



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: June 27, 2014

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Trust Fund Funding for Specific Costs in 2014–2015 and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Allocation Reductions for 2014–2015	Action Required
	Effective Date
	June 27, 2014
	Date of Report
	June 17, 2014
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Contact
None	Colin Simpson, 415-865-4566
Recommended by	colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	
Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Cochair	
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Cochair	
Sherri Carter, Court Executive Officer, Los Angeles Superior Court	

Executive Summary

For fiscal year 2014–2015, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends an allocation of \$154.6 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund consisting of \$20.6 million for various trial court-related projects and programs, \$124.8 million for reimbursement of various trial court costs, including court-appointed dependency counsel, and \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs, as well as a process for adjusting 2014–2015 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund allocations approved by the council. Assuming the timely enactment of the 2014 State Budget, the TCBCA intends to bring additional recommendations for the council’s consideration at its July 29, 2014 meeting and may also bring back changes to what is being recommended in this report or other allocations already approved by the council.

Recommendations

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve an allocation of \$20.56 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Programs 30.05 and 30.15 expenditure authority in fiscal year (FY) 2014–2015, which consists of funding to maintain three projects and programs at their 2013–2014 allocation levels and increases and decreases for six projects and programs that net to a overall decrease of \$2.83 million.
2. Approve an allocation of \$124.8 million from the TCTF Program 45.10 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015 for reimbursement of various trial court costs, including court-appointed dependency counsel, but consider any revised recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee following enactment of the 2014 State Budget.
3. Approve an allocation of \$9.2 million from the TCTF Program 45.10 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015 for criminal justice realignment costs in the following manner:
 - a. Allocate \$4.6 million, with each court’s share based 50 percent on population and 50 percent on the FY 2013–2014 first, second, and third quarter workload data (number of petitions to revoke/modify postrelease community supervision and parole) submitted to the Criminal Justice Court Services Office (CJCSO) pursuant to Penal Code section 13155, as described in this report and displayed in column F of Attachment F; and
 - b. Direct Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Fiscal Services Office staff to allocate the remaining \$4.6 million based solely on updated FY 2013–2014 fourth quarter and FY 2014–2015 first quarter workload data submitted to the CJCSO pursuant to Penal Code section 13155.
4. To prepare for the likely outcome that the Budget Act of 2014 will continue to require the transfer of \$20 million from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund, approve the following process for reducing by \$14.6 million, (from \$78.5 million to \$63.9 million), the level of 2014–2015 allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund approved by the council in April 2014:
 - a. Move the \$6.3 million allocation for the V2 and V3 programs back to the TCTF;
 - b. Exempt from reduction, the Workers’ Compensation Reserve allocation of \$1.2 million, which is the estimated workers’ compensation tail claim settlement amount that is non-reducible and must be paid; and
 - c. Implement an 11.7 percent allocation reduction at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) division level and request the three divisions, in consultation with the relevant advisory committees, governing board and other immediate stakeholders, to

recommend to the council at its July business meeting, how the reduction should be allocated to the programs and projects managed by the divisions (see Attachment H).

A summary of the recommended TCTF Programs 30.05 and 30.15 allocations by project and programs is displayed in Attachment A. A summary of the recommended TCTF Program 45.10 allocations is displayed in Attachment B.

Previous Council Action

Program 30 allocations and related actions. At its April 25, 2014 meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the TCBAC's recommendations to allocate a total of \$78.5 million from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF), discontinue the transfer of \$20 million from the IMF to the TCTF, move the FY 2014–2015 allocation for noncourt-reimbursed costs of the V2 and V3 case management systems to the IMF, and move the allocation for the costs of the Enhanced Collections program from the IMF to the TCTF (see Attachment A, column G). These recommendations were brought before the council as part of the TCBAC's recommendations regarding IMF allocations.

In the Governor's May Revision proposal for the 2014 State Budget, the Governor did not adopt the council's proposal to discontinue the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF. Because this is not an issue that the Legislature is addressing, it is almost guaranteed that \$20 million will continue to be transferred to the TCTF.

Program 45.10 allocations. At its April 25, 2014 meeting, the council approved removing in 2014–2015 the \$29.4 million allocation for unfunded 2012–2013 benefits costs since there is projected to be insufficient revenue to support the allocation going forward (see Attachment B, row 14).

In 2011–2012 and 2012–2013, the Judicial Council approved an allocation of the Criminal Justice Realignment funding using a methodology based on an estimate of caseload received from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. In 2013–2014, the council approved an initial allocation in July 2013 of half of the funding using that same methodology and a final allocation in February 2014 that was based equally on both population and workload. Specifically, this split methodology determined each court's share of the allocation by adding each court's percentage of the statewide population of individuals on postrelease community supervision (PRCS) and parole weighted at .50 and each court's percentage of the statewide realignment workload measured as the number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole weighted at .50. The sum of the weighted percentages resulted in the percentage share of the total amount allocated.

Fiscal status of the Trial Court Trust Fund. Assuming the Judicial Council approves the recommended allocations contained in this report, the projected 2014–2015 ending fund balance of the TCTF is a negative \$44.4 million (see Attachment C, column B, row 7). Because about \$9.2 million of that amount are monies that are either statutorily restricted or restricted by the

council (mainly savings related to the Program 45.45 court interpreter appropriation), the unrestricted fund balance is a negative \$53.5 million (see Attachment C, column B, row 11). Assuming that the Budget Act will provide a \$30.9 million backfill for the continued decline in fee and assessment revenues that support courts' base allocations, and that does not change, the projected shortfall in revenue to support courts' base allocations is \$22.7 million (see Attachment C, column B, row 19).

Pending FY 2014–2015 TCTF allocation recommendations for Judicial Council consideration on July 29, 2014. Assuming the timely enactment of the 2014 State Budget, the TCBAC intends to bring recommendations for the council's consideration at its July 29, 2014 meeting regarding new funding allocations and historical funding reallocations based on the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Model (WAFM); trial court benefits cost changes funding, allocation of the statutorily-required 2 percent set-aside; preliminary allocation adjustments related to the 1 percent cap on trial courts' reserves; and, if necessary, reductions related to the aforementioned \$22.7 million projected revenue shortfall. The TCBAC may also bring back changes to what is being recommended in this report or other allocations already approved by the council.

Recommendation 1: TCTF Programs 30.05 and 30.15 Allocation

1. Approve an allocation of \$20.56 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund Programs 30.05 and 30.15 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015, which consists of funding to maintain three projects and programs at their 2013–2014 allocation levels and increases and decreases for six projects and programs that net to a overall decrease of \$2.83 million.

Rationale for recommendation 1

In January 2014, the TCBAC approved recommendations by its Revenue and Expenditure subcommittee on TCTF Program 30 allocation levels, totaling \$24.130 million for FY 2014–2015. Subsequently at their March 2014 meeting, the TCBAC approved the subcommittee's recommendation to move the allocation for costs of the V2 and V3 case management systems to the IMF. In response to the Governor's May Revision proposal, at its June 3, 2014 meeting, the TCBAC approved the subcommittee's recommendation to keep the allocation for costs of the V2 and V3 case management systems within the TCTF if the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF continues, resulting in recommended Program 30 allocations totaling \$21.185 million based on updated cost estimates for 2014–2015 (see Attachment A, column F, row 11).

Of the \$21.185 million in Program 30-recommended allocations, only \$20.560 million is presented for the council's consideration in this report. The recommended allocation of \$625,000 for the Enhanced Collections program was adopted by the council on April 25, 2014 (see Attachment A, columns G and H).

Expenditure authority. There is estimated to be sufficient expenditure authority for the recommended allocations. The Governor's proposed State Budget for 2014 provides \$4.33 million in expenditure authority for Program 30.05 allocations and \$20.13 million for Program

30.15 allocations. The TCBAC is recommending allocations of \$4.37 million from Program 30.05 and \$16.82 million from Program 30.15 (see Attachment A, columns D and E, line 11).

Though the total recommended Program 30.05 allocation exceeds the State Budget bill appropriation authority, there is provisional language in the State Budget bill that allows for this authority to be increased sufficiently to address the shortfall of \$44,000.

Recommended FY 2014–2015 allocations for projects and programs. Table 1 displays the recommended allocations from the TCTF Programs 30.05 and 30.15 expenditure authority by the AOC offices that manage the various projects and programs.

Attachment D provides the description of these projects and programs as provided to the TCBAC’s Revenue and Expenditure subcommittee.

Table 1. Recommended 2014–2015 TCTF Programs 30.05 and 30.15 One-Time Allocations by AOC Office

AOC Office	2013–2014 Allocation	Proposed Adjustment	Recommended Allocation
Center for Families, Children & the Courts	\$10,647,100	(\$1,774,100)	\$ 8,873,000
Information Technology Services Office	\$11,432,247	(\$1,094,247)	\$10,338,000
Trial Court Administrative Services Office	\$ 1,307,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 1,349,000
Total	\$23,386,347	(\$2,826,347)	\$20,560,000

Maintain allocations at 2013–2014 levels. The TCBAC recommends that the allocations for three projects and programs be maintained at their 2013–2014 levels: Children in Dependency Case Training, the Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections program, and the Interim Case Management System program.

Adjustments to 2013–2014 allocation levels. The TCBAC recommends adjustments to the 2013–2014 allocation levels of six projects and programs for a net decrease of \$2.83 million as follows.

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

1. Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program
Reduction: \$1,762,000
Description and Impact: This project is funded by fees specifically designated for this project by Government Code section 68651. The reduction reflects the decreased total amount of fee revenue projected in 2014–2015.

2. Equal Access Fund Program

Reduction: \$12,100

Description and Impact: The TCTF portion of this program is funded by a \$4.80 share of first paper filing fees specifically designated for this program by Government Code sections 68085.3 and 68085.4. The Program 30.05 component of the program represents the administrative costs of the program, which are capped at 5% of the funding appropriated. The reduction reflects the Program 30.05 share of the decreased fee revenue projected in 2014–2015.

Information Technology Services Office

3. Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System (CMS)

Augmentation: \$869,137

Description and Impact: The proposed allocation increase in FY 2014–2015 compared to last fiscal year is due to an increase in infrastructure and California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) costs in order to replace aging equipment. In addition, one-time cost savings used in FY 2013–2014, which were achieved through earlier infrastructure and CCTC cost reductions, are not available in FY 2014–2015.

4. Criminal and Traffic (V2) Case Management System

Reduction: \$1,998,784

Description and Impact: These savings will be achieved through infrastructure cost reductions and consolidating processing onto fewer servers. In addition, the Superior Court of Fresno County initiated a project in January 2014 to convert their criminal and traffic case types from the V2 CMS to the Tyler Odyssey CMS. The project is targeted to be complete in April 2015, with V2 decommissioned by August 2015. Costs will therefore ramp down in FY 2014–2015.

5. California Courts Technology Center

Augmentation: \$35,000

Description and Impact: The proposed allocation of \$1.689 million, an increase of \$35,000 over the FY 2013–2014 allocation, reflects a preliminary estimate of the costs that will be fully reimbursed by the trial courts for CCTC-related services requested by the courts. This allocation is intended to have a net-zero impact on the TCTF fund balance as any costs incurred are charged to the trial courts. As such, the final allocation amount will be adjusted to reflect the costs once agreed upon by the courts receiving the services. For FY 2013–2014, the final allocation amount based on costs agreed upon by the courts was \$1,605,596.

Trial Court Administrative Services Office

6. Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Augmentation: \$42,000

Description and Impact: The request reflects a forecasted increase in staffing costs for the Phoenix Program staff that supports the trial courts receiving this service. This allocation is intended to have a net-zero impact on the TCTF fund balance as any costs incurred are charged to the trial courts.

Recommendation 2: TCTF Program 45.10 Reimbursement Allocations

2. Approve an allocation of \$124.8 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.10 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015 for reimbursement of various trial court costs, including court-appointed dependency counsel, but consider any revised recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee following enactment of the 2014 State Budget.

Rationale for recommendation 2

Because they defray or help defray unavoidable or essential trial court costs, the 2014–2015 allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund, using Program 45.10 expenditure authority, should be maintained at the 2013–2014 levels for the following items:

- Court-appointed dependency counsel (\$103.7 million);
- Jury (\$16 million);
- Self-help center (\$2.5 million);
- Replacement screening stations (\$2.3 million); and
- Elder abuse (\$332,000)

If the amount of funding provided in the 2014 Budget Act is materially different from what was proposed in the Governor’s May Revision, the TCBAC may revisit these allocations and present revised recommendations for the Judicial Council’s consideration at its July 29, 2014 meeting.

Attachment E provides the description of these programs as provided to the TCBAC’s Revenue and Expenditure subcommittee.

Recommendation 3: Criminal Justice Realignment

3. Approve an allocation of \$9.2 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.10 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015 for criminal justice realignment costs in the following manner:
 - a. Allocate \$4.6 million with each court’s share based 50 percent on population and 50 percent on the FY 2013–2014 first, second, and third quarter workload data (number of petitions to revoke/modify postrelease community supervision and

parole) submitted to the Criminal Justice Court Services Office (CJCSO) pursuant to Penal Code section 13155, as described in this report and displayed in column F of Attachment F; and

- b. Direct AOC Fiscal Services Office staff to allocate the remaining \$4.6 million based solely on updated FY 2013–2014 fourth quarter and FY 2014–2015 first quarter workload data submitted to the CJCSO pursuant to Penal Code section 13155.

Rationale for Recommendation 3

The consensus of the TCBAC subcommittee that made this recommendation to the TCBAC is that workload is the best measure for allocating the criminal justice realignment funding to the courts. However, allocating the entire \$9.2 million in funding immediately based on workload is not an optimal choice at this time because the workload information the courts have submitted to the CJCSO—pursuant to Penal Code section 13155—as of this date includes only limited data on the number of petitions to revoke/modify parole as these petitions did not begin to be filed in the courts until July 1, 2013. At the most, there would be three quarters worth of petitions to revoke/modify parole data received from some courts, and even less from others. In addition to a lag time in receiving the data from the courts, it takes time for the CJCSO staff to review and clean the data to the point where they feel relatively confident in its accuracy and completeness.

While allocation of the whole \$9.2 million could be delayed until later in the fiscal year when more complete parole data has been received, due to possible cash flow issues in some courts as a result of their reduced fund balances, TCBAC does not advise waiting to make an allocation. For this reason, a two-step allocation process is recommended. The first allocation would be based on the same allocation methodology used for the final FY 2013–2014 allocation, and the second would occur after the first of the 2015 calendar year when a full year’s worth of parole modification/revocation activity has been reported by the courts and would reflect any recent changes in workload—increases or decreases in filings—that they have experienced. This recommended allocation process would also provide additional time to make sure courts are processing and reporting these activities in the same manner.

Finally, by approving the two-step allocation methodology in advance, AOC staff can allocate funds based on the information they have now—both population and workload data—and then update the allocation early next year, based solely on the most current workload data submitted by the courts. There would be no necessity to present this item again to the TCBAC and then to the Judicial Council for consideration.

Recommendation 4: IMF Allocation Reductions

4. To prepare for the likely outcome that the Budget Act of 2014 will continue to require the transfer of \$20 million from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund, approve the following process for reducing by \$14.6 million, (from \$78.5 million to \$63.9 million), the level of 2014–2015 allocations from

the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund approved by the council in April 2014:

- a. Move the \$6.3 million allocation for the V2 and V3 programs back to the TCTF;
- b. Exempt from reduction, the Workers' Compensation Reserve allocation of \$1.2 million, which is the estimated workers' compensation tail claim settlement amount that is non-reducible and must be paid; and
- c. Implement an 11.7 percent allocation reduction at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) division level and request the three divisions, in consultation with the relevant advisory committees, governing board and other immediate stakeholders, to recommend to the council at its July business meeting, how the reduction should be allocated to the programs and projects managed by the divisions (see Attachment H).

Rationale for recommendation 4

When the TCBAC adopted this recommendation, it was known that the Governor's May Revision proposal did not adopt the Budget Change Proposal that was submitted by council to discontinue the required \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF that began in 2011–2012 in order to offset trial court funding reductions, but not known what actions the Legislature would take. At the time of the writing of this report, it is known that the Legislature conference committee also did not discontinue this required transfer. Assuming the transfer continues, which is virtually guaranteed to happen, the council's allocation of \$78.5 million would result in a projected negative fund balance in the IMF of \$14.6 million (see column B of Attachment G).

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

This item was not circulated for public comment. No comments concerning the TCBAC's recommendation were received. The TCBAC did not consider any alternatives to these recommendations. The recommended process already incorporates two methodologies for allocating the funding.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

There are no implementation requirements or operational impacts.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: TCBAC-Recommended 2014–2015 TCTF Program 30.05 and 30.15 Allocations
2. Attachment B: FY 2013–2014 and FY 2014–2015 Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.10: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations
3. Attachment C: Trial Court Trust Fund—Fund Condition Statement
4. Attachment D: Description of Program 30 Projects/Programs Proposed to the TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee by the AOC for FY 2014–2015
5. Attachment E: Description of Program 45.10 Programs Proposed to the TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee by the AOC for FY 2014–2015

6. Attachment F: Allocations Based on Population (PRCS and Parole) and Workload (Petitions for PRCS and Parole)
7. Attachment G: State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund – Fund Condition Statement
8. Attachment H: IMF Proposed Allocation for FY 2014–2015

TCBAC-Recommended 2014-2015 TCTF Program 30.05 and 30.15 Allocations

Attachment A

#	Project and Program Title	2013-14 JC-Approved Allocation	2013-14 Reimbursed by Courts	2013-14 Approved Total Allocation	FY 2014-15 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommendations			2014-15 Judicial Council-Approved Allocation on April 25, 2014	FY 2014-15 Allocation for Judicial Council Consideration on June 27, 2014
					Program 30.05 AOC Support ¹	Program 30.15 Local Assistance	Total		
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col A + B)	Col. D	Col. E	Col F (Col. D + E)	Col. G	Col. H
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	113,000		113,000	-	113,000	113,000	-	113,000
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	10,000,000		10,000,000	500,000	7,738,000	8,238,000	-	8,238,000
3	Equal Access Fund	274,100		274,100	262,000	-	262,000	-	262,000
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000		260,000	260,000	-	260,000	-	260,000
5	Enhanced Collections	-	-	-	625,000	-	625,000	625,000	-
6	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	4,789,000	804,863	5,593,863	1,276,000	5,187,000	6,463,000	-	6,463,000
7	Criminal and Traffic (V2) CMS	2,646,700	510,084	3,156,784	97,000	1,061,000	1,158,000	-	1,158,000
8	California Courts Technology Center	-	1,654,000	1,654,000	-	1,689,000	1,689,000	-	1,689,000
9	Interim Case Management System	-	1,027,600	1,027,600	-	1,028,000	1,028,000	-	1,028,000
10	Phoenix HR Services	7,000	1,300,000	1,307,000	1,349,000	-	1,349,000	-	1,349,000
11	Total	18,089,800	5,296,547	23,386,347	4,369,000	16,816,000	21,185,000	625,000	20,560,000
12	Budget Bill Appropriation Authority	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,325,000	20,134,000	24,459,000	N/A	N/A
13	Appropriation Balance¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	(44,000)	3,318,000	3,274,000	N/A	N/A

¹ There are no Program 30.05 appropriation authority concerns. Provisional language in the State Budget bill allows the authority to be increased as it relates to the costs of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot program, Equal Access Fund program, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections program.

**FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.10: Appropriation
vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2013-14	Estimated 2014-15	For Judicial Council Consideration on June 27, 2014
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,693,270,804	1,518,726,356	
3	II. Adjustments				
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions and Screening	Base	-916,979	-702,811	
6	III. FY 2013-2014 Allocations				
7	\$261 Million Court Operations Reduction	Base	-261,000,000		
8	\$60 Million in New Funding	Base	60,000,000		
9	\$50 Million Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	
10	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-35,178,540	-37,082,840	Pending
11	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to Courts	Non-Base	35,178,540	37,082,840	Pending
12	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000	9,223,000
13	Reduction for FY 2013-14 Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-2,033,219		
14	FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	29,405,750	-29,405,750	
15	2011-12 Benefits Cost Increases	Non-Base	4,740,092		
16	Fresno CMS Replacement	Non-Base	2,373,200		
17	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding (FY 2012-13 costs)	Non-Base	150,000		
18	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Non-Base	-173,587		
20	IV. FY 2014-2015 Allocations (May Revise)				
21	\$42.8 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base		42,800,000	Pending
22	\$86.3 Million in New Funding	Base		86,300,000	Pending
23	\$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall Reduction	Base			Pending
25	V. Allocation for Reimbursements				
26	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	103,725,445	103,725,445	103,725,445
27	Jury	Non-Base	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
28	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	2,286,000	2,286,000
29	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
30	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	332,000	332,000
31	CSA Audits	Non-Base	0	325,000	Pending
32	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	2,315,000	1,005,361	Pending
34	VI. Estimated Revenue Distributions¹				
35	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	107,910,203	107,910,203	
36	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	22,992,171	22,992,171	
37	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	10,907,494	
38	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,450,448	3,450,448	
39	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,707,282	2,707,282	
40	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840	
42	VII. Miscellaneous Charges				
43	JCWCP and SAIC	Non-Base	-21,067,516	-21,116,127	
46	Total		1,740,041,427	1,830,909,912	134,066,445
48	Program 45.10 Appropriation		1,739,893,437	1,836,912,437	0
50	Estimated Remaining Program 45.10 Appropriation		-147,990	6,002,525	

¹ The revenue distributions listed are made either as directed by statute or based on existing Judicial Council policy and do not require further Judicial Council action for the amounts to be allocated.

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

		FY 2013-14 (Estimated)	FY 2014-15 (Estimated)
#	Description	Col. A	Col. B
1	Beginning Balance	82,346,997	9,421,089
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	(5,905,715)	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	76,441,282	9,421,089
4	Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	2,141,298,567	2,239,610,373
5	Total Resources	2,217,739,849	2,249,031,462
6	Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	2,208,318,759	2,293,417,850
7	Ending Fund Balance	9,421,089	(44,386,387)
8			
9	Fund Balance Detail		
10	Restricted Fund Balance	9,160,459	9,160,459
11	Unrestricted Fund Balance	260,630	(53,546,847)
12			
13	Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	(67,020,193)	(53,807,477)
14			
15	Governor's May Revise		
16	Backfill for Revenue Shortfall		30,900,000
17	Ending Fund Balance		(13,486,387)
18	Restricted Fund Balance		9,160,459
19	Unrestricted Fund Balance		(22,646,847)

Description of Program 30 Projects/Programs Proposed to the TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee by the AOC for FY 2014–2015

Table of Contents

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts14
Children in Dependency Case Training14
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program18
Equal Access Fund.....23
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collection.....28
Fiscal Services Office.....33
Enhanced Collections33
Information Technology Services Office36
Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System.37
Criminal and Traffic (V2) Case Management System.....38
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations38
Interim Case Management System.....42
Trial Court Administrative Services Office.....47
Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services47

JUDICIAL AND COURT OPERATIONS SERVICES DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Children in Dependency Case Training

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$113,000; no change from 2013–2014

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

Program provides training designed to improve the trial and appellate advocacy skills of juvenile dependency court-appointed attorneys. All trial courts are eligible to send attorneys to this training. These funds are used to hire expert faculty and to support attendees’ travel. Attorneys educated in advanced trial skills save court costs by improving hearing efficiency, avoiding continuances, and adhering to federal standards for timeliness. If they are educated in establishing an adequate record, identifying issues for appeal, and meeting the appropriate timelines for writs and appeals, attorneys save the appellate courts considerable time by providing thorough and timely filings.

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

NA

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

No

4. Effectiveness of project/program

As part of the series of advanced trial skills trainings being offered, we are implementing various data collection methods to measure the effectiveness of these trainings and transfer of learning to the job. Participants must complete a pre-training questionnaire in which they assess their own skills related to the content to be covered, such as making objections and delivering effective opening and closing arguments. In addition, we have also asked participants' supervisors to complete a similar questionnaire designed to assess the skills of the participant before taking the course. The participants must also complete a post-training questionnaire for their immediate feedback about the course. Finally, all participants and their supervisors have been asked to complete a follow-up survey after 90 days to assess the impact of the training on their practice. The initial results from the pre-training survey and post-training evaluations have yielded positive impressions of the training. This particular training stands apart from many of the other trainings delivered in that it is a three-day, highly interactive, skill-building training that includes practice sessions and immediate feedback. This design has been extremely well received. Many learners reported an unexpected benefit of being energized by the training and feeling more connected to the purpose of their work. It seems that the level of engagement in this course may have contributed to this outcome and is worth exploring for future trainings.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

There is a budget of \$113,000 from TCTF.

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

\$113,000 per year, based on the assumptions that the contract faculty will continue to provide their services at the current rate and that travel costs will remain relatively stable.

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

NA

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

This funding was designated for this training by the Judicial Council with the recognition that the lack of knowledge on dependency appeals was impacting the workload of the appellate courts. If these funds were eliminated, court-appointed attorneys would have no access to training on important elements of preparing a case for appeal. The workload of the courts of appeal would increase. There is no other source of funding that could provide training on this topic.

9. Other

N/A

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Children in Dependency Case Training

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Alameda							yes	yes
Alpine							yes	yes
Amador							yes	yes
Butte							yes	yes
Calaveras							yes	yes
Colusa							yes	yes
Contra Costa							yes	yes
Del Norte							yes	yes
El Dorado							yes	yes
Fresno							yes	yes
Glenn							yes	yes
Humboldt							yes	yes
Imperial							yes	yes
Inyo							yes	yes
Kern							yes	yes
Kings							yes	yes
Lake							yes	yes
Lassen							yes	yes
Los Angeles							yes	yes
Madera							yes	yes
Marin							yes	yes
Mariposa							yes	yes
Mendocino							yes	yes
Merced							yes	yes
Modoc							yes	yes
Mono							yes	yes
Monterey							yes	yes
Napa							yes	yes

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Children in Dependency Case Training

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Nevada							yes	yes
Orange							yes	yes
Placer							yes	yes
Plumas							yes	yes
Riverside							yes	yes
Sacramento							yes	yes
San Benito							yes	yes
San Bernardino							yes	yes
San Diego							yes	yes
San Francisco							yes	yes
San Joaquin							yes	yes
San Luis Obispo							yes	yes
San Mateo							yes	yes
Santa Barbara							yes	yes
Santa Clara							yes	yes
Santa Cruz							yes	yes
Shasta							yes	yes
Sierra							yes	yes
Siskiyou							yes	yes
Solano							yes	yes
Sonoma							yes	yes
Stanislaus							yes	yes
Sutter							yes	yes
Tehama							yes	yes
Trinity							yes	yes
Tulare							yes	yes
Tuolumne							yes	yes
Ventura							yes	yes
Yolo							yes	yes

Project/Program Title: Children in Dependency Case Training

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Yuba							yes	yes
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other/Non-court ²⁾				-			113,000	113,000
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	113,000	113,000

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

In FY2012-2013, of the \$1,130,000 allocated, \$85,000 was used to fund consultants for training to improve the trial and appellate advocacy skills of juvenile dependency court-appointed attorneys. All trial courts are eligible to send attorneys to this training. The remaining \$28,000 was used to support travel costs for training attendees.

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
	Children in Dependency Case Training		113,000					113,000

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
	Children in Dependency Case Training	113,000	113,000	113,000	113,000	113,000	565,000

Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$8,238,000; \$1,762,000 decrease from 2013–2014

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

This directed funding implements a pilot program required by Government Code section 68651 (AB 590-Feuer). The funding supports seven pilot programs, which are each a partnership of a legal services nonprofit corporation, the court, and other legal services providers in the community. The

programs provide legal representation to low-income Californians (at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level) in housing, child custody, probate conservatorship, and guardianship matters. Since not all eligible low-income parties with meritorious cases can be provided with legal representation, the court partners receive funds to implement improved court procedures, personnel training, case management and administration methods, and best practices.

Project funds come from a restricted \$10 supplemental filing fee on certain postjudgment motions. Based upon early revenue figures, \$9.5 million has been allocated to legal services agencies and their court partners. \$500,000 was set aside for annual administrative costs including the evaluation costs for the project to meet the legislative requirements for an extensive evaluation due in 2016. The amount of collections has decreased, and thus, the projection for future allocations has been decreased to \$8,962,000 per year. Administrative costs will be reduced proportionately as well. For the current grants, \$1,768,656 has been allocated to courts, and \$7,731,344 has been allocated to the legal aid organizations providing representation.

Pilot programs were selected through a competitive RFP process and approved by the Judicial Council. The projects are located in Kern, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Yolo counties. The San Francisco Superior Court did not request funding for the project. Government Code 68651 provides that the “participating projects shall be selected by a committee appointed by the Judicial Council with representation from key stakeholder groups, including judicial officers, legal services providers, and others, as appropriate... Projects approved pursuant to this section shall initially be authorized for a three-year period, commencing July 1, 2011, subject to renewal for a period to be determined by the Judicial Council, in consultation with the participating project in light of the project's capacity and success....”

The majority of administrative funds are being used for the evaluation of the pilot project as the statute requires the Judicial Council to submit a study of the project to the Governor and Legislature by January 2016. “The study shall report on the percentage of funding by case type and shall include data on the impact of counsel on equal access to justice and the effect on court administration and efficiency, and enhanced coordination between courts and other government service providers and community resources. This report shall describe the benefits of providing representation to those who were previously not represented, both for the clients and the courts,

as well as strategies and recommendations for maximizing the benefit of that representation in the future. The report shall describe and include data, if available, on the impact of the pilot program on families and children. The report also shall include an assessment of the continuing unmet needs and, if available, data regarding those unmet needs.” This study should provide useful information to all courts on effective ways of handling these cases.

The pilots focus on providing representation in cases where one side is generally represented and the other is not. These are typically the most difficult cases for both the litigants and the courts. The intent is not only to improve access to the courts and the quality of justice obtained by those low-income individuals who would otherwise not have counsel, but also to allow court calendars that currently include many self-represented litigants to be handled more effectively and efficiently. The legislature found that the absence of representation not only disadvantages parties, but has a negative effect on the functioning of the judicial system. “When parties lack legal counsel, courts must cope with the need to provide guidance and assistance to ensure that the matter is properly administered

and the parties receive a fair trial or hearing. Such efforts, however, deplete scarce court resources and negatively affect the courts’ ability to function as intended, including causing erroneous and incomplete pleadings, inaccurate information, unproductive court appearances, improper defaults, unnecessary continuances, delays in proceedings for all court users and other problems that can ultimately subvert the administration of justice.”

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

NA

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

Yes, the project is required by Government Code 68651. Specific fees are designated in that Code for this project.

4. Effectiveness of project/program

A legislatively required evaluation of the project is due on January 31, 2016. Early reports indicate an increased rate of pretrial settlements and efficiencies associated with court innovations, e.g., e-filing.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

This project is fully funded by new fees specifically designated for this project by Government Code 68651. The total amount of fee revenue projected in 2013-2014 is \$8,962,000. 5% of the fees collected may be used for administration of the project including evaluation.

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

The 5 year projected budget for this project is dependent on the filing fees established in the authorizing legislation (Government Code section 68651). The amount is currently projected to be \$8,962,000 per year. The project is currently scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2017.

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

The revenue source is set forth in the authorizing legislation (Government Code section 68651).

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

If this project was eliminated, the Judicial Branch would not be in compliance with the law establishing the requirements and funding sources for this project.

9. Other

N/A

Project/Program Title: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Alameda							yes	yes

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Alpine							yes	yes
Amador							yes	yes
Butte							yes	yes
Calaveras							yes	yes
Colusa							yes	yes
Contra Costa							yes	yes
Del Norte							yes	yes
El Dorado							yes	yes
Fresno							yes	yes
Glenn							yes	yes
Humboldt							yes	yes
Imperial							yes	yes
Inyo							yes	yes
Kern							yes	yes
Kings							yes	yes
Lake							yes	yes
Lassen							yes	yes
Los Angeles							yes	yes
Madera							yes	yes
Marin							yes	yes
Mariposa							yes	yes
Mendocino							yes	yes
Merced							yes	yes
Modoc							yes	yes
Mono							yes	yes
Monterey							yes	yes
Napa							yes	yes
Nevada							yes	yes
Orange							yes	yes
Placer							yes	yes

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Plumas							yes	yes
Riverside							yes	yes
Sacramento							yes	yes
San Benito							yes	yes
San Bernardino							yes	yes
San Diego							yes	yes
San Francisco							yes	yes
San Joaquin							yes	yes
San Luis Obispo							yes	yes
San Mateo							yes	yes
Santa Barbara							yes	yes
Santa Clara							yes	yes
Santa Cruz							yes	yes
Shasta							yes	yes
Sierra							yes	yes
Siskiyou							yes	yes
Solano							yes	yes
Sonoma							yes	yes
Stanislaus							yes	yes
Sutter							yes	yes
Tehama							yes	yes
Trinity							yes	yes
Tulare							yes	yes
Tuolumne							yes	yes
Ventura							yes	yes
Yolo							yes	yes
Yuba							yes	yes
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other/Non-court ²⁾							500,000	500,000

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	500,000	500,000

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

\$9.5 million has been allocated to legal services agencies and their court partners. \$500,000 is set aside in the Budget Act for administration of the program. Of that, \$290,000 is usually encumbered with an independent evaluation firm to work on the legislatively mandated evaluation. The remainder of the funding is being used to pay portions of salaries of staff who work on administration and evaluation of the project, and a small budget is for travel expenses for administrative site visits. Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project had a previous total budget of \$10 million from supplemental filings fees with \$500,000 set aside for annual administrative costs including the evaluation costs for this project. Since the collection amount has decreased, in 2013-2014 the projection of future allocations has been decreased to \$8,962,000 which will decrease administrative costs proportionately as well.

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project*		8,692,000					8,692,000

Note:

*Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project had a previous total budget of \$10 million from supplemental filings fees with \$500,000 set aside for annual administrative costs including the evaluation costs for this project. Since the collection amount has decreased, the projection of future allocations has been decreased to \$8,962,000 which will decrease administrative costs proportionately as well.

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project**	8,962,000	8,962,000	8,962,000			26,886,000

Note:

**Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Project had a previous total budget of \$10 million from supplemental filings fees with \$500,000 set aside for annual administrative costs including the evaluation costs for this project. Since the collection amount has decreased, in 2013-2014 the projection of future allocations has been decreased to \$8,962,000 which will decrease administrative costs proportionately as well.

Equal Access Fund

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$262,000; \$12,100 decrease from 2013–2014

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

For the last 13 years, the state Budget Act has contained a provision for the allotment of \$10 million to an Equal Access Fund “to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice.” In 2005, the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act was approved by the Legislature and the

Governor. That act established a new distribution of \$4.80 per filing fee to the Equal Access Fund in the Trial Court Trust Fund. The estimated revenue from filing fees for the fund is \$5.7 million per year.

The Budget Act provides that 90% of the funds are to support agencies providing civil legal assistance for low-income persons. The Business and Professions Code sets forth the criteria for distribution of those funds. 10% of the funds support partnership grants to eligible legal services agencies providing self-help assistance at local courts. Organizations must complete specific applications for these funds and have the approval of their courts. The Budget Act allocates up to 5% for administrative costs. Two thirds of the administrative costs go to the State Bar and 1/3 to AOC.

AOC administrative funds cover the costs of staffing to distribute and administer the grants, provide technical assistance and training support for the legal services agencies and courts, as well as the cost of Commission expenses, accounting and programmatic review. It further provides staff support to develop on-line document assembly programs and other assistance for partnership grant projects.

The program serves all 58 courts by providing support to legal services programs which assist litigants with their legal matters. Thirty-three partnership grant programs operate 33 self-help centers in 28 courts. Parties who receive legal services – either fully or partly represented or helped in self-help centers – generally save the court valuable time and resources by helping litigants have better prepared pleadings, more organized evidence, and more effective presentation of their cases. Legal services programs also save significant time for courts by helping litigants understand their cases and helping them to settle whenever possible. Often a consultation with a lawyer is helpful for potential litigants to understand when they do not have a viable court case.

The administrative funds also provides the staff support to develop on-line document assembly programs and other instructional materials developed in partnership grant programs which are available to courts throughout the state.

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

NA

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

Yes. The program has been specifically set forth in the State Budget Act since 1999 with language setting forth the requirements for funding.

4. Effectiveness of project/program

An evaluation of the Equal Access Fund prepared for the legislature in 2005 found that the Equal Access Fund has created strong partnerships between the courts and nonprofit legal aid providers. The self-help centers started with partnership grant funds have often been continued with funding from local courts as they demonstrated their effectiveness. Judges and court personnel expressed widespread support for partnership grant self-help centers which allow many more low-income person to be served by the courts. Court staff reported that working in partnership with legal aid providers helped them to identify systemic problems for low-income people that can be addressed by changes in the way the court functions. Ultimately, those changes often benefited all litigants.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

The \$294,598 allocated to this program is the AOC's portion of the administrative costs for the

program. \$90,453 of those funds come from the Trial Court Trust Fund, the remainder is from the General Fund. The State Bar receives \$510,906 for its administrative costs.

Since 1999, the state Budget Act has contained a provision for the allotment to an Equal Access Fund “to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice.” In 1999, the amount allocated was \$10 million. (Sen. Bill 160; Stats. 1999, ch. 50), Item 0250-101-001.) It has increased over time to the current year’s figure of \$10,392,000. (Assem. Bill 110; Stats. 2013, ch. 20); see Item 0250-101-0001, Schedule 8.)

In addition, in 2005, the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act was approved by the Legislature and the Governor Assem. Bill 195; Stats. 2005, ch. 75. That act established a new distribution of \$4.80 per first paper filing fee to the Equal Access Fund via the Trial Court Trust Fund. The expenditure authority stated in the Budget Act of 2013 from those filing fees for the Equal Access Fund is \$5,482,000. (See Item 0250-101-0932, Schedule 7.)

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

The administrative costs projections for fiscal year 2014-2018 are based upon the authorized amount in the State Budget Act as well as a percentage of filing fee revenue as set out in the Budget Act. The only change anticipated would be based upon a change in filing fee revenue or additional general fund revenue identified by the legislature.

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

No funds for this project come from the IMF. All are from TCTF and the General Fund from designated line items in the State Budget Act.

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

The impact of eliminating the TCTF funds is that the AOC/Judicial Council would still have the responsibility of administering \$16 million in funding for legal services without any administrative funding.

9. Other

N/A

Project/Program Title: Equal Access Fund

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Alameda					yes	yes	yes	yes
Alpine					yes	yes	yes	yes
Amador					yes	yes	yes	yes
Butte					yes	yes	yes	yes
Calaveras					yes	yes	yes	yes

Project/Program Title: Equal Access Fund

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Colusa					yes	yes	yes	yes
Contra Costa					yes	yes	yes	yes
Del Norte					yes	yes	yes	yes
El Dorado					yes	yes	yes	yes
Fresno					yes	yes	yes	yes
Glenn					yes	yes	yes	yes
Humboldt					yes	yes	yes	yes
Imperial					yes	yes	yes	yes
Inyo					yes	yes	yes	yes
Kern					yes	yes	yes	yes
Kings					yes	yes	yes	yes
Lake					yes	yes	yes	yes
Lassen					yes	yes	yes	yes
Los Angeles					yes	yes	yes	yes
Madera					yes	yes	yes	yes
Marin					yes	yes	yes	yes
Mariposa					yes	yes	yes	yes
Mendocino					yes	yes	yes	yes
Merced					yes	yes	yes	yes
Modoc					yes	yes	yes	yes
Mono					yes	yes	yes	yes
Monterey					yes	yes	yes	yes
Napa					yes	yes	yes	yes
Nevada					yes	yes	yes	yes
Orange					yes	yes	yes	yes
Placer					yes	yes	yes	yes
Plumas					yes	yes	yes	yes
Riverside					yes	yes	yes	yes
Sacramento					yes	yes	yes	yes

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Equal Access Fund

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
San Benito					yes	yes	yes	yes
San Bernardino					yes	yes	yes	yes
San Diego					yes	yes	yes	yes
San Francisco					yes	yes	yes	yes
San Joaquin					yes	yes	yes	yes
San Luis Obispo					yes	yes	yes	yes
San Mateo					yes	yes	yes	yes
Santa Barbara					yes	yes	yes	yes
Santa Clara					yes	yes	yes	yes
Santa Cruz					yes	yes	yes	yes
Shasta					yes	yes	yes	yes
Sierra					yes	yes	yes	yes
Siskiyou					yes	yes	yes	yes
Solano					yes	yes	yes	yes
Sonoma					yes	yes	yes	yes
Stanislaus					yes	yes	yes	yes
Sutter					yes	yes	yes	yes
Tehama					yes	yes	yes	yes
Trinity					yes	yes	yes	yes
Tulare					yes	yes	yes	yes
Tuolumne					yes	yes	yes	yes
Ventura					yes	yes	yes	yes
Yolo					yes	yes	yes	yes
Yuba					yes	yes	yes	yes
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other/Non-court ²⁾				-	315,569	314,742	294,602	294,598
Total	-	-	-	-	315,569	314,742	294,602	294,598

Project/Program Title: Equal Access Fund

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

The Budget Act allocates up to 5% for administrative costs. Two thirds of the administrative costs go to the State Bar and one third to the AOC. Administrative funds cover the costs of staffing to distribute and administer the grants, provide technical assistance and training support for the legal services agencies and courts, as well as the costs of Commission expenses, accounting, and programmatic review. It further provides staff support to develop on-line document assembly programs and other assistance for partnership grant projects.

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
	Equal Access Fund - IOLTA Formula grants		4,687,110	9,352,800				14,039,910
	Equal Access Fund - Partnership Grants		520,790	1,039,200				1,559,990
	Administrative Costs/Expenses for the Bar		180,906	330,000				510,906
	Administrative Costs/Expenses for the AOC		90,453	165,000				255,453

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
	Equal Access - AOC Administration	294,598	294,598	294,598	294,598	294,598	1,472,990

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collection

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$260,000, no change from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

A total of \$2.3 million net of expenses has been collected by the trial courts for redistribution to underfunded courts in the past four years. It is estimated that approximately \$750,000 will be collected and redistributed annually. This collection funding is designated by statute to be used in trial courts with high attorney-client caseloads, to bring down caseloads and improve outcomes for children. In addition, improving caseloads leads to a reduction in the time children spend in the dependency system and the number of unnecessary delays in a case, leading to workload savings for

the trial courts. All courts are required to comply with program guidelines. These guidelines establish criteria for receipt of program funds based on participation and local need.

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

NA

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

Yes. Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.47 mandates the collections program. This funding provides staffing for the program. Collections program staff assists trial courts in implementing the program in a variety of ways. A dedicated Serranus webpage, maintained by staff, provides quick access to the guidelines, optional forms, and other program resources. Staff also administers a listserv for judicial officers and court staff to share questions and information with program staff and each other. The attorney drafts program guidelines and forms, ensures program compliance with statute, and works directly with courts on implementing the program. The attorney also advises the courts and advisory committees on any legal questions regarding the program. The program analyst guides courts in completing the required implementation reports, receives and processes the reports, and follows up with individual courts as required. Staff hosts a monthly conference call to field implementation questions from the courts and provide courts with another forum for sharing information. In 2014, as required by the program guidelines, staff will collect and analyze data to assess the fiscal and operational impact of the program on the courts; and to suggest any needed changes to the appropriate advisory committee.

4. Effectiveness of project/program

Staff funded by the program has fulfilled all legislative and Judicial Council mandates: assisting the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to establish the program by drafting collections and allocation guidelines, assisting the courts to implement the program guidelines, and implementing and monitoring the reallocation of collected funds. In fiscal year 2013–2014, \$2.3 million in collected funds will be distributed to the trial courts to reduce dependency attorney caseloads.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

There is only the \$260,000 from TCTF.

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

\$260,000 per year based on stable staffing needs.

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

These cannot be shifted to the courts nor to the General Fund.

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

The guidelines approved by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and adopted by the council require staff to assist the courts in implementing the program, to ensure that the courts are able to comply with the statutory mandate in the most cost-effective way possible, and to facilitate the distribution of program funds to eligible needy courts. There are no other funds designated to support these functions; terminating the funding would increase the burden of the program on the trial courts while eliminating the sole mechanism through which the courts would see any benefit.

Eliminating this funding would also raise a barrier to the public's access to justice. By ensuring that

Attachment D

persons able to afford an attorney must pay for their attorney, the program allows courts to direct their scarce dollars to persons who would not otherwise have access to legal representation.

9. Other

N/A

Project/Program Title: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Alameda						yes	yes	yes
Alpine						yes	yes	yes
Amador						yes	yes	yes
Butte						yes	yes	yes
Calaveras						yes	yes	yes
Colusa						yes	yes	yes
Contra Costa						yes	yes	yes
Del Norte						yes	yes	yes
El Dorado						yes	yes	yes
Fresno						yes	yes	yes
Glenn						yes	yes	yes
Humboldt						yes	yes	yes
Imperial						yes	yes	yes
Inyo						yes	yes	yes
Kern						yes	yes	yes
Kings						yes	yes	yes
Lake						yes	yes	yes
Lassen						yes	yes	yes
Los Angeles						yes	yes	yes
Madera						yes	yes	yes
Marin						yes	yes	yes
Mariposa						yes	yes	yes
Mendocino						yes	yes	yes
Merced						yes	yes	yes
Modoc						yes	yes	yes

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ^D			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Mono						yes	yes	yes
Monterey						yes	yes	yes
Napa						yes	yes	yes
Nevada						yes	yes	yes
Orange						yes	yes	yes
Placer						yes	yes	yes
Plumas						yes	yes	yes
Riverside						yes	yes	yes
Sacramento						yes	yes	yes
San Benito						yes	yes	yes
San Bernardino						yes	yes	yes
San Diego						yes	yes	yes
San Francisco						yes	yes	yes
San Joaquin						yes	yes	yes
San Luis Obispo						yes	yes	yes
San Mateo						yes	yes	yes
Santa Barbara						yes	yes	yes
Santa Clara						yes	yes	yes
Santa Cruz						yes	yes	yes
Shasta						yes	yes	yes
Sierra						yes	yes	yes
Siskiyou						yes	yes	yes
Solano						yes	yes	yes
Sonoma						yes	yes	yes
Stanislaus						yes	yes	yes
Sutter						yes	yes	yes
Tehama						yes	yes	yes
Trinity						yes	yes	yes
Tulare						yes	yes	yes

Project/Program Title: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Tuolumne						yes	yes	yes
Ventura						yes	yes	yes
Yolo						yes	yes	yes
Yuba						yes	yes	yes
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other/Non-court ²⁾				-		75,000	210,000	260,000
Total	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	210,000	260,000

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

These funds are used to assist courts in collecting court-appointed dependency counsel reimbursements from parents and to allocate these funds to courts. In accordance with the guidelines specified in Assembly Bill 131 (Stats. 2009, ch. 413) and approved by the Judicial Council in FY 2012–2013 and FY 2013–2014, funding supports courts in implementing a program of assessment of all parents for ability to pay as well as court hearings on the assessment if requested, collection of reimbursement, and reporting. Administrative costs include legal and technical assistance for implementation. Funding for this program is allocated in accordance with the guidelines specified in AB 131.

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
	Equal Access Fund - IOLTA Formula grants		4,687,110	9,352,800				14,039,910
	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections		260,000					260,000
	Total	5,290,000	20,744,259	10,887,000	173,384	-	-	37,094,643

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000	260,000	260,000	260,000	260,000	1,300,000

JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

Fiscal Services Office

Enhanced Collections

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$625,000

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

The AOC Enhanced Collections Unit represents the only centralized professional and technical assistance team available to courts and counties in California regarding issues relating to the collection of court-ordered debt. Support provided to courts and counties ranges from assistance with annual reporting requirements, collections master and participation agreements, operational reviews of individual collection programs, as well as daily assistance in the form of policy and statutory guidance.

The benefit to any given court is dependent on their utilization of these services.

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

The unique nature of this service provides intangible service benefits to courts and counties.

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

SB 940, passed and signed into law in 2005, requires courts and counties to collaborate on collections programs. Given the courts are required to maintain a collections program, which includes annual reporting to the legislature—developed, prepared, and submitted by the AOC—this program could be considered as mandatory.

4. Effectiveness of project/program

Based on the volume of customer requests for assistance as well as the complexity of such requests, the unit's track record for timely legislative report submittals and successful collections RFP solicitations and resulting master agreements, we would rate this as a highly effective program.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

The total budget for the current year is \$625,000, a \$75,000 decrease from the prior year.

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

Based on current resources, the five year funding need is \$625,000 per year for each year (\$3.125 million).

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

These costs can be shifted to the TCTF.

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

The state would be without a centralized resource for courts and counties to consult regarding questions

Project/Program Title: Enhanced Collections (support)

Section 1

Section 2
1)

Monetary Benefit	Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No				Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				
	Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Tehama	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Trinity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Tulare	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Tuolumne	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Ventura	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Yolo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Yuba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other/Non-court ²⁾				-					-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
56	Enhanced Collections	625,000						625,000

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
56	Enhanced Collections	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	3,125,000

Information Technology Services Office

Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System
Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$6,463,000, \$869,137 increase from FY 2013–2014.

Description

The proposed allocation increase in FY 2014–2015 compared to last fiscal year is due to an increase in infrastructure and CCTC costs in order to replace aging equipment. In addition, one time cost savings used in FY 2013–2014, which were achieved through earlier infrastructure and CCTC cost reductions, are not available in FY 2014–2015.

Starting in 2006, the civil, small claims, probate and mental health interim case management system (V3) was deployed in six superior courts (Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura). Five of the six courts rely on this production application for daily case management processing. As of June 2012, the Los Angeles Superior Court no longer enters new transactions into the V3 Court, using V3 for inquiry purposes only. The V3 case management system (CMS) was developed by a software development vendor, Deloitte Consulting, LLP. In July 2011, support for V3 was transitioned from Deloitte to the Information Services Technology Office at the AOC. Projected savings are \$5.7 million dollars through FY 2013-14.

The projected budget for FY 2014-15 will support the following:

- Hardware and software maintenance.
- Infrastructure support and hosting services for all environments: development, test, training, staging and production.
- Software product support including ongoing technical support to the California Courts
- Technology Center (CCTC) and locally hosted courts.
- User support.
- Product releases including court enhancement requests, judicial branch requirements, and bi- annual legislative changes.
- Future product enhancements as directed by the Court Technology Committee.

Purpose

The civil, small claims, probate and mental health interim case management system (V3) processes 25 percent of all civil cases statewide. V3 functionality enables the courts to process and administer their civil caseloads, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, work queue, payment and financial processing. All V3 courts are now using the latest version of the V3 application. This model allows for a single deployment and common version of the software, avoiding the cost of three separate installations.

E-filing has been successfully deployed at the Orange County and San Diego courts, saving time and resources. Sacramento Superior Court has also deployed e- filing for their Employment Development Department cases. Sacramento and Ventura integrate V3 with public kiosks. E-filing and public kiosks are recognized as providing public and justice partners with increased ease of use and efficiencies.

The V3 team has the ability to control product development and functionality to meet ongoing changes requested by the courts, legislature, public and justice partners that may not be available in a vendor controlled, off the shelf product.

Criminal and Traffic (V2) Case Management System

Proposed FY 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,158,000, \$1,998,784 decrease from FY 2013–2014.

Description

Savings and technology efficiency initiatives reduced estimated costs for FY 2014–2015 by \$1,998,784 from the FY 2013–2014 allocation. These savings were achieved through infrastructure cost reductions, consolidating processing onto fewer servers, and will be aimed at reducing FY 2014–2015 infrastructure costs. In addition, the Fresno Superior Court initiated a project in January 2014 to convert their criminal and traffic case types from CMS V2 to Tyler Odyssey. The project is targeted to be complete in April 2015, with CMS V2 decommissioned by August 2015. Costs are therefore ramping down in FY 2014–2015.

V2 is a case management system for criminal and traffic cases, deployed in 2006 and currently operating in Fresno Superior Court. Maintenance and support was successfully transitioned from Deloitte Consulting, LLP to the Information Services Technology Office at the AOC in September 2009. The project broke even in June 2010. Fresno Superior Court is satisfied with the system performance and is supportive of the ITSO maintenance and support team.

During FY 2014–2015, V2 maintenance and operations projected budget will support:

- Support for data conversion to Tyler Odyssey
- Hardware and software maintenance.
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC).
- Day to day operational application support and service requests.
- Product releases to address judicial branch requirements, including biannual legislative changes if necessary.

Purpose

V2 enables the Fresno Superior Court to process and administer its criminal and traffic caseload, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, payment, and financial processing. The daily fund distribution report generated by V2 calculates distributions for monies collected from fees and fines, an operation that was previously done manually. With the courtroom functionality, a defendant is able to walk out of a hearing and immediately receive a transcript of the hearing, including any actions or instructions delivered at the hearing. Justice Partners such as the District Attorney’s office have inquiry access from their offices to authorized case information.

Automated interfaces to justice partner systems include: 1) Department of Motor Vehicles for updates and inquiries on traffic violations; 2) Web Pay for online payment of bail, fines, and fees; and 3) the Fresno County Sheriff’s Office for warrants issued or revoked. The public is able to view authorized case information on V2 at kiosks. For example, a case participant is able to view the location and time of their hearing using a kiosk.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,689,000, \$35,000 increase from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

Courts reimburse the ITSO via the annual Schedule C process, where courts confirm help desk users and other agreed upon technical charges. Once CCTC charges are confirmed by the courts, they are then “billed” by the AOC’s Budget Office through reduced monthly allocations.

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

The ITSO administers and coordinates all vendor services and payments centrally, eliminating the need for courts to contract separately with vendors or pay vendors directly. The courts reimburse the ITSO for a small portion of the total CCTC program charges, with remaining costs paid by the CCTC program. With the exception of courts deciding to add or remove various CCTC services, Schedule C charges have remained relatively stable since the inception of the annual Schedule C process in FY 2005-06.

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

In alignment with Judicial Council directives to affirm development and implementation of statewide technology initiatives, the CCTC program provides a Judicial Branch Technology Center for use by all courts.

Funding is utilized for maintaining core services and court requested services. Services include: operational support; data network management, desktop computing and local server support; tape back-up and recovery; help desk services; email services; and a dedicated service delivery manager. These services allow the courts to rely on the skills and expertise of the maintenance and support within the CCTC to remediate defects, implement legislative updates, configure and install software and hardware upgrades, and address other minor and critical issues.

4. Effectiveness of project/program

This program supports Judicial Council objectives to allow the courts to take advantage of operational efficiencies and cost effective services, eliminating redundant expenditures, and providing a coordinated approach to addressing statewide technology initiatives.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

\$1,654,000

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

FY 14/15 - \$1,689,325

FY 15/16 - \$1,689,325

FY 16/17 - \$1,689,325

FY 17/18 - \$1,689,325

FY 18/19 – \$1,689,325*

* The amount listed for FY 2018-19 is the same amount listed for FY 2017-18. Budget data will be updated after ITSO completes its next annual zero based budget process.

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

N/A – costs are currently TCTF

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

These funds cannot be eliminated since this is funding that is being reimbursed to ITSO for current CCTC services. The program would be unable to pay the invoices from the vendor as contractually obligated. AOC would be required to evaluate, prioritize, and decommission services in order to reduce costs accordingly.

9. Other

The administration of Schedule Cs with the courts is a laborious task and takes months to validate individual charges, confirm them with court personnel, and process allocation reductions. There may be consideration of moving a baseline level of funding to IMF and then only charge courts for added services beyond the baseline. This would simplify the process significantly.

Project/Program Title: CCTC (Schedule C)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Alameda								
Alpine								
Amador								
Butte								
Calaveras								
Colusa								
Contra Costa								
Del Norte								
El Dorado								
Fresno								
Glenn								
Humboldt								
Imperial								
Inyo								
Kern								
Kings								
Lake								
Lassen								
Los Angeles								
Madera								
Marin								

Project/Program Title: CCTC (Schedule C)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ^D			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Mariposa								
Mendocino								
Merced								
Modoc								
Mono								
Monterey								
Napa								
Nevada								
Orange								
Placer								
Plumas								
Riverside								
Sacramento								
San Benito								
San Bernardino								
San Diego								
San Francisco								
San Joaquin								
San Luis Obispo								
San Mateo								
Santa Barbara								
Santa Clara								
Santa Cruz								
Shasta								
Sierra								
Siskiyou								
Solano								
Sonoma								
Stanislaus								

Project/Program Title: CCTC (Schedule C)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Sutter								
Tehama								
Trinity								
Tulare								
Tuolumne								
Ventura								
Yolo								
Yuba								
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other/Non-court ²⁾				-				-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
13	California Courts Technology Center (Schedule C)	-	1,654,000	-	-	-	-	1,654,000

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
13	California Courts Technology Center (Schedule C)	1,689,325	1,689,325	1,689,325	1,689,325	1,689,325	8,446,625

Interim Case Management System

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,028,000, no change from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

Courts reimburse the ITSO via the annual Schedule C process, where courts confirm Interim Case Management System (ICMS) charges. Once ICMS charges are confirmed by the courts, they are then “billed” by the AOC’s Budget Office through reduced monthly allocations.

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

The ICMS unit provides program support to trial courts with case management systems hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). Currently, there are ten courts with the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) CMS hosted at the CCTC. The support for the CCTC-hosted courts include project management and technical expertise for maintenance and operations activities, such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, disaster recovery services, CCTC infrastructure upgrades, and patch management..

The CCTC hosted SJE courts benefit from a shared hosting environment which provides services such as disaster recovery, system redundancy, layered security architecture, help desk and centralized production support resources. The ITSO administers and coordinates all vendor services and payments centrally, eliminating the need for courts to contract separately with vendors or pay vendors directly to locally host SJE..

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

No

4. Effectiveness of project/program

These funds help pay for the SJE hosting costs at the CCTC and provides the trial courts with a secure environment that has a common architecture which streamlines system maintenance. The CCTC architecture has provides a stable environment for the trial courts with minimal system outages, disaster recovery services, failover redundancy and centralized security.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

There is a projected \$1,027,600 in reimbursements from the courts on Sustain.

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

FY 14/15 - \$1,027,615

FY 15/16 - \$1,027,615

FY 16/17 - \$1,027,615

FY 17/18 - \$1,027,615

FY 18/19 – \$1,027,615*

* The amount listed for FY 2018-19 is the same amount listed for FY 2017-18. Budget data will be updated after ITSO completes its next annual zero based budget process.

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

N/A – costs are currently TCTF

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

The program would be unable to pay the cost of hosting SJE at the CCTC. If this funding was

Attachment D

unavailable, there would not be enough funding to continue hosting SJE at the CCTC and its unlikely that the CCTC hosted courts would have the funding and resources to be able to host SJE locally..

9. Other

The administration of Schedule Cs with the courts is a laborious task and takes months to validate individual charges, confirm them with court personnel, and process allocation reductions. There may be consideration of moving a baseline level of funding to IMF and then only charge courts for added services beyond the baseline. This would simplify the process significantly.

Project/Program Title: ICMS (Schedule C)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Alameda	-	-	-					
Alpine	-	-	-					
Amador	-	-	-					
Butte	-	-	-					
Calaveras	-	-	-					
Colusa	-	-	-					
Contra Costa								
Del Norte								
El Dorado								
Fresno								
Glenn								
Humboldt								
Imperial								
Inyo								
Kern								
Kings								
Lake								
Lassen								
Los Angeles								
Madera								

Project/Program Title: ICMS (Schedule C)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ^D			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Marin								
Mariposa								
Mendocino								
Merced								
Modoc								
Mono								
Monterey								
Napa								
Nevada								
Orange								
Placer								
Plumas								
Riverside								
Sacramento								
San Benito								
San Bernardino								
San Diego	-	-	-					
San Francisco	-	-	-					
San Joaquin	-	-	-					
San Luis Obispo	-	-	-					
San Mateo	-	-	-					
Santa Barbara	-	-	-					
Santa Clara	-	-	-					
Santa Cruz	-	-	-					
Shasta	-	-	-					

Project/Program Title: ICMS (Schedule C)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list				Click the cell and pick a type of benefit from drop-down list			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Sierra	-	-	-					
Siskiyou	-	-	-					
Solano	-	-	-					
Sonoma	-	-	-					
Stanislaus	-	-	-					
Sutter	-	-	-					
Tehama	-	-	-					
Trinity								
Tulare	-	-	-					
Tuolumne	-	-	-					
Ventura	-	-	-					
Yolo	-	-	-					
Yuba	-	-	-					
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other/Non-court ²⁾				-				-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Attachment D

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
14	Interim Case Management System (Schedule C)		1,027,600					1,027,600

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
14	Interim Case Management System (Schedule C)	1,027,615	1,027,615	1,027,615	1,027,615	1,027,615	5,138,075

Trial Court Administrative Services Office

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$1,349,000, \$42,000 increase from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

1. Direct actual or estimated monetary benefit to each trial court

Prior to fiscal year 2012–2013, the Phoenix Shared Services Program has been primarily funded through trial court reimbursements specific to the costs associated with the services provided by the Phoenix Shared Services Center as provided in Gov. Code section 68085(a). Template B reflects that there is a monetary benefit to the courts for fiscal years 2010–2011 (column C) and 2011–2012 (column D), but that the specific amount of savings realized by each cannot be identified.

For both fiscal years 2012–2013 and 2013–2014, the Judicial Council approved funding from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for staff support costs related to the program’s financial component. These payments made from the IMF on behalf of the courts are reflected in columns J and K by court.

- a. All courts are eligible to benefit from the Phoenix Program. Currently, 58 courts have implemented the Phoenix Financial Services component of the program and 8 courts have implemented the Phoenix Human Resources (HR)/Payroll Services component.
- b. The Phoenix HR/Payroll Services component of the program has not been implemented statewide due to a lack of resources. Deployments were suspended in May 2010 after the downturn of the state’s economy. System deployment remains an option for courts in need of payroll services pending additional resources.
- c. Allocation methodology: Phoenix Financial Services charges remained steady since 2006. Costs were first recalculated for fiscal year 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 using up-to-date information that also included the Los Angeles Superior Court in the formula. In 2002, a lengthy workload study was conducted to discern what it would cost to establish and maintain the Phoenix Shared Services Center. This cost has not increased over the years due to greater economies of scale, improvements in system automation, and enhanced staff knowledge, skills, and abilities. The charges are divided among the courts based on court authorized positions. The courts have benefited from the Judicial Council’s decision to fund these costs directly from the IMF for prior and current year, eliminating the need for any associated reduction to their allocations. Costs for the Phoenix HR/Payroll Services component of the program are calculated based on the same methodology, but these costs continue to be reimbursed solely by the 8 courts on the HR system.

2. Other indicator of benefit to each trial court

- The Phoenix Financial System enables the courts to produce a standardized set of monthly, quarterly, and annual financial statements that comply with existing statutes, rules, and regulations, prepared in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).
- The program provides professional accounting and business services for the 58 courts using the Phoenix Financial System, and also provides continued fiscal and internal audit support.
- The immediate access to data on the Phoenix Financial System enables the courts to make informed business decisions and improve their day-to-day operations.
- The Phoenix Human Resources System provides a comprehensive information system infrastructure that supports the trial courts' human resources management and payroll needs.
- The Phoenix Human Resources System offers new, standardized technology for human resources administration and payroll processing, provides consistent reporting, ensures compliance with state and federal labor laws, collects data at the source, provides central processing, and provides manager and employee self-service functions to the courts.
- The Phoenix Financial System and the Phoenix Human Resources System are integrated to provide end users with a coordinated system that allows seamless interaction between the input and retrieval of financial information and support for human resources.

3. Is the project/program mandatory?

Yes. The Phoenix Program was established in response to the Judicial Council's directive for statewide fiscal accountability and human resources support as part of the council's strategic plan. Goal IV: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence states that the judicial branch will 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. This goal was the direct result of the passage of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997.

4. Effectiveness of project/program

The Judicial Council has sought to establish an administrative infrastructure at the state and local levels to provide appropriate accountability for the legally compliant, effective, and efficient use of resources; to provide the necessary information to support policymaking responsibilities; and consistently and reliably provide the administrative tools to support day-to-day operations.

The Phoenix Program supports this goal effectively by implementing a system that provides for uniform processes and standardized accounting and reporting, and provides human capital management and payroll services to the courts in a cost-effective and efficient manner.

Beyond the typical day-to-day workload of paying invoices, processing jury checks, processing payroll, procuring goods and services, and managing trust and treasury on behalf of the courts, the Shared Services Center workload is also generated by unforeseen changes. Such changes include changes in:

- (1) Tax laws, such as the Obama health care plan;
- (2) Legislation, such as the Judicial Branch Contract law;
- (3) Accounting best practices, such as GASB 54;
- (4) Collective bargaining agreements;
- (5) Benefit plans which occur naturally and typically each year; and
- (6) Court specific projects, such as reorganizations.

A portion of the workload is cyclical, but other activities and/or requests for services from the courts happen on an ad hoc basis.

5. Total FY 2013-2014 funding for the project/program

- a) Allocations have not yet been finalized for local assistance. At this time, the Phoenix Program anticipates a budget of \$18,221,790 for fiscal year 2013-2014.

General Fund	\$4,980,505
IMF	\$11,934,285
<u>TCTF</u>	<u>\$1,307,000</u>
Total	\$18,221,790

- b) A total of 65% of the General Fund is used for staff support. The remaining 35% funds the SAP license and maintenance contract. The 8 courts on the Phoenix HR System collectively share the TCTF \$1.3 million total via reimbursements.

6. 5-year projection of funding needs or costs

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Phoenix Total	\$ 19,386,137	\$ 19,128,036	\$ 19,144,304	\$ 19,247,197	\$ 19,276,095

Should be \$13,649,723 for each year,

Assumptions:

- a. Program costs remain relatively stable over the course of 5 years.
- b. Assumes no changes in staffing (other than MSAs and benefit adjustments).
- c. Assumes no new Phoenix HR System deployments that cannot be absorbed within existing resources.
- d. Assumes CCTC and SAIC charges remain static.
- e. Assumes all necessary licenses and software updates have been included.

7. What costs can and/or should be shifted from IMF to TCTF?

Negotiations between the AOC and the courts regarding the Phoenix Program resulted in a 2005 agreement that:

(1) The AOC would fund:

- AOC staffing for indirect services
- Licensing
- Hardware and software maintenance
- California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) overhead
- CTCC disaster recovery costs
- Development and deployment costs
- Upgrades
- Outside legal assistance
- End-user training (for AOC-sponsored statewide initiatives)

(2) The courts would fund:

- AOC staffing to provide court specific services
- Court-specific CTCC costs
- AOC provision of court-specific jury check services (Note - this service is now provided by the AOC at no cost to the courts)
- Direct court-specific collection services
- Application support, on-site infrastructure services, staging and production, and Citrix license
- Court-specific professional services associated with using the ISB for conversion services

The Phoenix Program's Shared Services Center provides the courts with direct financial and human resources services. The staff of the Shared Services Center was fully funded by the courts per the 2005 agreement; however, in fiscal year 2012-13 and 2013-14, the Judicial Council approved the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's recommendation to allocate one-time funding from the IMF for staff support costs related to the financial component of Phoenix Shared Services that had been paid for by courts in previous years according to council policy. As a result, the courts did not see a reduction in their monthly distributions related to those costs.

At this time, there are no IMF expenditures that can be shifted to the TCTF without revisiting the 2005 agreement currently in place.

8. Impact of eliminating TCTF and IMF funding for the project/program

To fulfill part of the funding need, the AOC sought recovery costs from the trial courts for administrative and information technology services through Memorandums of Understanding. In addition, Government Code Section 68085(a) authorizes the direct payment or reimbursement, or both, of actual costs from the Trial Court Trust Fund or the Trial Court Improvement Fund to fund administrative infrastructure within the AOC for legal services, financial services, HR services, information services, and support services for the courts. As courts transitioned from historically provided county services, the proceeds from Government Code 68085(a) in conjunction with the

recovery of costs, along with any offsets of existing charges for county-provided services from the trial courts supported the critically important administrative services. This combination of funding continues to date.

- (1) The TCTF and IMF constitute 73% of the Phoenix Program’s funding for both staffing and local assistance. Eliminating these funds without an alternate source as replacement would immediately halt the program. The impact to the courts would be that all 58 would be left without an accounting system, without treasury and trust services or jury check services, and without procurement assistance. For the 8 courts currently on the Phoenix HR System, these courts would find themselves without the means to generate staff payroll, or generate associated tax filings, benefit and related documents.

- (2) If IMF and TCTF funding were eliminated, courts would have to incur the costs of acquiring a financial system and, for the 8 HR courts, a payroll system. Costs would be higher if the Phoenix Program were to be defunded.

Because all 58 courts share the expense of the current AOC system, costs are maintained below private sector alternatives. Past comparisons have persuaded courts to select the AOC’s financial solution over alternatives they researched, including remaining with their county where that remained an option. Recent research also found that while companies like ADP could provide payroll services, they could not offer the courts financial human resources support necessary for successful day-to-day processes, and could not offer the benefit of a fully integrated system.

9. Other

N/A

Project/Program Title: Phoenix Program (IMF Only)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No				Payment on behalf of the court - \$ Amount			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Alameda	Yes	Yes					381,129	281,861
Alpine	Yes	Yes					3,797	1,425
Amador	Yes	Yes					18,473	11,972
Butte	Yes	Yes					68,305	41,497
Calaveras	Yes	Yes					15,079	10,330
Colusa	Yes	Yes					8,306	6,233
Contra Costa	Yes	Yes					208,602	109,031
Del Norte	Yes	Yes					16,375	

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Phoenix Program (IMF Only)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No				Payment on behalf of the court - \$ Amount			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
								11,131
El Dorado	Yes	Yes					46,894	35,085
Fresno	Yes	Yes					258,771	157,242
Glenn	Yes	Yes					12,341	8,192
Humboldt	Yes	Yes					46,396	33,571
Imperial	Yes	Yes					59,035	46,298
Inyo	Yes	Yes					10,917	7,865
Kern	Yes	Yes					239,691	164,206
Kings	Yes	Yes					43,239	30,490
Lake	Yes	Yes					21,264	10,543
Lassen	Yes	Yes					12,958	11,309
Los Angeles	Yes	Yes					0	1,733,245
Madera	Yes	Yes					44,260	38,113
Marin	Yes	Yes					86,669	45,059
Mariposa	Yes	Yes					7,594	4,915
Mendocino	Yes	Yes					41,483	21,158
Merced	Yes	Yes					58,024	44,328
Modoc	Yes	Yes					5,696	4,631
Mono	Yes	Yes					9,137	6,262
Monterey	Yes	Yes					110,970	66,324

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Phoenix Program (IMF Only)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No				Payment on behalf of the court - \$ Amount			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Napa	Yes	Yes					46,467	25,682
Nevada	Yes	Yes					36,215	20,602
Orange	Yes	Yes					710,790	544,191
Placer	Yes	Yes					71,789	38,968
Plumas	Yes	Yes					9,374	4,631
Riverside	Yes	Yes					388,511	400,167
Sacramento	Yes	Yes					342,002	248,279
San Benito	Yes	Yes					14,951	9,510
San Bernardino	Yes	Yes					396,411	325,591
San Diego	Yes	Yes					708,995	448,606
San Francisco	Yes	Yes					244,616	167,942
San Joaquin	Yes	Yes					153,426	95,307
San Luis Obispo	Yes	Yes					79,905	50,847
San Mateo	Yes	Yes					196,974	95,549
Santa Barbara	Yes	Yes					144,066	109,505
Santa Clara	Yes	Yes					361,206	284,999
Santa Cruz	Yes	Yes					79,065	44,418
Shasta	Yes	Yes					83,299	69,102
Sierra	Yes	Yes					4,438	2,137
Siskiyou	Yes	Yes					27,529	15,316

Attachment D

Project/Program Title: Phoenix Program (IMF Only)

Monetary Benefit	Section 1				Section 2 ¹⁾			
	Benefit to court, but specific amount can't be identified - Yes/No				Payment on behalf of the court - \$ Amount			
Court	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Solano	Yes	Yes					124,592	75,371
Sonoma	Yes	Yes					110,519	71,549
Stanislaus	Yes	Yes					113,129	74,658
Sutter	Yes	Yes					30,614	17,382
Tehama	Yes	Yes					23,888	14,191
Trinity	Yes	Yes					8,472	6,205
Tulare	Yes	Yes					124,829	99,378
Tuolumne	Yes	Yes					23,020	17,008
Ventura	Yes	Yes					194,055	128,319
Yolo	Yes	Yes					54,298	33,839
Yuba	Yes	Yes					26,342	18,433
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,769,192	6,500,000
Other/Non-court ²⁾	7,804,930	6,426,698					5,316,853	3,638,447
Total	7,804,930	6,426,698	-	-	-	-	12,086,045	10,138,447

Note:

¹⁾ If a project/program has multiple benefits (e.g., distribution and direct payment) to courts, use this section. Cut-and-paste this section if more are needed.

²⁾ If monetary benefits can't be identified by court, please provide the total amount (e.g., costs for consultant, vendor, contractor, settlement, etc.) from the allocation for this project/program that benefits to the courts

Total FY 2013-2014 Funding by Source

Line #	Project/Program Title	IMF	TCTF	GF	GRANT	COURT	OTHER	TOTAL
79	Phoenix Program	11,934,285	1,307,000	4,980,505				18,221,790

Five Year Project and Program Funding Needs/Costs

Line #	Project/Program Title	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Total
79	Phoenix Program	19,386,137	19,128,036	19,144,304	19,247,197	19,276,095	96,181,769

Should be \$13,649,723 for each year,

Description of Program 45.10 Programs Proposed to the TCBAC
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee by the AOC for FY 2014–2015

Table of Contents

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts.....56
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel56
Self-Help Centers57
Court Operations Special Services Office58
Screening Equipment Replacement.....58
Fiscal Services Office.....60
Jury.....60
Elder Abuse60

JUDICIAL AND COURT OPERATIONS SERVICES DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$ 103,725,445, no change from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

Description:

For 2013–2014, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommended and the council approved that the program’s \$103.725 million annual allocation be maintained at the most recent base level for court-appointed counsel in juvenile dependency proceedings. The council allocated one-time augmentations of \$7.1 million in 2010–2011 and \$3.5 million in 2011–2012 to reimburse court expenses in excess of the base level. Total 2013–2014 reimbursements are estimated to be about \$103.7 million. A statewide increase in juvenile dependency filings has increased the demand for dependency representation.

This allocation funds court-appointed dependency counsel, who represent approximately 125,000 parent and child clients in the state. Representation begins at the initial filing of a petition to remove a child from the home, and extends—sometimes for many years—through the processes of reunification, termination of parental rights, adoption, or emancipation of the child.

In juvenile dependency proceedings, the trial court is required by law to appoint counsel for a parent or guardian if the parent desires counsel but is financially unable to afford counsel and the

agency has recommended that the child be placed in out-of-home care; and to appoint counsel for a child unless the court finds that the child would not benefit from the appointment of counsel (W&I § 317, CRC 5.660, etc.).

For the twenty courts in the Dependency Representation Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program, the AOC, in partnership with local court leadership, directly manages contracts with dependency attorney organizations, including solicitations, negotiation, financial management, invoicing and payment, statistical reporting, training, and other technical assistance. The twenty DRAFT courts account for approximately 60 percent of juvenile dependency filings statewide. The remaining courts receive a base allocation for dependency counsel at the beginning of the year, manage their own dependency counsel contracts, and are reimbursed through the monthly TCTF distribution process for up to 100 percent of their budget. In the past two years, some courts not in the DRAFT program have begun to adopt aspects of the DRAFT model, particularly by negotiating deliverables-based rather than time-based contracts. Use of this model is allowing courts to lower costs spent on court-appointed counsel without reducing the level of service to the courts, parents, and children.

Training and performance standards for dependency attorneys are laid down in California Rules of Court, rule 5.660. Adequately funding effective counsel for parents and children has resulted in numerous benefits both for the courts and for children in foster care. Effective counsel can ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays and improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge. Unnecessary delays also result in children spending long periods of time in foster care, a situation that has improved greatly in the past few years through the courts' focus on effective representation and adherence to statutory timelines.

Self-Help Centers

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$2,500,000, no change from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

Description:

For 2013–2014, the TCBAC recommended and the council approved that the program's \$2.5 million annual allocation be maintained at the \$2.5 million level for distribution to all 58 trial courts for self-help centers. The estimated 2013–2014 total distribution to courts is \$2.5 million.

Funding for self-help centers comes from both the TCTF (\$6.2 million, of which \$3.7 million is in courts' base allocation) and the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (STCIMF) (\$5 million). When combining the two fund sources, the minimum allocation for any court is \$34,000, with the remainder distributed according to population size in the county where the trial court is located.

Self-help centers, which provide assistance to self-represented litigants in a wide array of civil law matters to save the courts significant time and expense in the clerk's office and in the courtroom, serve over 450,000 persons per year. Self-help staffing reduces the number of questions and issues at the public counter substantially, thereby reducing line lengths and wait times. Similarly, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and clean-up work in the clerk's office.

Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and carries measurable short and long-term cost benefits to the court. One study found that self-help centers workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent.

Demand for self-help services is strong and growing. Courts, struggling with budget reductions, indicate that they are not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need of \$44 million in additional funds to fully support self-help.

The Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants, which was approved by the Judicial Council in 2004, calls for self-help centers in all counties. California Rule of Court 10.960 provides that self-help services are a core function of courts and should be budgeted for accordingly. The Budget Act provides that “up to \$5,000,000 [from the Trial Court Modernization and Improvement Fund] shall be available for support of services for self-represented litigants.” Based upon recommendations by the TCBCAC, the Judicial Council has allocated an additional \$6,200,000 for self-help services from the Trial Court Trust Fund since 2007.

Court Operations Special Services Office

Screening Equipment Replacement

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$2,286,000, no change from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

Description:

In 2013–2014, the TCBCAC recommended and the Judicial Council approved the program’s \$2.286 million annual allocation. Actual expenditures are estimated at that level at year end. The estimated 2014–2015 expenditures are \$2.286 million. The estimated cost for equipment replacement is \$1,780,800 and service agreement renewal is \$555,800.

The Screening Equipment Replacement Program is a reimbursement program that replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers in the trial courts. The equipment is replaced on an eight-year cycle and is the property of the court. Funds are allocated to courts for replacement based on the age and condition of the equipment.

Master Agreements which include pricing for the equipment, installation, training and maintenance, as well as removal of the old x-ray units are used for program purchases. The purchase price includes 5 years of service. Program funds are used to purchase service agreements to cover the remainder of the 8-year replacement cycle.

The estimated cost for equipment replacement and service agreement extensions for all courts due for them in 2014–2015 exceed the budget. The reasons for this fact include:

- The budget has remained at \$2.286 million since the program began in 2006, while the cost of equipment and service agreements has increased. This includes the added cost of removing decommissioned x-ray units.
- The initial replacement cycle was estimated at 5 years, but was increased to 8 as the cost of equipment increased and experience proved that the equipment had a longer lifecycle than initially anticipated, resulting in the need to cover the costs of service agreements for the balance of the life of the equipment.

To stay within budget, the Office of Security will take the following actions:

- Identify equipment with service agreements due to expire within 2 months of the end of 2014–2015 that is due for replacement in 2015–2016. Rather than extend those service agreements for 2014–2015, they will be allowed to expire and it will be recommended that the equipment be replaced early in 2015–2016.
- Develop a process that will allow funds to be advanced for a portion of the purchase. This is a solution to the potential cash flow issues for some courts resulting from the reduction in fund balances courts will be permitted to retain.
- Inform courts that we will not be able to replace equipment if they have newer equipment in storage due to facility closures.

Without this program, the courts will be responsible for the purchase and maintenance of the screening equipment. The cost of an x-ray unit with a five-year service agreement is approximately \$36,000. The cost of a magnetometer with a five-year service agreement is approximately \$5,600. Reimbursing the costs of screening equipment is particularly critical to the smaller courts, where equipment and service agreements can represent a significant expenditure relative to their overall operations budget. However, the need in large courts should not be minimized. The cost of a single year's equipment replacement and service agreement renewal costs in a large court can result in the expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars. For example, in 2010–2011, the Los Angeles Superior Court was reimbursed by the program for \$718,000 in equipment and service agreements and \$694,000 in 2011–2012.

The program also offers a service to the court staff responsible for the equipment. The Office of Security staff member who manages the program also acts as a liaison to the courts and assists in resolving issues with the vendors and the AOC Customer Service Center and acts as a subject matter expert on radiation and code compliance associated with the x-ray equipment. If a court chooses to purchase equipment or service that is not covered by the Master Agreements, the court is required to go out to bid. That process represents a direct cost to the court in staff time and in the overall cost of the purchase, as well as inconsistency in response to service calls at court expense.

JUDICIAL AND COURT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

Fiscal Services Office

Jury

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$16,000,000, no change from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

Description:

For 2013–2014, the TCBAC recommended and the council approved that the program’s annual allocation be \$16 million. The eligible juror costs for the past ten years through 2012–2013 have averaged \$15.7 million. The latest five year average is \$15.8 million and the latest three year average is \$15.0 million. The reimbursement for 2012–2013 was \$14.7 million. The 2013–2014 reimbursement is estimated to be \$14.0 million.

The purpose of the jury funding is to reimburse courts for 100 percent of their eligible jury expenditures, which includes the following types of jury costs in criminal cases and non-reimbursed civil cases:

- Jury per diem (\$15 per day after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Mileage (\$0.34 per mile one-way only, after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Meals and lodging for sequestered jurors
- Public transportation (criminal cases only, one-way only).

Elder Abuse

Proposed 2014–2015 Allocation – \$332,000, no change from FY 2013–2014 Allocation

Description:

For 2013–2014, the TCBAC recommended and the council approved that the program’s \$332,340 allocation be retained at the 2012–2013 level and that the courts be reimbursed quarterly, even though this allocation level would likely result in courts being reimbursed at about 45 percent of eligible reimbursements. Through the third quarter in 2013–2014, eligible reimbursements total \$482,480.

AB 59 (Stats. 1999, ch. 561) authorized elders and dependent adults to seek protective orders. As specified by this bill, the council approved form EA-100—Petition for Protective Orders (Elder or Dependent Adult Abuse)—effective April 2000. At its April 27, 2001 meeting, the council approved the allocation of these funds to the courts by the end of that fiscal year. The reimbursement rate for each filing was set at \$185. It appears the rate was set at the level of the lowest first paper filing fee in limited civil cases, and was not intended to cover the actual cost to a court of processing an order. Since 2001–2002, courts that seek reimbursement are required to report quarterly to the AOC the number of EA-100 forms filed.

Table 1 -- Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Allocation Savings and Shortfalls, 2001–2002 to 2013–2014

Fiscal Year	EA-100 Filings Reported by Courts	Eligible Reimbursement Amount Based on Filings (\$185 per filing)	Available Funding	Reverted Savings*/ (Funding Shortfalls)
2001–2002	1,073	\$ 198,505	\$ 1,175,000	\$ 976,495
2002–2003	1,110	205,350	1,175,000	969,650
2003–2004	1,198	221,630	1,175,000	953,370
2004–2005	1,515	280,275	1,175,000	894,725
2005–2006	1,704	315,240	300,000	(15,240)
2006–2007	1,813	335,405	350,000	14,595
2007–2008	1,761	325,785	368,340	42,555
2008–2009	1,832	338,920	368,340	29,420
2009–2010	2,033	376,105	368,340	(7,765)
2010–2011	2,511	464,535	356,340	(108,195)
2011–2012	2,751	508,935	332,465	(176,470)
2012–2013	3,128	578,680	332,340	(246,340)
2013-2014**	2,608	482,480	332,340	(150,140)

* The savings from 2001–2002 to 2004–2005 were reverted back to the state General Fund.

** As of third quarter of current fiscal year.

Allocations based on Population (PRCS+Parole) + Workload (Petitions for PRCS+Parole)

Court ¹	A. Population (PRCS ² +Parole ³)	B. % of Statewide PRCS+Parole Population	C. Workload (Petitions to revoke/modify PRCS+Petitions to revoke/modify Parole) ⁴	D. % of Statewide PRCS+Parole Workload	E. 50% of Statewide Population (PRCS+Parole) + 50% of Workload (Petitions for PRCS+Parole)	F. Proposed Initial 2014-2015 Allocation
Alameda	2,162	3.04%	1,311	3.52%	3.28%	\$ 151,377
Alpine*	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 97
Amador	33	0.05%	15	0.04%	0.04%	\$ 2,000
Butte	654	0.92%	263	0.71%	0.81%	\$ 37,520
Calaveras	52	0.07%	16	0.04%	0.06%	\$ 2,679
Colusa	16	0.02%	14	0.04%	0.03%	\$ 1,386
Contra Costa	941	1.32%	271	0.73%	1.03%	\$ 47,333
Del Norte	74	0.10%	35	0.09%	0.10%	\$ 4,570
El Dorado	211	0.30%	140	0.38%	0.34%	\$ 15,520
Fresno	2,865	4.03%	996	2.67%	3.35%	\$ 154,695
Glenn	38	0.05%	21	0.06%	0.05%	\$ 2,534
Humboldt	330	0.46%	150	0.40%	0.43%	\$ 20,003
Imperial	186	0.26%	101	0.27%	0.27%	\$ 12,293
Inyo	9	0.01%	10	0.03%	0.02%	\$ 911
Kern	3,071	4.32%	1,433	3.85%	4.09%	\$ 188,444
Kings	574	0.81%	175	0.47%	0.64%	\$ 29,473
Lake	171	0.24%	41	0.11%	0.18%	\$ 8,091
Lassen	47	0.07%	36	0.10%	0.08%	\$ 3,755
Los Angeles	20,198	28.44%	15,832	42.52%	35.48%	\$ 1,636,166
Madera	380	0.54%	149	0.40%	0.47%	\$ 21,564
Marin	112	0.16%	41	0.11%	0.13%	\$ 6,175
Mariposa	14	0.02%	5	0.01%	0.02%	\$ 764
Mendocino*	194	0.27%	79	0.21%	0.24%	\$ 11,187
Merced	582	0.82%	298	0.80%	0.81%	\$ 37,349
Modoc*	12	0.02%	3	0.01%	0.01%	\$ 544
Mono	3	0.00%	5	0.01%	0.01%	\$ 407
Monterey	754	1.06%	178	0.48%	0.77%	\$ 35,503
Napa	131	0.18%	42	0.11%	0.15%	\$ 6,854
Nevada	67	0.09%	58	0.16%	0.13%	\$ 5,767
Orange	4,383	6.17%	1,775	4.77%	5.47%	\$ 252,219
Placer	319	0.45%	134	0.36%	0.40%	\$ 18,655
Plumas	21	0.03%	2	0.01%	0.02%	\$ 806
Riverside	4,404	6.20%	2,541	6.82%	6.51%	\$ 300,336
Sacramento	3,559	5.01%	967	2.60%	3.80%	\$ 175,431
San Benito*	71	0.10%	32	0.09%	0.09%	\$ 4,275
San Bernardino	5,635	7.93%	2,755	7.40%	7.67%	\$ 353,554
San Diego	4,690	6.60%	1,752	4.71%	5.65%	\$ 260,762
San Francisco	1,133	1.60%	562	1.51%	1.55%	\$ 71,587
San Joaquin	2,096	2.95%	661	1.78%	2.36%	\$ 108,983
San Luis Obispo	460	0.65%	205	0.55%	0.60%	\$ 27,629
San Mateo	702	0.99%	126	0.34%	0.66%	\$ 30,594
Santa Barbara	547	0.77%	185	0.50%	0.63%	\$ 29,215
Santa Clara	2,613	3.68%	1,000	2.69%	3.18%	\$ 146,761
Santa Cruz	230	0.32%	131	0.35%	0.34%	\$ 15,580
Shasta	557	0.78%	276	0.74%	0.76%	\$ 35,175
Sierra	4	0.01%	2	0.01%	0.01%	\$ 254
Siskiyou	98	0.14%	31	0.08%	0.11%	\$ 5,101
Solano	802	1.13%	475	1.28%	1.20%	\$ 55,453
Sonoma	579	0.82%	600	1.61%	1.21%	\$ 55,954
Stanislaus	1,411	1.99%	406	1.09%	1.54%	\$ 70,952
Sutter	172	0.24%	50	0.13%	0.19%	\$ 8,681
Tehama	230	0.32%	51	0.14%	0.23%	\$ 10,626
Trinity	21	0.03%	3	0.01%	0.02%	\$ 868
Tulare	1,044	1.47%	306	0.82%	1.15%	\$ 52,844
Tuolumne	62	0.09%	16	0.04%	0.07%	\$ 3,004
Ventura	747	1.05%	175	0.47%	0.76%	\$ 35,090
Yolo	281	0.40%	194	0.52%	0.46%	\$ 21,137
Yuba	264	0.37%	104	0.28%	0.33%	\$ 15,011
Statewide (Total)	71,019	100%	37,234	100%	100%	\$ 4,611,500

¹Courts marked with an asterisk (*) reported incomplete data. For these courts a proxy value was calculated using available data.

²PRCS population data from the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) as of 12/31/2013

³Parole population data from CDCR data as of 4/30/2014. Does not include 1,973 parolees with indeterminate/unknown county.

⁴PRCS and parole filings collected by the AOC-Criminal Justice Court Services Office from July 1, 2013 - March 31 2014.

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund - Fund Condition Statement

Line No.	Description	FY 2014-15			
		Judicial Council Approved Allocation (On 4/24/2014)	Countinuing \$20M Transfer from the IMF to the TCTF	R/E Subc. Recommended 11.7% Reduction	TCBAC Recommendation
		A	B	C	D
1	Beginning Balance	18,470,467	18,470,467	-	18,470,467
2	<i>Prior-Year Adjustments</i>				
3	Liquidation of Prior-Year Encumbrances and Adjustment for Revenue and Expenditure Accruals	-	-	-	-
4	Adjusted Beginning Balance	18,470,467	18,470,467	-	18,470,467
5	<i>Revenues</i>				
6	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	25,324,600	25,324,600	-	25,324,600
7	2% Automation Fund Revenue	14,845,200	14,845,200	-	14,845,200
8	Jury Instructions Royalties	445,400	445,400	-	445,400
9	Interest from SMIF	135,000	135,000	-	135,000
10	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	-	3,062	-	3,062
11	<i>Transfers</i>				
12	From State General Fund	38,709,000	38,709,000	-	38,709,000
13	To Trial Court Trust Fund	-	(20,000,000)	-	(20,000,000)
14	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	-	(13,397,000)
15	To TCTF (Improvement Fund AOC staff savings)	(594,000)	(594,000)	-	(594,000)
16	Net Revenue/Transfers	65,468,200	45,471,262	-	45,471,262
17	Total Resources	83,938,667	63,941,729	-	63,941,729
18	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocation				
19	Program and Project Expenditure/Encumbrance/Allocation	72,066,600	72,066,600	(8,287,765)	63,778,835
20	Less: V2 & V3 Costs Staying in TCTF	6,305,600	6,305,600	(6,305,600)	-
21	Less: Pro Rata	162,894	162,894	162,894	162,894
22	Total Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocation	78,535,094	78,535,094	(14,430,471)	63,941,729
23	Fund Balance	5,403,573	(14,593,365)		-
24	Fund Balance (as % of total allocation)	6.9%	-18.6%		0.0%
25	Net Revenue/Transfers Over/(Under) Expenditure	(13,066,894)	(33,063,832)		(18,470,467)

IMF Proposed Allocation for FY 2014-15

Line No.	Project and Program Title	FY 2014-15		
		JC Approved Allocation on 4/24/2014	% of Total Allocation	TCBAC Recommended 11.7% Reduction by Division ¹
		A	B	C
1	Judicial and Court Operations Services Division	8,432,600	10.76%	(986,614)
2	Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	100,000		
3	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	20,000		
4	Self-Help Center	5,000,000		
5	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	60,000		
6	CFCC Educational Programs	90,000		
7	CFCC Publications	20,000		
8	Total, Center for Families, Children and Courts	5,290,000		
9	Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	121,000		
10	B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA	180,000		
11	Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews	263,000		
12	Leadership Training - Judicial	55,000		
13	Judicial Institutes	150,000		
14	Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	34,000		
15	Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	9,000		
16	<i>Subtotal, Mandated, Essential/Other Education for Judicial Officers</i>	<i>812,000</i>		
17	Manager and Supervisor Training	34,000		
18	<i>Subtotal, Essential/Other Education for CEOs, Managers/Supervisors</i>	<i>34,000</i>		
19	Court Personnel Institutes	132,000		
20	Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	11,000		
21	<i>Subtotal, Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel</i>	<i>143,000</i>		
22	Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	249,000		
23	Faculty Development	28,000		
24	Curriculum Committee - Statewide Education Plan Development	1,000		
25	<i>Subtotal, Faculty and Curriculum Development</i>	<i>278,000</i>		
26	Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	137,000		
27	Distance Education - Online Video, Resources, Webinar	10,000		
28	<i>Subtotal, Distance Learning</i>	<i>147,000</i>		
29	Total, Office of Education / CJER	1,414,000		
30	Trial Court Security Grants	1,200,000		
31	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	13,000		
32	Court Access and Education	347,600		
33	Court Interpreter Program	168,000		
34	2015 Language Needs Study (every 5-year)	-		
35	California Language Access Plan (one-time funding in FY 2013-14)	-		
36	Total, Court Operations Special Services Office	1,728,600		
37	Judicial Council and Court Leadership Services Division	12,299,700	15.69%	(1,439,065)
38	Litigation Management Program	4,500,000		
39	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	966,600		
40	Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	17,100		
41	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	451,000		
42	Jury System Improvement Projects	19,000		
43	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	75,000		
44	Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,000		
45	Regional Office Assistance Group (Support)	1,460,000		
46	Total, Legal Services Office	11,489,700		
47	Audit Contract	150,000		
48	Internal Audit Services (Support)	660,000		

IMF Proposed Allocation for FY 2014-15

Line No.	Project and Program Title	FY 2014-15		
		JC Approved Allocation on 4/24/2014	% of Total Allocation	TCBAC Recommended 11.7% Reduction by Division ¹
		A	B	C
49	<i>Total, Internal Audit Services</i>	810,000		
50	Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division	57,639,900	73.55%	(5,862,086)
51	Contract for OPEB Valuation Report (every 2 years)	-		
52	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	50,000		
53	Treasury Services - Cash Management (Support)	238,000		
54	Trial Court Procurement (Support)	244,000		
55	Enhanced Collections (Support)	-		
56	<i>Total, Fiscal Services Office</i>	532,000		
57	Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	-		
58	Workers' Compensation Program Reserve	1,231,000		
59	Human Resources - Court Investigation	94,500		
60	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	34,700		
61	<i>Total, Human Resources Services Office</i>	1,360,200		
62	Telecommunications Support	11,705,000		
63	Judicial Branch Enterprise License and Policy	5,268,500		
64	Interim Case Management Systems	1,246,800		
65	Data Integration	3,903,600		
66	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	10,487,200		
67	Jury Management System	600,000		
68	CLETS Services/Integration	433,400		
69	CCPOR (ROM)	585,600		
70	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	624,300		
71	Uniform Civil Fees	343,000		
72	Justice Partner Outreach / E-Services	200,700		
73	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension (Starting from 2013-14)	133,700		
74	V2 CMS (new - non-reimbursed costs from TCTF)	647,500		
75	V3 CMS (new - non-reimbursed costs from TCTF)	5,658,100		
76	<i>Total, Information Technology Services Office</i>	41,837,400		
77	Phoenix Financial Services (Including Support)	13,885,300		
78	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force (New, starting 2013-14)	25,000		
79	<i>Total, Trial Court Administrative Services Office</i>	13,910,300		
80	Total	78,372,200	100.00%	(8,287,765)

Note:

1. At its meeting on 6/3/2014, the TCBAC approved a recommendation for an 11.7% reduction at the AOC division level to the JC approved allocation for FY 2014-15 in order to balance the IMF with assumptions: a) the funding for Workers' Compensation Reserve is exempted from the allocation reduction due to its cost is a liability to pay for the estimated costs of settling the tail claims with two counties; and b) the \$6.3 million V2 and V3 CMS program costs will not be transferred from the TCTF to the IMF.