



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: October 27, 2014
Time: 11:30 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.
Location: Redwood Room, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Public Call-In Number 1-877-820-7831; Passcode: 3511860

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the September 29, 2014 meeting and Vote by Electronic Means.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Public Comment

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least 15 minutes prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 2255 N. Ontario Street,

Suite 220, Burbank, California 91504, attention: Jessica Craven. Only written comments received by 11:30 a.m. on Friday, October 24, 2014 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. AGENDA ITEMS

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. James E. Herman, Chair, Judicial Council Technology Committee

Item 2

Update on work of Information Technology (No Action Required)

Update on the current and upcoming work and activities of the Information Technology office.

Presenter: Mr. Mark W. Dusman, Chief Information Officer and Director, Information Technology

Item 3

Update on Information Technology Budget (No Action Required)

An update on the Information Technology budget will be provided.

Presenter: Mr. Mark W. Dusman

Item 4

Update and discussion on Interim Case Management Systems

Update on the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation that the Technology Committee develop a plan to eventually eliminate subsidies to courts for V3 (civil, small claims, probate, and mental health) case management system and Sustain Justice Edition. This includes a strategy based on V3 courts' responses about current and future plans for the V3 interim case management system.

Presenters: Mr. Mark W. Dusman

Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager, Information Technology

Ms. Kathy Fink, Manager, Information Technology

Item 5

Workstreams (Action Required)

Update on the proposed workstreams related to State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces and Electronic Filing Services Providers (EFSP) and E-filing. After the update, the committee will be asked to conceptually approve this concept.

Presenter: Hon. James E. Herman

Item 6

Update on Budget Change Proposals for Technology (No Action Required)

An update on submitted and future Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for technology will be provided.

Presenter: Mr. Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

September 29, 2014

4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. James E. Herman, Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Mr. Mark G. Bobino; and Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. David De Alba, Vice-Chair; Hon. Emilie H. Elias; and Hon. Gary Nadler.

Liaison Members Present: Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers; and Hon. Marsha Slough

Others Present: Hon. Steven D. Barnes; Mr. Curt Soderlund; Mr. Curtis L. Child; Mr. Mark Dusman; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Ms. Diana Earl; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Renea Stewart; and Ms. Jessica Craven

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed and made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2014 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting and Vote by Electronic Means.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-5)

Items 1 and 2

Welcome to new Members and Chair Report (No Action Required)

Discussion: Hon. James E. Herman, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. He welcomed the new members and invited them to share a bit about their experience related to court technology.

Item 3

Review Update to Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan

Discussion: The Judicial Council Technology Committee reviewed the update to the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan that addresses language access. Feedback was provided by Hon. Maria P. Rivera, Cochair of the Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan.

Action: The committee made a motion to update the Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan to include the additional feedback related to language access and vote by email later in the week on the final plan and accompanying Judicial Council report.

Item 4

Update on Budget for the Improvement and Modernization Fund

Update: The committee received an update by Mr. Curt Soderlund on the budget impacts on the Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF), specifically the shortfall and the work that is being done on this issue.

Item 5

Information Technology Staffing/Contractors

Update: Mr. Mark Dusman provided an update on the budget for staffing, specifically contractors utilized in the Information Technology office. The report included why the office uses specialized technical contractors, a definition of the contractors, the process for hiring the contractors, the budget for the contractors, as well as the current status.

Item 6

Interim Case Management Systems

Update: An update on the additional feedback received from the V3 courts on their current and future plans for the V3 interim case management system was received. The responses from Orange, San Joaquin, San Diego, and Ventura were reviewed; Sacramento did not respond.

Item 7

Video Remote Interpretation Demonstration

Update: Mr. Mark Bonino provided an update on the September 22, 2014 CourtCall demonstration. Mr. Curtis L. Child added information related to the political climate surrounding video remote interpreting.

Item 8

Technology Workstreams

Update: An update on new workstream projects, which are time sensitive initiatives related to technology, was provided by Judge Herman. The workstreams were defined in the approved Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan. The two potential workstreams include State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces and Electronic Filing Services Providers (EFSP) and E-filing.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS
OCTOBER 6, 2014

Email Proposal

The Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) was asked to approve the updated Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan and accompanying report to the Judicial Council. The committee had reviewed the report and updated plan, as well as listened to feedback regarding language access at an open meeting on September 29, 2014. By the end of the September 29, 2014 meeting, the Committee: 1) directed staff to include additional comments related to language access in the report and plan; and 2) decided to vote by email later in the week on the final report and plan.

Notice

On October 2, 2014, a notice was posted advising that the JCTC was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(A).

Public Comment

Because the email proposal concerned a subject that otherwise must be discussed in an open meeting, the JCTC invited public comment on the proposal under rule 10.75(o)(2). The public comment period began at 3:15 p.m., Thursday, October 2, 2014 and ended at 8:30 a.m., Monday, October 6, 2014. No comments were received.

Action Taken

After the public comment period ended, JCTC members were asked to submit their votes on the proposal by 12:00 noon on October 7, 2014. All seven members voted to approve. The updated Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan and accompanying report to the Judicial Council were approved.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

Judicial Council Technology Committee Meeting

October 27, 2014

Call to Order and Roll Call

- Welcome
- Open Meeting Script
- Approve minutes of previous meeting and vote by email

*Hon. James E. Herman, Chair, Judicial Council Technology
Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Chair Report

Hon. James E. Herman



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Work of Judicial Council Information Technology Services

*Mr. Mark W. Dusman, Chief Information Officer and Director,
Information Technology*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Mission

Our mission emphasizes that:

- We serve at the direction of the Judicial Council.
- We have a customer focus.
- Our key goals include:
 - Provide full technology life cycle services (following industry Solution Delivery Life Cycle / SDLC).
 - Optimize operational core services.
 - Cost-effective technological enhancements and solutions (virtualization).
 - Cost control (5-year budget process).
 - Increase productivity through improvement of work processes.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Information Technology Organization

Mark Dusman, Director/Chief Information Officer

- 5 major units/ senior managers:
 - AOC & Court Application Services
 - CMS & E-Business Application Services
 - Enterprise Resource Planning Services
 - Technology Support Services
 - California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)/Shared Services
- Staff as of October 14:
 - 109.88 filled FTEs
 - 50.6 consultants
 - Total: 160.48



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Court Application Customers & Services

Develops, maintains, and supports mission-critical case management systems for the JCC, appellate and trial courts, including:

- Appellate Courts Case Management System (ACCMS)
- California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)
- Sustain Justice Edition (SJE)
- Database Administration
- Web Services
- Enterprise Technology Architecture

Customers include judicial officers and staff in the Supreme Court, appellate courts, trial courts, Tribal Courts; statewide justice partners, JC divisions and offices, State Bar, the public, and the Judicial Council Technology Committee



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Key Statistics & Metrics

- Appellate Court Case Management System
 - 10 court locations and 1,390+ court users.
 - Number of active justices using the system: 85
 - Total active cases in ACCMS: 21,992
- California Courts Protective Order Registry
 - Currently in 38 counties and 12 tribal courts
 - Contains 95,000+ protective & restraining order files
 - Deployment to Napa, Modoc, and Shasta by Jan. 2015
- Sustain Justice Edition
 - Primarily supports 9 courts hosted at CCTC
 - 799 licensed SJE users
- Web Services
 - Trial Court Website Templates - 17 courts use new Web templates; 4 in progress in 2014
 - Web Services providing technical & implementation assistance for Granicus legislation management solution, which will automate Judicial Council agenda creation and posting, and allow Council meetings to be webcast and broadcast via our public website



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

CMS & E-Business Application Customers & Services

- Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2)
- Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health Case Management System (V3)
- California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) in 8 courts
- E-Business Initiatives
- Justice Partner outreach

Customers include trial court judicial officers and staff, statewide partners (DMV, DOJ, FTB, CHP), local law enforcement, national justice organizations, National Center for State Courts, Court Technology Advisory Committee.



Key Statistics & Metrics

- Criminal & Traffic Case Management System (V2)
 - Court users: 475; Justice Partner users: 2,800
 - Processed 139,674 new felony, misdemeanor, and infraction cases in FY 2013/2014.
- Civil, Small Claims, Probate & Mental Health Case Management System (V3)
 - In 5 superior courts, representing 26% of the state's court civil caseload.
 - San Diego (Probate and Civil Limited/Unlimited) and Orange County Superior Courts (all V3 case types) have both deployed e-filing.
 - For 18 months of the mandatory e-filing pilot at Orange County Superior Court (Jan 2013 – June 2014), 1,168,709 documents (91% of filed documents) were filed electronically.
 - 65% e-filed docs reviewed within 24 hours of filing
- E-Business/Justice Partner Outreach
 - E-filing project management for 1DCA; additional courts to follow.



Enterprise Resource Planning

Customers & Services

- Develop & maintain mission-critical systems for the JC, appellate and trial courts.
 - Phoenix Financials / HR Payroll
 - Financials
 - HREMS (HR and Education)
 - Computer-Aided Facilities Management
 - Themis: Assigned Judges, CAPS, Nominations, Faculty Tracking
 - Uniform Civil Fee System
 - Supreme Court – Court Appointed Counsel
 - Appellate Court Appointed Counsel
 - Administrative Services for IT
- Customers include judicial officers and staff in the Supreme Court, appellate courts, trial courts, JC divisions and offices, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, State of California Commission on Judicial Performance, justice partners, state partners (DOF, SCO), third-party service providers, attorneys, retired judges and the general public.



Key Statistics & Metrics

- Phoenix Financials / HR Payroll
 - 58 trial courts financials/procurement, 10 courts HR/Payroll
 - 80+ interfaces
- Computer-Aided Facilities Management (CAFM)
 - 20+ million sq. ft of real estate, 530 court facilities
- Uniform Civil Fee System
 - Over \$630 million Fees Distributed/year
- Supreme Court – Court Appointed Counsel
 - Currently 340 automatic appeals of death sentences, 268 have appointed counsel
 - Interfaces with AOC Financials for payment of counsel: \$10.7 million in claims paid per year
- District Court of Appeals - Court Appointed Counsel
 - Over \$40 million in claims/year



Technology Support - Customers & Services

- Technical Infrastructure
- User Helpdesk Support
- Desktop Support
- Data Center Support
- Network Infrastructure & Security Support
- Trial court LAN/WAN telecommunications program.

Customers include the Judicial Council, Supreme Court, appellate courts, trial courts, JC Divisions and Offices.



Statistics and Metrics

- Technical Infrastructure and User Support hosts 354 servers and supports 69 applications
- 700 support calls are closed per month on average
- 44% of calls resolved without dispatch or escalation
- Trial Court Network Technology Refresh goal is to replace 630 network switches by 2015 and 230 routers and 40 wireless controllers by 2016 at 53 courts.
- IT negotiated a branch agreement that saves the trial courts 31% over 5 years. This agreement ends May 2015. IT is negotiating a renewal of the terms.
- 58 courts currently participate in the Telecommunications Program.
- 57 courts participate in at least one security service



CCTC/Shared Services Customers & Services

- CCTC Data Center
 - Hosts key applications and tools for the JC, trial and appellate courts.
- Shared Services includes enterprise tools & services
 - Data Integration Program (Integration Services Backbone)
 - Enterprise Test Management System
 - Enterprise Management of File Transfer
 - Enterprise Methodology & Process/Community of Practice.

Customers include appellate courts, trial courts, justice partners and third-party service providers.



Statistics & Metrics

- Supports over 10,000 users.
- Supports 12 key applications.
- Supports 58 Superior Courts, Appellate Courts, and Supreme Court.
 - Answers on average 98.8% of Help Desk calls within 20 seconds.
- The 2014 10th annual Disaster Recovery exercise was successfully completed within 11:46 hours. The service level commitment is 72 hours.



IT Challenges

- Governance and funding of technology programs.
- Staffing to meet the demand.
- Support the implementation of the Judicial Branch strategic plan.



IT Opportunities

- Branchwide leveraged purchase agreements.
- Standardize on technology, processes, and procedures.
- Support innovative initiatives for the courts.
- Develop and provide new e-Business Services.



Update: Information Technology Budget FY 2014- 2015

Mr. Mark W. Dusman



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

IT Budget by Fund

Total FY 2014-2015 Information Technology Budget

Trial Court Improvement Modernization Fund (IMF)	\$34.9M
Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF)	\$10.9M
General Fund (GF)	\$17.5M
State Court Facility Construction Fund (SCFCF)	<u>\$ 1.3M</u>
Total, all funds	\$64.6M

5 Year Historical IT Budget Allocations

	FY 2010-2011	FY 2011-2012	FY 2012-2013	FY 2013-2014	FY 2014-2015
IMF	54,184,737	38,787,474	37,980,543	39,214,180	34,931,766
TCTF	27,394,500	29,762,299	22,826,543	11,390,200	10,899,209
GF	16,896,174	15,720,516	16,491,304	16,853,792	17,519,548
SCFCF	1,326,732	1,243,956	1,755,340	1,253,648	1,262,818
Totals*	99,802,143	85,514,245	79,053,730	68,711,820	64,613,341



* For comparison purposes, totals exclude CCMS & grants

How IT Achieved Reductions

- Baseline funding, no new projects.
- Defer LAN/WAN hardware refresh (FY 2011/12) or prioritize refresh (FY 2014-15).
- Defer program CCTC equipment refresh when possible.
- Implement cost-saving technology solutions.
- Reduce support and enhancements for interim programs (SJE, V2, V3).
- Recruited and converted 8 IT consultants to Full Time Equivalents (FTE).



IT Budget Development Process

- 5-year annual IT budget process (6 years)
- Zero-based budgeting. Prior year budgets do not automatically “roll over.”
- IT management reviews and prioritizes budgets.
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) reviews and recommends TCTF and TCIMF budget requests.



IT Budget Development Process (cont)

- Budget allocation vs. expenditures - monitored weekly
- All program expenditures - approved by the Project Manager.
 - All purchases and contracts - reviewed by IT budget staff.
 - All contracts/amendments - approved by the CIO.
- Mid-year budget review to project remaining year's expenditures.



IT Budget Issues

- Cyclical IT program budgets vary year to year (equipment replacement, deployment, contract renewals, etc.).
- 5 years of numerous budget cuts.
- Unstable funding impact:
 - deferred maintenance (SW & HW)
 - deferred new project initiatives
- Recruitment of FTEs to replace contractors has had limited success to date
- Straight percentage reductions (5%, 8%, etc.) by individual programs are difficult since programs are operating at “keeping lights on” levels.



Update and Discussion: Interim Case Management Systems

Mr. Mark W. Dusman,

*Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager, Information
Technology, and*

Ms. Kathy Fink, Manager, Information Technology



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Interim Case Management

Systems: Actions to Date

- January 16, 2014 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommendation:

Recommend that the Technology Committee develop a plan to eventually eliminate subsidies from the TCTF and IMF to courts for V3 (civil, small claims, probate, and mental health) case management system and Sustain Justice Edition costs.

- April 24 – 25, 2014 Judicial Council Action

The Judicial Council, effective April 24, 2014:

Directed the Judicial Council Technology Committee to evaluate the TCBAC's recommendation of having the committee develop a plan to eliminate the subsidies from the IMF and the TCTF to courts for CCMS V3 and Sustain Justice Edition costs, and to make recommendations to the Judicial Council.



Interim Case Management Systems: Actions to Date

- April 24, 2014

The Technology Committee meets to review the SJE and V3 programs and potential costing models. Presentation by Chair of the Sustain Justice Edition Path Forward Consortium.

- May 19, 2014, May 29, 2014, and June 26, 2014 JCTC Meetings

The Technology Committee meets to review the SJE and V3 programs and potential costing models. JCTC action to include courts in decision making process and handle the courts serially (V3 followed by SJE).



Interim Case Management Systems: Actions to Date

- July – August 2014

The Technology Committee surveys V3 courts on current and future plans. JCTC Chair and Vice-Chair meet with V3 courts at August 2014 joint TCPJAC/CEAC meeting to discuss results.

- September 2014

The Technology Committee distributes a follow up template to V3 courts with additional questions on the current and future plans for the interim case management system. Responses received and consolidated.



Interim Case Management Systems: Next Steps

- JCTC needs to continue to work with V3 courts on the final recommendation.
- JCTC will then need to work with SJE courts on the final recommendation.
- JCTC needs to return to Judicial Council with these recommendations.



Action: Workstreams

Hon. James E. Herman



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Update: Budget Change Proposals for Technology

Mr. Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Adjourn

All



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

The background of the slide features a large, semi-transparent seal of the Judicial Council of California. The seal is circular and contains a central figure, likely a personification of Justice, holding a scale and a sword. The text "JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA" is visible around the perimeter of the seal, and the year "1926" is at the bottom. The seal is rendered in a light blue color that blends with the dark blue background.

Background on Interim Case Management Systems

From May 19, 2014 Judicial Council
Technology Committee Meeting

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Program

- Provides project management support and technical expertise for the CCTC-hosted courts which includes interfaces to state and local justice partners. Locally hosted courts benefit from implementation of legislative updates as requested.
- Primary beneficiaries are the 9 SJE courts hosted at CCTC. Locally hosted courts benefit from implementation of legislative updates as requested.
- SJE Court Consortium meets every two months where a status of the current CMS deployments is provided. There has been no decision on a path forward. The Chair presented to the JCTC at their April meeting.



Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Program

- SJE Courts transitioning to a new CMS are all local deployments:
 - Tyler Odyssey: Merced for all case types. Monterey was part of CMS BCP to transition to Tyler for civil case types.
 - Sustain eCourt: Placer and Tulare for all case types.
- Possible considerations for a path forward include
 - A group of the SJE courts agree to work together to select a vendor and share a configuration and CMS instance. This option would allow the courts to leverage economies of scale.
 - The courts decide to work independently to select a CMS replacement.
 - Hosting options include locally hosted, vendor hosted (e.g. Software as a Service) or centrally hosted (e.g. CCTC).
 - As SJE Courts transition to a new CMS, there will be an increase in the SJE licensing cost and possibly the CCTC hosting cost.
 - It is expected that to transition all SJE Courts to a new CMS will take between 3 to 5 years.
 - Analysis and discussion of potentially hosting Tyler at the CCTC are underway.



V3 Program

- Provides product releases including court enhancements, judicial branch requirements, and bi- annual legislative changes; day to day technical and application support; and infrastructure support, including hosting services for the V3 CCTC courts.
- Primary beneficiaries are the five CMS V3 courts:
 - CCTC hosted courts: Superior Courts of Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties
 - Locally hosted courts: Superior Courts of Orange and San Diego Counties
- CMS V3 courts were early adopters of the vision of a common case management system for California and have invested significant resources and time participating in building a Civil Case Management System that processes 25% of Civil cases in California. E-filing is deployed at Orange, San Diego, and Sacramento.
- Goal: Develop a glide path, not an immediate full cost impact to the CMS V3 courts. CMS V3 Courts to decide on the model.



V3 Program

- Possible considerations for a path forward include:
 - CMS V3 courts' investments were made with the expectation that this would lead to a common case management system for all case types. These investments need to be recognized in the path forward.
 - The efforts of the courts in the V2/V3 Workstream did not reach consensus on a funding and governance model.
 - Orange, San Diego, and Sacramento will have increased CMS V3 costs at the same time as the implementation of the WAFM model.
 - San Joaquin is converting from CMS V3 to FullCourt Enterprise for all case types, targeting July 2015. Other courts' plans for continuing to use CMS V3 vary significantly. As courts convert from CMS V3, costs will fall disproportionately on the remaining courts.



V3 Program

- Costing Models
 - Equal CCTC/Support by User: CCTC hosting costs allocated equally across CCTC courts / Application Support costs allocated by number of Users
 - Equal Allocation of Applicable Costs: CCTC hosting costs and Application Support allocated equally across courts
 - By Share of Budget: Costs allocated by equal percentage of court budget (FY 13/14 allocation used for model)
 - Cost Per Court Based on Volume (All Filings): Costs allocated by case activity



Plans for a Civil, Small Claims, Probate, Mental Health CMS.

Superior Court	Vendor	Data Conversion
Orange	Perform a gap analysis between V3 and Tyler	If moving to Tyler, planning to convert data from V3
Sacramento	No response	
San Diego	Tyler	Unknown
San Joaquin	Justice Systems, Inc	Converting data from V3
Ventura	Tyler – have Statement of Work (SOW)	Planning to convert data from V3



Timeline

Superior Court	Dependencies	Est. Start	Est. Duration
Orange	Gap analysis and Judicial Council funding. If Tyler: completion of Tyler Family and Juvenile	Gap analysis: Sep 2014 If Tyler: late Spring 2015	Gap analysis: 3 months If Tyler: 18 – 24 months
Sacramento			
San Diego	Additional and sufficient funding; staff resources; completion of Tyler Family, Mental Health, Traffic and Criminal (Est. Dec 2016)	Sometime in 2016	15 – 20 months
San Joaquin	Started and in progress	Feb 2014	15 months
Ventura	Judicial Council funding	June 2014	17 months



Funding Sources

Superior Court	CMS V3 Maint & Supp	New CMS Deployment	New CMS Maint & Supp
Orange	Current sources	Judicial Council funding and court funding for existing staff and technology	Current court allocation
Sacramento			
San Diego	Current sources from Judicial Council	Judicial Council funding through BCP's	Court budget. Will seek budget requests for court technology initiatives critical to the trial courts
San Joaquin	General Fund	Court General Fund	Court Special Funds and/or General Fund as needed
Ventura	Existing sources	Judicial Council funding and existing local baseline operations funding	Local baseline operations funding



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Deployment Funding Ideas

- Savings from Fresno V2 to Tyler project
- Existing funds
- New funding from Governor and Legislature
 - Savings from V3 conversions as courts assume ongoing costs
- Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for transition of all V3 courts, based on Return On Investment (ROI) against savings on V3
- State general fund money, now that there is a branch plan



Costs Over 5 Years

Orange: not included

Sacramento: no response

San Diego:

Summary Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total One-Time Costs	\$ 4,538,109	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Continuing Costs	\$ 439,851	\$ 439,851	\$ 439,851	\$ 439,851	\$ 439,851
Project Total	\$ 4,977,960	\$ 439,851	\$ 439,851	\$ 439,851	\$ 439,851

San Joaquin:

Summary Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total One-Time Costs	\$ 81,289	\$ 288,783	\$ 79,465	\$ 79,462	\$ 59,599
Total Continuing Costs	\$ 339,807	\$ 332,963	\$ 150,946	\$ 197,502	\$ 197,502
Project Total	\$ 421,096	\$ 621,746	\$ 230,411	\$ 276,964	\$ 257,101

Ventura:

Summary Costs	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total One-Time Costs	\$ 667,874	\$ 3,055,529	\$ 612,409	\$ -	\$ -
Total Continuing Costs	\$ 184,387	\$ 380,455	\$ 403,740	\$ 396,650	\$ 396,650
Project Total	\$ 852,261	\$ 3,435,984	\$ 1,016,149	\$ 396,650	\$ 396,650

