based on the new information provided. The ongoing annual process is integral to court operations and does not end after five years.

The network and security infrastructure at every courthouse is the foundation of all secure information data flow both internally and externally with the public, local and state justice partners and public safety agencies. This technological foundation enables future technologies such as video court proceedings, migration to modern case management systems, building automation, building security, remote access and mobility, and justice partner integration. The network infrastructure enables improved access to court data, administers timely and much more efficient justice, gains case processing efficiencies and vastly improves public safety through electronic services for public interaction and collaboration with justice partners.

The judicial branch has a fiduciary responsibility to ensure that all court data is secure from internal and external alteration and operational interruption. Technology equipment that is not up-to-date is vulnerable to the ever-growing cyber security threats. Today, the judicial branch is exposed and detects over one million security events per month. Fortunately, our exposure to actual security threats are minimized due to current network technology in conjunction with the managed network security services. If the network and security equipment are not refreshed, these benign events will eventually translate into major security breaches of court data. The courthouses require a secure, robust, reliable and flexible network infrastructure to ensure a smooth day-to-day operations in order to best serve all the judiciary's constituents.

The courts are still dealing with funding shortfalls and a decrease in court resources capable of managing local efforts to refresh their technology. Currently, the courts are already behind schedule for the replacement of some components of the infrastructure. The exclusion of these four courts in the program may continue to push the refresh schedule of technology further out placing court operations at high risk should an infrastructure device failure or security breach occur. A major operational impact to court operations may affect public and justice partner access and in some cases public safety if the court does not refresh their network infrastructure prior to end-of-life cycles.

The Alpine courthouse has never benefited from a technological refresh. The network infrastructure does not meet the same technology standards deployed throughout the rest of the judicial branch nor does it provide the same access available to other courts. A failure of any component of the infrastructure would halt court operations until a replacement could be procured and installed. Now that the facilities can accommodate the new infrastructure, this proposal would provide the Alpine courthouse with technology that is equitable with the rest of the judicial branch, although it would be a great deal smaller in scale and cost compared to the other courts.

In the current year, the Los Angeles court infrastructure requires the replacement of eight core and five major closet switches that have already been deemed end-of-life by the vendor in 2012. Court operations may be in critical danger of a severe outage should one of these core devices fail. The impact to the court would render an

entire courthouse and its constituents incapable of conducting court business until a replacement could be identified, procured and deployed up to ten business days later at a greater cost to the judicial branch due to the emergency procurement and resources in order to expedite the solution.

In the current year, the Orange court infrastructure requires the replace of two of their core switches that are deemed end-of-life by the vendor. Court operations may be in critical danger of a severe outage should one of these core devices fail. The impact to the court would render an entire court and its constituents incapable of conducting court business until a replacement could be identified, procured and deployed up to ten business days later at a greater cost to the judicial branch due to the emergency procurement and resources in order to expedite the solution.

In the current year, the San Diego court infrastructure requires the replace of the majority of their core and closet switches that are deemed end-of-life by the vendor. Court operations is in critical danger of a severe outage should one of these core devices fail. The impact to the court would render an entire court and its constituents incapable of conducting court business until a replacement could be identified, procured and deployed up to ten business days later at a greater cost to the judicial branch due to the emergency procurement and resources in order to expedite the solution.

Investments in the court network infrastructure assure technological capabilities for a minimum of six years or longer depending on the technology at which point emerging technological advancements and court requirements may dictate another refresh of that technology to continually maintain the same level of secure and reliable access to all court constituents.

The program currently utilizes contractors annually to provide project management, oversight and subject matter expertise; the number of resources varies depending on the number and complexity of court projects each year. Two permanent positions would be required to administer the project for these four courts on an ongoing basis. The two positions would be a technology project manager and a senior network engineer. The majority of the workload occurs during the design and deployment of each project; however, the resources continually manage the other components of the program in parallel throughout the year. The analysis of next year's technology road map commences upon completion of every refresh cycle on an annual basis.

There are no known legal implication associated with this proposal which is consistent with the use and purpose of the funding sources requested.

#### **1.4 OUTCOMES AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

The AOC administers the LAN/WAN program by providing subject matter expertise for all network designs, and managing the procurement, deployment and testing of all equipment and services leveraging existing State CALNET Master Service Agreements. The AOC has created a strong partnership with AT&T as the primary deployment vendor and with Cisco Systems as the primary technology vendor. The AOC team oversees all deployment efforts by assigning a project manager and senior network engineer to ensure the following:

- Compliance with defined network and security architecture standards and guidelines

- Technological parity regardless of court size, yet scaled to court capacity
- Value engineering
- Uniform delivery of technology
- System testing and verification
- Quality assurance
- Timeliness
- Minimal disruption to court
- Financial accountability
- Risk management
- Customer satisfaction based on agreed-upon metrics

The AOC collaborates with the trial courts before and after every technology refresh cycle in order ensure the technology requirements are met and to maintain a two-year outlook on new technologies to further enrich network functionality, capacity, performance and information security.

All network designs and bill of materials are reviewed and approved by the designated court IT personnel and LAN/WAN resources prior to procurement and deployment. A final scope of work and a technical implementation plan are also submitted by the integrator for review and approval by the court IT and AOC prior to the commencement of any technology refresh project and deployment of network security services.

The assigned AOC project manager will be responsible for coordination of resources, monitoring daily activities, making weekly status reports regarding the progress and financial status of the project reporting directly to the AOC program manager. The weekly status reports shall contain the list of accomplished objectives versus the scheduled objectives for the reporting period. Any discrepancies will be clarified with a remediation plan.

The assigned AOC network engineer will be responsible for analysis of current network infrastructure and design of the technology refresh. The engineer will provide technical oversight and escalation throughout the deployment and acceptance phases of the projects.

All capital assets purchased as part of this program will be tracked by the court's local asset tracking methodology for the life of the devices.

## **2 ANALYSIS OF ALL FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES**

### **2.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE (RECOMMENDED SOLUTION)**

#### **2.1.1 DESCRIPTION**

The recommended solution is to allocate funds to the Telecommunication LAN/WAN Program to accommodate the infrastructure requirements at Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego in the annual Technology Refresh projects. The courts will also benefit from the master maintenance agreement, managed network security services and network technology training.

#### **2.1.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES**

The primary benefit of the solution is to provide the four trial courts with the equivalent standardized level of network infrastructure and network security services which are the foundation to all court operations in order to sustain both local and enterprise court services, applications and technology. Refreshed equipment provides the core technology for all court innovation and cost efficient technology such as modern case management systems, remote video court proceedings, building automation, voice over IP, video remote interpretation, etc. Additionally, refreshing technology mitigates those risks by ensuring prompt vendor support in the case of failure and up-to-date operating systems preventing and minimizing security vulnerabilities.

All 58 courts will be part of the same judicial branchwide program which also includes annual network and security architecture standards, managed security services, network technology training, access to a pool of expert network engineering and planning resources and a master maintenance agreement. Additionally, the courts benefit from large volume discounts for every component of the program including equipment procurement, maintenance and services. The courts would otherwise have to devote greater funds for the equivalent tangible results.

The LAN/WAN program has administered the Technology Refresh projects and its other components since 2002 thus creating a solid foundation of knowledge, skill and expertise applicable to all courts in the judicial branch. Alpine, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego have not benefitted from this groundwork. The courts would have to deploy and maintain the same infrastructure and services utilizing local resources assuming they have the allocated funding and skill set to do so. In most cases, each court is required to outsource the same skill set due to a lack of resource availability. As a result, this would be much more costly to the judicial branch when executed on per court basis instead leveraging a pool of resources and expertise.

The only potential disadvantage is the complexity of the court environments of Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego. These three courts are the most complex of the 58 court computing environments requiring more time to

assess and deploy the refreshed technology. However, the project team has worked with the court IT staff to assess and create preliminary network refresh designs as part of this proposal. We are confident that the program can provide the same level of service to these courts as we have successfully executed with the other 54 courts, AOC and courts of appellate.

There is no inherent risk to the program or the courts by including all 58 courts in the program.

### **2.1.3 COSTS**

The technology refresh at the four courts in the first year requires one-time funding of \$3,550,778 to refresh the technology that is already deemed end-of-life by 2015. On-going funds of \$2,498,412 per year is required to refresh and maintain all technology deemed end-of-life by 2018 according to the technology roadmap schedule. This road map is a continual process in conjunction with vendor information and is updated on an annual basis. Funds will be required past the five years; however, specific road map information is not available. The funds would include services and resources for network design, hardware procurement, project management and deployment, device maintenance and managed network security services on an on-going basis.

#### **2.1.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS**

The costs for this solution are based on the following assumptions:

- Vendors do not forecast end-of-life technology farther out than five years. The program assessed the age of the courts' current inventory and the roadmap schedule to determine on-going costs past five years.
- Hardware maintenance costs will be 10% of the hardware costs and will be provided only for network equipment procured as part of this program.
- Implementation costs will be 25% of the hardware costs. This estimate is based on averages of recent refresh projects of similar scale and complexity.
- The cost of technology refresh will rise every year based on market demands.
- Two permanent employees will be hired to support these four courts.
- The solution for these four courts will utilize the same LAN/WAN standards, maintenance policy and network security services already in place for the program.
- The program is required to refresh technology past the current five year projections.

### 2.1.3.2 COST TABLES

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Increase Funds for Telecommunication Program</b>						
<b>One-Time Costs</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	341,978	321,165	321,165	321,165	321,165	1,626,638
Hardware Purchase	2,424,800	1,363,490	1,363,490	1,363,490	1,363,490	7,878,760
Software Purchase/Licenses						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Software Customization						-
Project Management						-
Project Oversight						-
IV&V Services						-
Other Contract Services	560,000	314,894	314,894	314,894	314,894	1,819,576
Total Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total One-time IT Costs</b>	<b>3,326,778</b>	<b>1,999,549</b>	<b>1,999,549</b>	<b>1,999,549</b>	<b>1,999,549</b>	<b>11,324,974</b>
<b>Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)						-
Hardware Lease/Maintenance	224,000	498,863	498,863	498,863	498,863	2,219,452
Software Maintenance/Licenses						-
Telecommunications						-
Contract Services						-
Data Center Services						-
Agency Facilities						-
Justice Partner Costs						-
Other						-
<b>Total Continuing IT Costs</b>	<b>224,000</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>2,219,452</b>
<b>Summary Costs</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Total Recommended</b>
Total One-Time Costs	3,326,778	1,999,549	1,999,549	1,999,549	1,999,549	11,324,974
<b>Total Continuing IT Project Costs</b>	<b>224,000</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>498,863</b>	<b>2,219,452</b>
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>3,550,778</b>	<b>2,498,412</b>	<b>2,498,412</b>	<b>2,498,412</b>	<b>2,498,412</b>	<b>13,544,426</b>

### 2.1.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS

The judicial branch would benefit from the following financial incentives when including the four courts in the LAN/WAN program:

- A guaranteed discount on all network and security equipment
- A guaranteed discount on all Cisco maintenance agreements
- The use of pooled permanent program resources minimizes the number of local resources required per court project.
- The use of pooled deployment services minimizes the cost of those contract services required per court project.
- Leveraging a branchwide managed network security program reduces the cost of those same services required per court system.

<b>Alt 1 LAN/WAN Funding Recommended : Estimated Benefits</b>							
							<b>5 Year Estimate</b>
<b>IT Cost Savings/Avoidance</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>		
Staff (Salaries & Benefits)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Software Maintenance/Licenses							
Hardware Lease/Maintenance	1,295,200	655,197	116,588	1,245,199	896,232	4,208,416	
Telecommunications	1,000,000	600,000	250,000	500,000	600,000	2,950,000	
Contract Services	560,000	283,285	50,409	538,381	387,500	1,819,575	
Telecommunications							
Data Center Services							
Justice Partner costs							
Facilities							
Other							
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$ 2,855,200</b>	<b>\$ 1,538,481</b>	<b>\$ 416,997</b>	<b>\$ 2,283,580</b>	<b>\$ 1,883,732</b>	<b>\$ 8,977,990</b>	
<b>Revenue Opportunities</b>							
eFiling fees						\$ -	
Other fees							
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	
<b>Total Estimated Benefits</b>	<b>\$ 2,855,200</b>	<b>\$ 1,538,481</b>	<b>\$ 416,997</b>	<b>\$ 2,283,580</b>	<b>\$ 1,883,732</b>	<b>\$ 8,977,990</b>	

## 2.1.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

<b>Alternative 1 - Recommended Solution ROI Calculation</b>	<b>Alternative 1: Five Year Total</b>
Total 5 Year Estimated Benefits	\$ 8,977,990
Total 5 Year Costs	13,544,426
<b>Estimated 5 Yr Benefits Less 5 Yr Costs</b>	<b>\$ (4,566,436)</b>
<b>ROI Calculation</b>	
<b>ROI (Total 5 Year Benefit - Total 5 Year costs)/Total 5 year costs</b>	<b>-34%</b>

## 2.1.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR RECOMMENDED SOLUTION

The network design proposals for each court in the first year are ready for final review and approval by the courts before procurement submittal. The purchase orders can be executed within a couple weeks of receiving funding approval.

Limited resources are available to initiate the project; however, an additional project manager and network engineer would be hired as permanent full-time employees dedicated to these specific four court projects. The hiring process may take up to three months to complete the process. The hiring process can be accomplished while the equipment is procured and scheduled for delivery which normally takes up to three months.

Deployment will commence once all equipment has arrived at the court. Full deployment may take up to six months given the complexity of the larger courts. The entire project for the first year from network design to project acceptance for the four courts in parallel is estimated to be ten months.

Documentation is required at each phase of the court refresh projects and includes the following artifacts for each court: a project statement of work, project plan, preliminary network designs, a technical implementation plan, network configuration templates, a configuration and performance test plan, final as-built network diagrams and a closing project check-list.

## **2.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (STATUS QUO/DO NOTHING)**

### **2.2.1 DESCRIPTION**

The courts continue to fund, refresh and administer their own local network infrastructure and security programs.

### **2.2.2 ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES**

The courts are still dealing with funding shortfalls and a decrease in court resources available and capable of managing local efforts to refresh their technology. Currently, the courts are already behind schedule for the replacement of key components of the infrastructure. The exclusion of these four courts in the program may continue to push the refresh schedule of technology further out placing court operations at high risk should an infrastructure device failure or security breach occur. A major operational impact to court operations may affect public and justice partner access and in some cases public safety if the court does not refresh their network infrastructure prior to end-of-life cycles.

Lack of funding may compel courts to refresh technology with equipment that does not meet LAN/WAN standards and those not offer adequate performance or equivalent technology as the rest of the judicial branch. Substandard technology may prevent the court from leveraging newer court innovation and cost efficient technology such as modern case management systems, document management systems, remote video court proceedings, building automation, voice-over-IP, video remote interpretation, etc.

A standard approach to design and deployment is not leveraged with local funding, therefore exhausting more resources and funds than necessary. The courts do not have the available resources required to manage and deploy large infrastructure deployments, therefore the need for additional resources per court would be required. Additionally, the courts would not benefit from economies of scale by using a pool of IT resources and volume discounts to accomplish the same tasks. The courts will have to devote a greater amount of funding for the equivalent tangible results of the LAN/WAN program.

### **2.2.3 COSTS**

The courts would continue to fund their local technology refresh. Therefore, there is no cost to the LAN/WAN program.

#### **2.2.3.1 ASSUMPTIONS**

This alternative solution of not including the four courts in the programs assumes that courts have adequate funding and available resources to support a local technology refresh effort.

#### **2.2.3.2 COST TABLES**

N/A

#### **2.2.4 ESTIMATED BENEFITS**

N/A

#### **2.2.5 RETURN ON INVESTMENT**

N/A

### **2.3 RECOMMENDATION**

Alternative 1 is the recommended solution as it expand the LAN/WAN projects to the four court that are not currently in the program helps ensure these court have secure, reliable and flexible network.

**GLOSSARY**

Term	Description

## **APPENDIX A: SPREADSHEETS FOR COST TABLES AND BENEFITS CALCULATIONS**

The Cost Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for costs for Business Case.



Cost table 2.xlsx

The Benefits Table Spreadsheet below must be filled out for the benefits for Business Case.



Benefits table.xlsx

The Return On Investment (ROI) spreadsheet below must be filled out using the total 5 year costs and benefits for each alternative included in the BCP.



ROI calculation  
v2.xlsx