



Superior Court of California County of Glenn BUDGET SNAPSHOT



Hon. Donald Cole Byrd, Presiding Judge

Kevin Harrigan, Court Executive Officer

(530) 934-6382

Court Service Highlights in the Current Year

- Preparation for capital construction project to renovate and expand historic courthouse
- Preparation for implementation of new case management system
- Proactive implementation of traffic ticket/infraction amnesty program

Court Service Highlights in Detail

Preparation for capital construction project to renovate and expand historic courthouse

Glenn is gearing up for a major facilities project. Part of that effort includes moving entirely out of the historic courthouse which is a high volume main branch, and into a temporary modular facility to allow for construction to occur. Additional staff efforts have been dedicated to records destruction and to rid the court of any unnecessary records, items, and exhibits from the 120+ year-old courthouse. This is an undertaking which is being handled with fewer staff on hand now than we had five years ago. These efforts are only possible because of the reduced public service hours currently being offered.

Preparation for implementation of new case management system

Glenn Superior Court is also gearing up for the implementation of a new case management system (CMS) to replace our antiquated system which is well over 20+ years old. This is an arduous process being handled, also with fewer staff now than 5 years ago. When operational, the new system will allow for e-filing, paper on demand, and improved interfaces with other government agencies and justice partners, among many other additional improved features when compared to the current system in use. These efforts are made possible in part by the reduced public service hours currently being offered.

Proactive implementation of traffic ticket/infraction amnesty program

Glenn Superior Court has been aggressive with outreach and following up with those individuals who are eligible for the program.

Budget Challenges and Priorities

- The 1% cap on fund balances continues to inhibit multi-year planning, local budget stability, and seed money for innovation to further promote efficiency and increased access to justice, such as the new CMS, described above.
- The lack of ability to maintain a fund balance at a reasonable level diminishes our court's flexibility, and adds unnecessary administrative burdens at a time of underfunding.

Budget Challenges and Priorities (continued)

- Staff was at 24.5 FTE in FY 2012-13; we're currently at 17 FTE; when enhanced collections staff are removed, we have a 31% vacancy rate.
- Self-help services are only available to the public two days per week.
- We are seeing evidence that the amnesty program will erode local civil assessment revenue, a heavily relied upon source of operating funds. This is an unintended consequence of the program that has not been addressed at the State level.
- Glenn judges are ranked 5th highest in the State of California in filings per judicial position, despite being a small 2-judge court.
- Our TCTF budget was \$2.5m in FY 2010-11; currently it is \$1.8m.
- The Bureau of Labor Statistics calculation in WAFM does not work for our court because the region remains depressed economically.



Court Demographics

Population Served	28,353
Square Miles Covered	1,327
Total Number of Court Facilities	4

The Workload-based Allocation & Funding Methodology (WAFM)

The Workload-based Allocation & Funding Methodology (WAFM) calculates the total funding needed for California's 58 trial courts based on case filings, workload and other factors.

To do this, WAFM relies on results from what we call the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model to estimate total staffing needed using a weighted caseload model. Developed in partnership with national experts, the RAS model is based on a time study of over 5,000 case processing staff in 24 California trial courts. The study established a set of caseweights (amount of time in minutes to process a case from initial filing through any post-disposition activity) understanding that certain types of filings take more time and resources to handle than others. The weighted filings are used to estimate total staff needed in each court.

The WAFM model converts the staff need data into dollars, taking into account average salaries, benefits, operating expenses and equipment, and the local cost of labor using the Bureau of Labor Statistics as a benchmark. A "funding floor" is applied to the smallest trial courts because there is a basic operating threshold that must be met in order to provide service to the public. In other words, California's small courts do not have economies of scale, and yet there are basic expenditures that even the smallest courts must make. The result is, for each court, an estimate of the core operations funding required to adequately process its workload. This is known as the court's WAFM share.

Starting in FY 2013-14, a portion of each court's allocation is being recalculated according to its WAFM share. (A court's WAFM share is different from the courts' traditional share of the statewide funding. The WAFM calculation tells us what the trial courts need to function based on current filings, whereas the traditional share was based on the amount each court received from its county not taking into consideration the courts' filings or staff needs.)

Unfortunately, the total WAFM funding needed for all 58 courts exceeds the funding currently appropriated in the state budget. (This is the WAFM funding gap.) California's trial courts are underfunded by at least a collective \$444 million. The underfunding is made worse for those courts that experience a reduction of funding based on their WAFM share. To manage the budget reductions resulting from the implementation of WAFM in the absence of full trial court funding, the Judicial Council approved applying WAFM incrementally, applying it fully only to new money appropriated in the budget.

The rules of application adopted by the Judicial Council are:

- Each year beginning in FY 2013-14, and through/including to FY 2017-18, incrementally more of the historical (base) funding (using FY 2012-13 as the base) will be subject to WAFM, until 50% of the FY 12-13 base is distributed according to WAFM;
- All new state funding is distributed according to the WAFM shares; and
- For each dollar of new state funding, one dollar of the historical base will be reallocated using WAFM.