



## 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 22, 2012

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Trust Fund Allocation: Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County Funding for Case Management System Replacement	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	N/A
Recommended by	Date of Report
California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Internal Committee Hon. James E. Herman, Chair	June 19, 2012
	Contact
	Mark Dusman, 415-865-4999 mark.dusman@jud.ca.gov Zlatko Theodorovic, 916-263-1397 zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov

---

### Executive Summary

The CCMS Internal (Technology) Committee and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) submit to the Judicial Council three alternatives for review and consideration for funding the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County's replacement of its two failing case management systems (CMS) and implementation of a document management system (DMS). The court's systems, which cannot be upgraded and run on unsupported legacy hardware, suffer from intermittent failures and could fail permanently at any time. The court has made multiple attempts to replace these systems and initially began the work to deploy the Criminal and Traffic (V2) interim CMS in 2004. More recently the court has expended significant time and resources as one of the planned "early adopter" courts to deploy the California Court Case Management System. The court now intends to deploy a new case management system as a result of the cancelled deployment of CCMS and requests approval for financial assistance before the selection of a vendor. Though these funds would not be expended until fiscal year (FY) 2012–2013, this approval will allow the court to plan appropriately, based on the resources available. Some \$3.36 million in FY 2010–2011 CCMS deployment savings is available for the Judicial Council to allocate from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) to assist the court in addressing the

deployment costs. These funds are not part of the funds identified by the Legislature in the state budget bills as of June 18, 2012, that are to be redirected to offset reductions to trial court operations funding. Consistent with prior allocation practices of the council, any allocated funds that are unencumbered at the end of FY 2012–2013 shall be reappropriated to the TCTF and available for reallocation by the Judicial Council in FY 2013–2014.

## **Recommendation**

The CCMS Internal (Technology) Committee and the Administrative Office of the Courts offer the Judicial Council the following options with regard to the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County's replacement of its case management system. The committee recommends the first option.

**Option 1—Allocate one-time funding for the deployment of a new court case management system contingent on the costs from the request for proposal (RFP) and the enacted state budget and the court's FY 2011–2012 ending fund balance as of June 30, 2012.** Based on the constraints on locally held fund balances included in the current state budget bill, this option recognizes that the court will need to reduce its fund balance to what is allowed in the enacted state budget or subsequent trailer language, which currently is 1 percent of the court's allocation. Allocate up to \$3.36 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund, to be distributed to the court and/or vendors, with the final amount to be determined based on the enacted state budget and the court's FY 2011–2012 ending fund balance as of June 30, 2012. The ongoing expenses related to the maintenance and operations of the case management system and document management system would be the responsibility of the court. Consistent with prior allocation practices of the council, any allocated funds that are unencumbered at the end of FY 2012–2013 would be reappropriated to the TCTF and available for reallocation by the Judicial Council in FY 2013–2014.

**Option 2—Allocate no funding for the deployment of a new court case management system.**

**Option 3—Allocate one-time funding for the deployment of a new court case management system.** Allocate up to \$3.36 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund, to be distributed to the court and/or vendors. The ongoing expenses related to the maintenance and operations of the case management system and document management system would be the responsibility of the court. Consistent with prior allocation practices of the council, any allocated funds that are unencumbered at the end of FY 2012–2013 would be reappropriated to the TCTF and available for reallocation by the Judicial Council in FY 2013–2014.

## **Previous Council Action**

In December 2010, the Executive and Planning Committee approved the previous CCMS governance model, which was developed to provide broader participation by the judicial branch and justice system partners. The council assumed the role of CCMS executive sponsor and

designated the Administrative Director of the Courts as the lead executive for CCMS. In April 2011, the Chief Justice established, with council approval, the CCMS Internal Committee, which is charged with overseeing the council's policies on CCMS. The committee advises the council on CCMS-related policy decisions and reports on CCMS progress, ensuring that the Judicial Council is fully informed and up to date on the case management system.

At the July 22, 2011, Judicial Council business meeting, the council approved the redirection of \$56.4 million from CCMS to trial court operations. A portion of this redirected funding would have been used for maintenance of the application and completion of a software release to incorporate legislative and other necessary changes that have occurred since the requirements for the CCMS application were created in 2007.

On March 27, 2012, the Judicial Council held a special session specifically to address CCMS-related business. After a review and discussion of deployment options for CCMS, the council voted unanimously to cancel the deployment of CCMS because of the budgetary constraints resulting from unprecedented budget reductions to the judicial branch. The council directed the CCMS Internal Committee, in partnership with the trial courts, to develop timelines and recommendations to the council for:

- Establishing an approach and vision for implementing technology that serves the trial courts, litigants, attorneys, justice system partners, and the public while considering available resources and technology needs;
- Leveraging the CCMS technology and developed software to benefit ongoing judicial branch technology solutions;
- Providing technology solutions in the near term to improve efficiencies in court operations by maximizing the value of document management systems, e-filing capabilities, and e-delivery services for the benefit of litigants, attorneys, justice system partners, and the public.
- Establishing a judicial branch court technology governance structure that would best serve the implementation of the technology solutions otherwise included in these recommendations;
- Developing alternatives for the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County to meet its current case management system needs; and
- Developing strategies to assist trial courts with existing critical case management system needs.

As part of the council's action, \$741,688 was allocated for gathering requirements, defining process, and selecting a replacement case management system for the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County. The Judicial Council's decision to terminate deployment of CCMS V4 has resulted in \$3.36 million of FY 2010–2011 savings from the Trial Court Trust Fund for funds that were previously encumbered to reimburse the Superior Court of Ventura County for costs incurred locally during the deployment of CCMS.

## **Rationale for Recommendation**

The Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County's two case management systems, which cannot be upgraded and run on unsupported legacy hardware, suffer from intermittent failures and could fail permanently at anytime. For example, in a recent post-CCMS court technology survey, the court noted that its civil system has experienced outages lasting weeks. Further, the court, in anticipation of budgetary cuts, has worked with the county to lower CMS-related costs from \$1.6 million to \$1 million annually by reducing services such as the number of terminals, discontinuing all management reports, reducing data entry services, and reducing programming costs. For the court's county-hosted criminal and traffic CMS, the court portion of maintenance and support costs is likely to increase as other county agencies plan to move off the mainframe. Lastly, the county is planning on discontinuing print services within a year, which will affect court services and operations and add additional operating costs to the court.

The court had a history of investigating a replacement CMS and in 2004 was chosen to deploy the Criminal and Traffic (V2) interim CMS. As focus shifted to CCMS, the court was selected to be one of three early adopter courts to deploy the system. In preparation for the deployment, the court and county expended considerable time and staff resources toward initial deployment activities, including developing a deployment readiness assessment. In addition, the court had a significant participant in the product acceptance testing phase of CCMS, and assisted the AOC in the proof-of-concept and development of the business process maps that would guide the configuration efforts at the court and future deployments. This delay in the replacement of the court's case management systems has caused the branch and, more specifically, the court to forego any annual savings from a likely reduction in its \$1.6 million in CMS-related costs.

With the council's decision at the March 27, 2012, business meeting not to deploy CCMS, the council recognized that the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County would still require a new system and the funding to procure and deploy the system.

Based on the requirements identified in the RFP, the CMS benefits would include:

- A state-of-the-art system covering all case types compliant with business and functional requirements;
- Configurable workflow to actively process cases using automated and manual work queues;
- E-filing capable with a web-based public-facing portal;
- DMS compatibility;
- State and local data exchange compliance with integration of existing and new mandatory data exchanges potentially leveraging work to date using CCMS data exchanges;
- Vendor support for changes in state laws, federal regulations, rules of court, and administrative requirements; and
- Scalable design to accommodate court size, court users, data volume, and public web users with a high degree of data security.

In addition, the knowledge gained by court and AOC staff from lessons learned during this deployment would serve to facilitate an improved, field-tested deployment process resulting in reduced costs and the mitigation of time necessary for future court CMS deployments.

### **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

#### **Option 1— Allocate one-time funding for the deployment of a new court case management system contingent on the costs from the request for proposal (RFP) and the enacted state budget and the court’s FY 2011–2012 ending fund balance as of June 30, 2012.**

Based on the constraints on locally held fund balances included in the current state budget bill, this option recognizes that the court will need to reduce its fund balance to what is allowed in the enacted state budget or subsequent trailer language, which currently is 1 percent of the court’s allocation.

The court would be required to contribute an amount equal to any FY 2011–2012 ending fund balance as of June 30, 2012, exceeding a calculated amount toward the deployment costs of the new case management system. Any additional CMS deployment costs that the court contribution did not cover, up to \$3.36 million, would be allocated to the court and/or paid directly to the vendor from the Trial Court Trust Fund. The court contribution would be calculated based on its FY 2011–2012 ending fund balance as of June 30, 2012, less the court’s share of the statewide reduction allocated specifically to reduce trial courts’ fund balances and less any reserve amount the court would be allowed to retain locally.

The ongoing expenses related to the maintenance and operations of the CMS and DMS would be the responsibility of the court. Consistent with prior allocation practices of the council, any allocated funds that are unencumbered at the end of FY 2012–2013 would be reappropriated to the TCTF and available for reallocation by the Judicial Council in FY 2013–2014. This alternative may require that the Judicial Council revisit this issue once the impact of the enacted state budget is understood.

#### **Pros:**

- Depending on the court’s fund balance, the court would receive sufficient funding to address costs related to the CMS and DMS.
- The court would need to redirect less of its available operations resources, including fund balance, for this purpose.

#### **Con:**

- This allocation would reduce the available funds in the TCTF that could be used for other purposes.

**Option 2— Allocate no funding for the deployment of a new court case management system.**

Pro:

- This allocation would not reduce the available funds in the TCTF that could be used for other purposes.

Con:

- The court would need to redirect more of its available operations resources, including fund balance, for this purpose.

**Option 3— Allocate one-time funding for the deployment of a new court case management system.**

Allocate up to \$3.36 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund to be distributed to the court and/or vendors. The ongoing expenses related to the maintenance and operations of the CMS and DMS would be the responsibility of the court. Consistent with prior allocation practices of the council, any allocated funds that are unencumbered at the end of FY 2012–2013 would be reappropriated to the TCTF and available for reallocation by the Judicial Council in FY 2013–2014.

Pros:

- The court would receive sufficient funding to address costs related to the CMS and DMS.
- The court would need to redirect less of its available operations resources, including fund balance, for this purpose.

Con:

- This allocation would reduce the available funds in the TCTF that could be used for other purposes.

**Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

The implementation of CMS and DMS applications includes:

- Providing CMS and DMS application software that meets the functional requirements for the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County;
- Analyzing trial court operations to effectively use the CMS and DMS applications;
- Installing, configuring, and testing the CMS and DMS applications according to the business rules of the court;
- Maintaining the CMS application for changes in regulatory requirements, application enhancements, common configuration changes, and fixing of program defects;
- Training court technical staff on the administration and support of CMS and DMS applications and the infrastructure equipment to ensure reliable service;
- Training court staff on using the new CMS and DMS solutions;
- Providing cutover and post-go-live services; and

- Helping the court, the AOC, state and local justice partners, and any other necessary vendors work cooperatively to make the CMS available in a manner that ensures a high level of service to users.

A standardized request for proposal to procure a CMS and DMS solution for the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County has been developed. As a result of the coordinated efforts of the court and the AOC Finance Division's Business Services Unit, Office of the General Counsel (OGC), and Information Services Division, the RFP received final approval and was posted for vendor response on June 19, 2012. The RFP will be used as a template for courts needing to replace their case management systems to reduce future procurement process costs to the branch.

The total deployment costs have not yet been determined because responses and cost proposals will be unavailable until August 2012, but they are not anticipated to exceed \$3.36 million. The primary factors that would affect the final cost estimate are the technical staff necessary for a locally hosted solution, vendor costs, risk contingency, and unanticipated facility upgrades.

Following are anticipated procurements, infrastructure, and implementation services that would be included in the deployment costs.

1. RFP and CMS procurement is currently in progress and is considered a one-time cost that includes the following:
  - RFP process
  - Procurement
  - Selection
  - Negotiation
2. Infrastructure is considered a one-time cost and includes the following:
  - Equipment purchases
  - Vendor software purchases
  - Third-party software purchases
  - Software licensing (first year only)
  - Maintenance and support (first year only)
  - Facility modifications (e.g., electrical, HVAC, backup generator)
3. Deployment implementation services are considered one-time investments to cover the following activities:
  - System setup
  - Configuration
  - Forms, notices, and reports
  - Testing

- Training
- Cutover
- Project management

The following are additional ongoing expenses that may be incurred by the court:

- Maintenance and support of equipment
- Maintenance and support of the CMS
- Licensing of vendor CMS software
- Licensing and maintenance of third-party software
- Infrastructure support costs for local hosting
- Associated court technical staffing
- Disaster recovery
- Network
- Security
- Desktop support
- Help desk
- Telecommunications

The primary goal of the RFP is to replace the court’s existing legacy systems with a CMS and DMS solution. The selected CMS and DMS and associated services should be modern, efficient, reliable, economical, and proven. It is also the goal of the RFP to engage an experienced vendor capable of executing an efficient project within budget and within a 13-month time frame.

The procurement schedule is as follows:

<b>Key Milestone</b>	<b>Planned Completion (2012)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Draft RFP and requirements attachment out for internal review	5/11	Completed
Draft RFP sent to the court for court internal review	5/15	Completed
Court internal review period of the draft RFP	5/15–5/22	Completed
AOC internal review of the draft RFP	5/16	Completed
Review of the RFP and requirements attachments with the court soliciting feedback	5/23	Completed
Review of the RFP contractual attachments with the court soliciting feedback	5/29	Completed
Updates incorporated to include court-requested changes, priorities, and contractual items	5/31	Completed
Reviews and revisions period of draft RFP to OGC, the Finance Division’s Business Services Unit, and the court	6/1–6/13	Completed
Acceptance of RFP by OGC, Business Services, and the court	6/14	Completed



<b>Key Milestone</b>	<b>Planned Completion (2012)</b>	<b>Status</b>
RFP out for vendor responses	6/19	In Progress
Half-day vendor question-and-answer conference	7/9	
RFPs due from vendors	7/18	
Review and selection of eligible participating vendors	7/19–8/01	
Vendor presentations at the court	8/2–8/8	
Vendor selection sessions with the court (noncost selection)	8/9–8/13	
Public opening of the cost portion of vendor proposals	8/14	
Vendor selection sessions with the court at the court (cost and noncost selection)	8/15–8/20	
Notification of selected vendor and nonselected vendors	8/21	
Vendor contract negotiations	8/22–9/11	
AOC and court executive review; court approval of negotiated vendor contract	9/12–9/13	
Execution of vendor and court CMS implementation contract	9/14	

### **Attachments**

This report includes no attachments.





# Superior Court of California

## County of San Luis Obispo

### HISTORY OF CCMS

#### BACKGROUND

In 2001, San Luis Obispo worked with the AOC to acquire and purchase the ACS case management system. The AOC's role was to monitor and assist with negotiations based on the use of statewide master agreements. After the Southern Regional Office opened in 2001, the CMS relationship changed. As SLO became part of the Southern Region, we were forced to abandon the purchase of ACS in favor of the new partnership developed between the AOC and the Southern California Technology Group (SCTG) to develop a statewide solution. SCTG eventually evolved into CCMS. The ACS Courts (Fresno, Butte, Glenn and San Luis Obispo) were targeted to pilot the interim criminal/traffic component (V2). In early 2002, the AOC and SLO court agreed on a \$2.5 million contribution to a case management replacement project (V2). In 2003, SLO began hiring staff to replace the staff needed for V2. Shortly thereafter, work began on V2. After many starts and delays, conflicts with Fresno's deployment schedule and conflicts between the AOC, Deloitte and our county justice partners, the AOC froze our V2 deployment in 2007. The next year, we were asked to commit to V4 by Sheila Calabro with the understanding that all costs would be borne by the AOC including an additional \$500,000 (payback from V2) for our deployment costs and three years of post-deployment costs. We reengaged our justice partners and worked on integration programming for the next several years. In March 2012, the JC pulled the plug on CCMS and all of our investments went down the drain. We were left without a CMS and all of our technology resources spent.

#### Business Case

- SLO seeks to get on-going benefit with a modern, common, efficient, extendable system
- Avoid rising mainframe costs and technical limitations
- Replace the 20+ legacy systems with one system
- Lower costly statewide code changes to comply with new laws
- Integrated imaging, IVR/IWR traffic web pay, web access, etc.

#### Current Situation

- SLO no longer has any local technology money to purchase new CMS
- Lost trust with County Justice Partners over V2 and CCMS experience
- AOC still owes our Court \$500,000 from V2 expenditures
- AOC promised to fully fund CCMS and on-going costs for three years post deployment

## **Business Case for New San Luis Obispo Court Case Management System**

### **Summary**

This business case recommends funding San Luis Obispo Court up to \$3.3 million dollars for the purchase of a court case management solution to replace the 20 plus applications currently in use to process all case types in San Luis Obispo Superior Court.

An RFP was issued on June 19, 2012 to solicit bids from competent case management vendors to provide a system that can handle all case types, integration with justice partners, document management and imaging, public portals, e-filing capabilities, fiscal, web capabilities and is configurable at the local level.

Our current annual case management costs are approximately \$1 million annually, after severely reducing programming, management reports and data entry costs. The estimated one-time cost for a new system is up to \$2.5 million with annual costs of approximately \$200,000. This estimate was derived from informal bids submitted by various vendors to courts of similar size.

It is understood that the remaining balance of money allocated for this purchase would be returned to the Judicial Council for reallocation.

### **Business Opportunity**

SLO Court has an opportunity to replace an old antiquated COBOL based mainframe system, a DOS based civil system and about 20 homegrown applications to achieve better public access and an overhaul of our business practices. Since our mainframe criminal and traffic system cannot generate minute orders, we continue to use NCR paper minutes which must be entered into the system after court by back office staff.

This opportunity aligns with our goals of access to justice and efficient and effective use of court resources.

### **Alternatives**

The alternatives for our court are bleak. We can continue to limp along with the current systems and pay the county for the costs of these services or we can stop using case management systems altogether and return to paper files as our sole means of operating. Either way, the public will suffer given these grave economic times. If we continue to pay \$1 million per year, it will likely cost our court about 20 positions. If we stop entering data and must rely on court files for information, it will backlog the system and delay fine and fee payments, not to mention public information requests.

## **Benefits**

The greatest benefit is cost-savings to the court; however, the following is a list of additional benefits:

Modernization of court procedures,

Streamlining and reducing redundant activities,

Improved web services,

Document imaging in lieu of microfilm,

E-filing capabilities,

Improved IT support,

Reduction in system down time,

Increased public access,

Better fiscal accountability,

Locally controlled configuration; and

Ease of training and operation

## **Costs**

Since we are currently in the RFP process we have not received any formal cost estimates for a case management system. The latest version of Sustain has been introduced to Tulare and Sonoma counties at an introductory price and will not likely be an applicable comparison. Other vendors who are unknown to us at this time may be competitively priced. We have heard that one company has given an informal price quote to a court of similar size for \$2.5 million.

## **Our Plan**

Currently, we are a fully integrated Court. The District Attorney, Sheriff, Probation and Court share a system. We plan to maintain integration. We also plan to host the system locally and have built a new server room to accommodate this plan. Our plan is to support the system locally through our IT department. We do not plan to convert our existing data to the new system. Our plan is to enter all pending cases into the system prior to “go live” as a method of training our staff. New cases and old cases coming back into the system will be entered as they are filed. A copy of our existing data bases will be archived for historical purposes.

## **Recommendation**

This business case recommends the allocation of resources by the Judicial Council to San Luis Obispo Court for the purchase of a new case management system. While this business case did not discuss why San Luis Obispo deserves consideration during these tough fiscal times, it is well known that this is a question of fairness. San Luis Obispo Court has been an early deployer Court since 2001 for both the V2 and CCMS projects. Not only have we spent our own money in pursuit of a statewide solution, our county partners have spent a great deal of time and money along- side us during this process. We no longer have the resources to purchase a system on our own as we once did. Our project plan is designed to be the most cost effective and efficient way of migrating from one system to another. It may also serve as a model for other courts of similar size. We respectfully recommend you approve this funding plan.