



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Materials for March 23, 2015 Meeting
Table of Contents**

Draft Minutes from January 15, 2015 Meeting	1
<u>Action and Discussion Items</u>	
Item 3 – Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocation (Action Item)	4
Item 5 – Amendments to the Statute Requiring a 2 Percent Reserve Held in the TCTF (Action Item)	12
Item 4 – Allocation of Proposed Restored Funding for Retirement Cost Changes (Action Item)	16
Item 2 – 2015–2016 Allocations for Various Programs from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund and the Trial Court Trust Fund (Action Item)	26
Item 6 – Children’s Waiting Room Distributions (Action Item)	253



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

January 15, 2015

1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Administrative Office of the Courts, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento

-
- Advisory Body Members Present:** Judges: Laurie M. Earl (Chair), Thomas J. Borris, Jonathan B. Conklin, Mark A. Cope, Thomas DeSantos, Gregory S. Gaul, Barry P. Goode, Dodie A. Harman, Lesley D. Holland, Elizabeth W. Johnson, Carolyn B. Kuhl, Cynthia Ming-mei Lee, Paul M. Marigonda, Marsha Slough, and Winifred Young Smith; Executive Officers: Alan Carlson, Sherri R. Carter, Jake Chatters, Richard D. Feldstein, Rebecca Fleming, Kimberly Flener, Jose Octavio Guillen, Shawn C. Landry, Stephen H. Nash, Deborah Norrie, Michael M. Roddy, Mary Beth Todd, Kim Turner, Christina M. Volkers, and David Yamasaki; Judicial Council staff advisory members: Curtis L. Child, Curt Soderlund, and Zlatko Theodorovic.
- Advisory Body Members Absent:** Judges and CEOs: None; Judicial Council staff advisory members: Jody Patel.
- Others Present:** Patrick Ballard, Steven Chang, Martin Hoshino, Cory Jaspersen, Vicki Muzny, and Rob Oyung.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. and roll was taken.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the December 9, 2014, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

Public Comment

None received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 6)

Item 1

Update on the Governor's Budget Proposal

Action: *This was a discussion item with no action taken.*

Item 2

Current Fund Condition Statements for the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF)

Action: *This was a discussion item with no action taken.*

Item 3

2015–2016 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) Allocations for Information Technology Programs

Action: *A motion was made and approved unanimously to amend the third recommendation of the working group that was formed by Judge Earl to identify the needs and priorities of the trial courts and determine whether and how costs for existing programs/services could be reduced. A motion was then made and approved unanimously to support the following working group recommendations as amended, and submit them to the Judicial Council for its consideration:*

- 1. The Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council Technology Committee oversee the implementation of the proposed actions outlined in Attachment 2D. Short-term actions (within 12 months) will result in a savings of approximately \$1.0 million which is short of the estimated \$3.4 million reduction needed. However, medium-term (12-24 months) to long-term (24-36 months) actions are anticipated to result in additional savings. Long-term actions should be initiated now due to the length of time required for analysis, implementation, and transition from existing to new solutions.*
- 2. The Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council IT Office consider reducing as many external contractors as possible. External contractors have specific domain knowledge but are typically more costly than permanent employees.*
- 3. The Judicial Council consider creating a working group or designating an existing committee to focus on IT efficiencies and cost saving measures for smaller courts.*

Item 4

Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for Funding Trial Court Security Costs

Action: *A motion was made and approved unanimously in support of the recommendations of the Trial Court Security Growth Funding Working Group as follows:*

- ***The request for a growth rate increase for courts that provide security should be delayed until the submission of BCP's for 2016–2017 in September 2015. A 2015 spring BCP would still be submitted to maintain funding at FY 2010–2011 security levels. This option allows the Trial Court Security Growth Funding Working Group more time to review the impacts of a growth factor if a 5 percent General Fund augmentation for court operations is to be received in 2016–2017.***
- ***The baseline amount to calculate the growth factor would be based on funding needed to maintain 2010–2011 security levels. (Staff and private security would be based on court-provided information in the 2010–2011 Security Survey.) Positions and/or private security that were permanently reduced would not be included. Court security staff benefits funding received would be deducted. Equipment costs for screening stations, duress buttons, and wands would also not be included.***

Item 5

Children's Waiting Room Distributions

Action: A motion was made to approve the recommendations of the Children's Waiting Room Work Group with an amendment to the third bullet in recommendation 2.D. that the courts should return the unspent CWR distributions. Before a vote was taken on this motion, further discussion was held and votes on two other motions were taken. A motion was made and approved to accept several changes to the language in the work group recommendations. A motion was made and approved to accept the amended language in recommendation 2.D regarding return of the unspent CWR distributions. After additional discussion, a vote was taken on the original motion relating to all of the recommendations and was not approved. A motion was then made and approved unanimously to have this item come back to the TCBAC after further review by the work group, including a review by the JCC's Legal staff and Finance/Accounting offices.

Item 6

Amendments to the Statute Requiring a 2 Percent Reserve Held in the TCTF

Action: Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred to the next TCBAC meeting.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on _____, 2015.

Item 3
Court Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Allocation
(Action Item)

Summary

The Court Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding Allocation Work Group of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the committee approve changes to the method used to allocate annual funding for court appointed dependency counsel among the courts. The revised allocations will be based on the caseload-based calculation of funding need for each court provided by the caseload funding model approved by the Judicial Council in 2007. The method will also adjust the calculation of total funding required to the amount of funding that is currently available statewide, and provide a 4-year reallocation process to bring all courts to an equivalent percentage of need met by available funding. The work group also recommends: a method to allocate any new funding provided for court appointed dependency counsel through the state budget process; methods to be used for allocating unspent funds and funds derived from collections; and finally recommends that a joint working group of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be formed to review the current caseload funding model for possible updates and revisions.

Background

The present members of the work group are Hon. Mark A. Cope (co-chair), Hon. Thomas DeSantos, Hon. Winifred Younge Smith, Sherri R. Carter (co-chair), Jake Chatters, Rick Feldstein, Kimberly Flener, Stephen H. Nash and David Yamasaki. The group met twice by conference call in October and November, 2014, and once in person in March 2015.

Recommendations

The committee may consider recommending the following:

- 1. That the Judicial Council approve a process to allocate dependency court appointed counsel funds to the courts that is based on each court's funding need as calculated by the caseload funding model for juvenile dependency, and adjusted to available funding statewide.**

Court-appointed dependency counsel became a state fiscal responsibility in 1989 through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (SB 612/AB 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945), which added section 77003 to the Government Code, defined "court operations" in that section as including court-appointed dependency counsel, and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. In 1997 the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (AB 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) provided the funding for, and delineated the parameters of, the transition to state trial court funding that had been outlined in the

earlier legislation. In the transition to state funding, most trial court systems maintained the existing dependency counsel service delivery models of their respective counties.

In 2004 the Judicial Council and the American Humane Association conducted a time study of all dependency attorneys in California. From this study, a review of best practices, and input from attorneys, judicial officers, researchers, and others, the Council in 2007 set a workload standard of 188 cases per attorney when the attorney has access to a part-time (50%) investigator.

In 2007 the Judicial Council approved a methodology to calculate the funding required in a court to achieve the target attorney caseload of 188 cases per attorney¹. The methodology uses the number of children in foster care in the county, the regional salary averages for attorneys, and investigator and overhead costs to calculate a total funding need. Overall, the caseload funding model calculates a statewide need of \$137.1 million, \$33.4 million more than the base budget of \$103.7 million (see Attachment 1).

The \$103.7 million annual base funding for court appointed juvenile dependency counsel represents approximately 75 percent of the \$137.1 million need. Courts do not receive base funding for court appointed counsel in proportion to their dependency caseloads. Allocations for court appointed counsel are primarily based on the local level of spending when the service was still a county function. For that reason, individual court allocations vary widely when the court's juvenile dependency caseload is taken into account: 26 courts receive an allocation of more than 100 percent of their need, 16 courts receive an allocation ranging from 50 percent to 100 percent of their need, 14 courts receive an allocation of less than 50 percent of their need, and two courts do not receive an allocation.

The work group recommends that each court's allocation of court appointed dependency counsel funding be based on its need as calculated by the caseload funding model. Since funds do not exist to fully fund the total need, each court will receive an equal percentage of its funding need. The percentage will be the available funding statewide divided by the total need statewide, or 75.7 percent at this time.

- 2. That the new allocations be phased with annual increases or decreases in FY 2015-2016, FY 2016-2017, and FY 2017-2018, and that in FY 2018-2019 all courts will receive an equivalent percentage of their calculated need. The allocations should be phased in by basing each court's annual allocation on a percentage of its base**

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., DRAFT Pilot Program and Court-Appointed Counsel (October 26, 2007), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/102607itemF.pdf.

funding in FY 2014-2015, and a percentage of its calculated need in the current fiscal year; and the percentages should change annually as follows:

- a. FY 2015-2016: court receives 20% of need and 80% of base**
- b. FY 2016-2017: 40% of need and 60% of base**
- c. FY 2017-2018: 80% of need and 20% of base**
- d. FY 2018-2019: 100% of need.**

The work group reviewed four options for phasing in new allocations over time, shown below:

Option		FY 2015-2016	FY 2016-2017	FY 2017-2018	FY 2018-2019
1a.	% of need	20%	40%	60%	100%
	% of base	80%	60%	40%	0%
1b.	% of need	25%	50%	75%	100%
	% of base	75%	50%	25%	0%
2a.	% of need	33%	67%	100%	
	% of base	67%	33%	0%	
2b.	% of need	40%	70%	100%	
	% of base	60%	30%	0%	

Options 1a and 2a model reductions or increases in each of the first three years. Options 2a and 2b model reductions and increases in each of the first two years. The option recommended by the work group blends elements from the two-year and the three-year options by incorporating a rise to 80 percent of need in the third year.

See Attachment 2 for an estimate of how each court’s annual allocation would change over the four years. Since over a period of four years the foster care caseloads in each county are liable to change, this recommendation provides for a recalculation of need each year. The caseload funding model uses an average of the previous three years of available child welfare caseload data by county to reduce sharp annual fluctuations, especially in smaller courts.

- 3. That any court appointed dependency counsel funding that is estimated to remain unspent at the end of the year be reallocated by Judicial Council staff to courts with**

a funding need as early in the fiscal year as is possible, using the formula and method approved by the Judicial Council for this purpose on January 22, 2015².

- 4. That revenue received from the juvenile dependency counsel collections program continue to be allocated by Judicial Council staff to courts using the needs based methodology approved by the Judicial Council in August 2013³.**
- 5. That any state funds designated for court appointed dependency counsel in addition to the current \$103.7 million budget be allocated to courts with an allocation of less than 100 percent of need as calculated by the caseload funding model.**

The work group recommends that if new funds are provided for court appointed dependency counsel through the state budget process, they be allocated to courts with a funding need. This allocation should be made after the annual increase/reduction methodology described in recommendation 2 is applied. At that point, courts with less than 100 percent of caseload funding need will receive an allocation based on their proportion of unmet need, using the same methodology approved by the Judicial Council for the allocation of unspent funds (see recommendation 3). These funds will remain in each court's base funding and be part of the allocation process described in recommendation #2 in the following years. The goal remains that by FY 2018-2019, all courts will receive an allocation that is based 100 percent on need, whether or not the funding base increases.

- 6. That the Judicial Council staff develop a process to reimburse the smallest courts for unexpected caseload increases that includes reserving up to \$100,000 of the court appointed dependency counsel budget for that purpose and implementing guidelines and an application and reimbursement procedure.**

The work group recognized that for some of the smallest courts in the state, small workload fluctuations of an additional 3 to 5 families involved in dependency in the county can lead to an increase in court appointed counsel costs that the court's budget cannot absorb. The committee recommended that staff develop a program modeled on the Judicial Council program that reimburses small courts for approved expenses related to homicide trials⁴. Judicial Council staff estimates that 11 courts would fall into the

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed-Counsel Funding Reallocation* (January 22, 2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150122-itemJ.pdf.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines* (August 23, 2013), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemF.pdf.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., *Finance Memo TC 2005-007: Reimbursement of Extraordinary Costs of Homicide Trials* (October 5, 2005).

category of courts so small they would require reimbursement for unexpected costs and that \$50,000 – approximately 8 percent of these courts total current allocation – would be sufficient for this purpose.

- 7. That the Superior Court of California, Colusa County be provided with an allocation for court appointed dependency counsel equal to 75.7 percent of its calculated need.**

Colusa court contacted Judicial Council staff in FY 2014-2015 to inform them that Colusa County continued to fund court appointed dependency counsel after most courts transitioned to state funding, but had told the court that this funding would cease in FY 2015-2016. Colusa has an annual funding need calculated through the caseload funding model of \$50,570. The work group recommends that Colusa be funded at 75.7 percent of its need, or the funding it would receive when all courts reach parity in FY 2018-2019.

- 8. That a joint working group of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be established to review the caseload funding model for court appointed dependency counsel and include in its review the following issues:**

- a. Whether attorney salaries should continue to be based on an average salary by region, or whether another method should be used such as an individual county index of salaries;**
- b. Whether the attorney salaries used in the model should be updated;**
- c. Whether the calculation for benefits costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed;**
- d. Whether the calculation for overhead costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed;**
- e. Whether the state child welfare data reported through U.C. Berkeley accurately represents court-supervised juvenile dependency cases in each county, or whether court filings data or another source of data be used;**
- f. Whether the ratio used to estimate parent clients in the model is accurate or if it should be changed.**

The work group focused solely on topics of allocating court appointed dependency counsel funding. However, in its review of the estimates of need generated by the current caseload funding model, a number of issues about the assumptions of the model were raised which the work group recommends be addressed by a joint working group with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. The model was developed between 2005 and 2007, and many of the financial assumptions could be usefully revisited. At the same time, the group strongly recommends that changes to the model continue to be based on

state level metrics for benefits and overhead costs, and that the joint working group carefully consider the impact of changes in the model on the four year reallocation process recommended in this report.

Dependency Counsel Funding

Statewide Implementation Costs			
Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need	FY 2014-2015 Base CAC Funding Level	Base/CFM
Alameda	\$3,450,970.68	\$4,171,032.46	120.9%
Alpine*	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Amador	\$85,336.77	\$120,146.93	140.8%
Butte	\$833,636.96	\$664,759.00	79.7%
Calaveras	\$226,026.98	\$76,519.00	33.9%
Colusa†	\$50,569.89	\$0.00	0.0%
Contra Costa	\$2,716,647.74	\$3,120,151.00	114.9%
Del Norte	\$168,566.70	\$223,089.81	132.3%
El Dorado	\$614,078.75	\$819,764.99	133.5%
Fresno	\$2,937,650.85	\$2,958,296.00	100.7%
Glenn	\$166,060.64	\$55,250.00	33.3%
Humboldt	\$458,193.85	\$562,460.00	122.8%
Imperial	\$545,032.34	\$607,371.00	111.4%
Inyo	\$34,019.37	\$76,990.00	226.3%
Kern	\$3,108,447.52	\$2,023,943.00	65.1%
Kings	\$686,524.56	\$199,672.35	29.1%
Lake	\$239,288.90	\$307,076.27	128.3%
Lassen	\$115,953.18	\$108,374.00	93.5%
Los Angeles	\$57,151,311.87	\$32,782,704.00	57.4%
Madera	\$586,978.22	\$53,030.50	9.0%
Marin	\$247,454.02	\$408,418.72	165.0%
Mariposa	\$51,591.50	\$32,243.00	62.5%
Mendocino	\$518,939.79	\$742,022.00	143.0%
Merced	\$1,064,521.71	\$593,861.37	55.8%
Modoc	\$20,432.28	\$16,064.00	78.6%
Mono	\$17,874.58	\$12,329.00	69.0%
Monterey	\$667,373.42	\$329,570.00	49.4%
Napa	\$294,546.52	\$176,430.00	59.9%
Nevada	\$202,963.00	\$232,799.00	114.7%
Orange	\$6,056,115.22	\$6,583,082.00	108.7%
Placer	\$743,663.62	\$418,422.00	56.3%
Plumas	\$82,240.12	\$163,290.96	198.6%
Riverside	\$10,235,491.48	\$4,171,897.50	40.8%
Sacramento	\$4,443,854.42	\$5,378,189.72	121.0%
San Benito	\$209,882.19	\$31,884.50	15.2%
San Bernardino	\$7,983,595.68	\$3,587,297.00	44.9%
San Diego	\$7,678,774.64	\$9,749,950.36	127.0%
San Francisco	\$2,951,118.03	\$3,907,633.00	132.4%
San Joaquin	\$2,542,228.38	\$3,081,900.92	121.2%
San Luis Obispo	\$781,869.29	\$707,000.04	90.4%
San Mateo	\$1,050,915.74	\$323,021.73	30.7%
Santa Barbara	\$1,318,162.00	\$1,610,017.00	122.1%
Santa Clara	\$3,340,629.23	\$4,700,130.81	140.7%
Santa Cruz	\$703,196.64	\$894,764.81	127.2%
Shasta	\$940,395.62	\$569,416.00	60.6%
Sierra	\$3,575.65	\$14,898.00	416.7%
Siskiyou	\$173,163.56	\$256,552.00	148.2%
Solano	\$847,816.33	\$896,319.14	105.7%
Sonoma	\$1,274,378.06	\$1,150,195.00	90.3%
Stanislaus	\$1,100,152.36	\$1,130,985.52	102.8%
Sutter	\$272,154.93	\$84,082.75	30.9%
Tehama	\$313,635.48	\$93,909.01	29.9%
Trinity	\$119,528.83	\$83,204.00	69.6%
Tulare	\$1,598,825.80	\$658,892.25	41.2%
Tuolumne	\$210,458.79	\$63,980.75	30.4%
Ventura	\$2,010,744.36	\$755,357.00	37.6%
Yolo	\$565,644.04	\$333,430.00	58.9%
Yuba	\$264,659.14	\$199,732.00	75.5%
Unallocated		\$651,641.31	
Total	\$137,077,862.19	\$103,725,444.48	

Four-Year Reallocation Recommendation: 20%-40%-80%-100%								
Court	CFM Estimated Funding Need	FY 2014-2015 Base CAC Funding Level	Base/CFM	Court at 75.7% need	FY 2015-2016: Total	FY 2016-2017: Total	FY 2017-2018: Total	FY 2018-2019 allocated by need
	Total need	Total base			Total 20% need	Total 40% need	Total 80% need	Total 100% need
	\$137,077,862	\$103,725,444						
Alameda	\$3,450,970.68	\$4,171,032.46	120.9%	2,611,315	3,880,185	3,562,967	2,928,532	2,611,315
Alpine*	\$0.00	\$0.00		0	0	0	0	0
Amador	\$85,336.77	\$120,146.93	140.8%	64,573	109,640	98,373	75,840	64,573
Butte	\$833,636.96	\$664,759.00	79.7%	630,805	661,330	653,699	638,436	630,805
Calaveras	\$226,026.98	\$76,519.00	33.9%	171,032	95,809	114,615	152,226	171,032
Colusa†	\$50,569.89	\$0.00	0.0%	38,266	7,653	15,306	30,613	38,266
Contra Costa	\$2,716,647.74	\$3,120,151.00	114.9%	2,055,660	2,923,033	2,706,190	2,272,503	2,055,660
Del Norte	\$168,566.70	\$223,089.81	132.3%	127,553	205,111	185,721	146,942	127,553
El Dorado	\$614,078.75	\$819,764.99	133.5%	464,667	752,892	680,835	536,723	464,667
Fresno	\$2,937,650.85	\$2,958,296.00	100.7%	2,222,891	2,826,177	2,675,356	2,373,712	2,222,891
Glenn	\$166,060.64	\$55,250.00	33.3%	125,656	69,611	83,622	111,645	125,656
Humboldt	\$458,193.85	\$562,460.00	122.8%	346,711	522,155	478,294	390,572	346,711
Imperial	\$545,032.34	\$607,371.00	111.4%	412,421	571,453	531,695	452,179	412,421
Inyo	\$34,019.37	\$76,990.00	226.3%	25,742	67,130	56,783	36,089	25,742
Kern	\$3,108,447.52	\$2,023,943.00	65.1%	2,352,131	2,099,817	2,162,896	2,289,053	2,352,131
Kings	\$686,524.56	\$199,672.35	29.1%	519,486	264,645	328,355	455,776	519,486
Lake	\$239,288.90	\$307,076.27	128.3%	181,068	283,428	257,838	206,658	181,068
Lassen	\$115,953.18	\$108,374.00	93.5%	87,741	104,795	100,532	92,004	87,741
Los Angeles	\$57,151,311.87	\$32,782,704.00	57.4%	43,245,825	35,041,132	37,092,305	41,194,652	43,245,825
Madera	\$586,978.22	\$53,030.50	9.0%	444,161	131,525	209,684	366,002	444,161
Marin	\$247,454.02	\$408,418.72	165.0%	187,246	366,250	321,499	231,997	187,246
Mariposa	\$51,591.50	\$32,243.00	62.5%	39,039	33,765	35,084	37,720	39,039
Mendocino	\$518,939.79	\$742,022.00	143.0%	392,677	675,906	605,098	463,484	392,677
Merced	\$1,064,521.71	\$593,861.37	55.8%	805,513	639,195	680,775	763,933	805,513
Modoc	\$20,432.28	\$16,064.00	78.6%	15,461	16,025	15,884	15,602	15,461
Mono	\$17,874.58	\$12,329.00	69.0%	13,526	12,631	12,854	13,302	13,526
Monterey	\$667,373.42	\$329,570.00	49.4%	504,995	366,322	400,990	470,327	504,995
Napa	\$294,546.52	\$176,430.00	59.9%	222,880	186,612	195,679	213,813	222,880
Nevada	\$202,963.00	\$232,799.00	114.7%	153,580	218,133	201,994	169,718	153,580
Orange	\$6,056,115.22	\$6,583,082.00	108.7%	4,582,602	6,216,281	5,807,861	4,991,021	4,582,602
Placer	\$743,663.62	\$418,422.00	56.3%	562,723	449,398	477,729	534,392	562,723
Plumas	\$82,240.12	\$163,290.96	198.6%	62,230	143,905	123,486	82,649	62,230
Riverside	\$10,235,491.48	\$4,171,897.50	40.8%	7,745,094	4,907,637	5,617,001	7,035,730	7,745,094
Sacramento	\$4,443,854.42	\$5,378,189.72	121.0%	3,362,620	5,002,277	4,592,363	3,772,534	3,362,620
San Benito	\$209,882.19	\$31,884.50	15.2%	158,816	57,432	82,778	133,470	158,816
San Bernardino	\$7,983,595.68	\$3,587,297.00	44.9%	6,041,107	4,096,202	4,582,428	5,554,881	6,041,107
San Diego	\$7,678,774.64	\$9,749,950.36	127.0%	5,810,452	9,011,363	8,211,135	6,610,679	5,810,452
San Francisco	\$2,951,118.03	\$3,907,633.00	132.4%	2,233,081	3,592,486	3,252,635	2,572,933	2,233,081
San Joaquin	\$2,542,228.38	\$3,081,900.92	121.2%	1,923,679	2,865,844	2,630,302	2,159,220	1,923,679
San Luis Obispo	\$781,869.29	\$707,000.04	90.4%	591,633	687,502	663,535	615,600	591,633
San Mateo	\$1,050,915.74	\$323,021.73	30.7%	795,217	419,095	513,125	701,187	795,217
Santa Barbara	\$1,318,162.00	\$1,610,017.00	122.1%	997,440	1,495,645	1,371,093	1,121,991	997,440
Santa Clara	\$3,340,629.23	\$4,700,130.81	140.7%	2,527,821	4,289,440	3,849,036	2,968,226	2,527,821
Santa Cruz	\$703,196.64	\$894,764.81	127.2%	532,102	826,758	753,094	605,766	532,102
Shasta	\$940,395.62	\$569,416.00	60.6%	711,588	600,730	628,445	683,874	711,588
Sierra	\$3,575.65	\$14,898.00	416.7%	2,706	12,535	10,078	5,163	2,706
Siskiyou	\$173,163.56	\$256,552.00	148.2%	131,031	232,745	207,317	156,460	131,031
Solano	\$847,816.33	\$896,319.14	105.7%	641,534	849,895	797,805	693,624	641,534
Sonoma	\$1,274,378.06	\$1,150,195.00	90.3%	964,309	1,118,835	1,080,204	1,002,941	964,309
Stanislaus	\$1,100,152.36	\$1,130,985.52	102.8%	832,474	1,077,003	1,015,871	893,607	832,474
Sutter	\$272,154.93	\$84,082.75	30.9%	205,937	108,879	133,143	181,672	205,937
Tehama	\$313,635.48	\$93,909.01	29.9%	237,325	123,067	151,632	208,760	237,325
Trinity	\$119,528.83	\$83,204.00	69.6%	90,446	85,073	86,417	89,103	90,446
Tulare	\$1,598,825.80	\$658,892.25	41.2%	1,209,815	772,409	881,761	1,100,464	1,209,815
Tuolumne	\$210,458.79	\$63,980.75	30.4%	159,252	83,359	102,332	140,279	159,252
Ventura	\$2,010,744.36	\$755,357.00	37.6%	1,521,510	912,408	1,064,683	1,369,235	1,521,510
Yolo	\$565,644.04	\$333,430.00	58.9%	428,017	354,034	372,530	409,521	428,017
Yuba	\$264,659.14	\$199,732.00	75.5%	200,265	200,849	200,703	200,411	200,265
Unallocated		\$651,641.31						
Total	\$137,077,862.19	\$103,725,444.48		103,725,444	103,725,444	103,725,444	103,725,444	103,725,444

Item 5
Amendments to the Statute Requiring a 2 Percent Reserve Held in the TCTF
(Action Item)

Issue

Should Government Code section 68502.5, the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve, be changed for 2015–2016? If so, what should the amendments be?

Background

On June 27, 2012, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 1021, which repealed the provisions in Government Code section 77209 related to urgent needs funding from the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF) and added Government Code section 68502.5, which requires that the Judicial Council set aside as a reserve an amount equal to 2 percent of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) appropriation in Program 45.10. In response to this new statute, the Judicial Council, at its August 31, 2012 meeting, approved the current policy with regard to the process, criteria, and required information for requesting supplemental funding from the reserve. This process modified what was approved by the council at its October 28, 2011 meeting as it related to requests for supplemental funding for urgent needs from the TCIF.

At the June 3, 2014 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting, Judge Earl appointed Michael Planet to head a 2 Percent Reserve Process Working Group with the goal of bringing options for possible changes back to the TCBAC. The other members of the working group are: Judge Laurie Earl, Presiding Judge Mark Cope, Presiding Judge Barry Goode, Mike Roddy, Sherri Carter, Mary Beth Todd, David Yamasaki, and Zlatko Theodorovic.

The TCBAC discussed options and recommendations at its July 7, 2014 meeting, brought forward by the 2 Percent Methodology Working Group to change the current Judicial Council–approved process for the allocation of the 2 percent state-level reserve in the TCTF. At the council’s business meeting on July 29, 2014, the committee recommended that the Judicial Council make changes to the 2 percent allocation process including the repeal of Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), which establishes the state-level reserve. The Judicial Council deferred the TCBAC recommendations presented for changes to the process for the allocation of the 2 percent state-level reserve until their October meeting, and requested the TCBAC work with other advisory bodies to provide further input to the council on the issues and recommendations presented in those items.

At the TCBAC meeting on September 26, the committee discussed options and recommendations for changes to the supplemental funding process from the 2 percent reserve, all of which originated from its working group, to be presented at the Judicial Council’s October 28 business meeting. The TCBAC recommended changes to expedite the distribution of the unexpended reserve funds to trial courts earlier in the fiscal year, and to establish a process for courts to apply for funding for emergencies after these funds have

been distributed. For 2015–2016, the TCBAC recommended proposing amendments to the statute that establishes the 2 percent state-level. The Judicial Council approved the following recommendations at its October 28, 2014, business meeting¹:

- 1) Starting in 2014–2015, approved the distribution in January, after the Judicial Council’s December business meeting, of 75 percent of the remaining Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) 2 percent reserve funds. From January 1 through March 15, the remaining 25 percent of the 2 percent reserve are available for court requests due to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses. These court requests are to be reviewed and recommended to the Judicial Council by a TCBAC working group. Any remaining funds are to be distributed back to the trial courts after March 15. The Judicial Council’s current approved supplemental funding process is to be updated by staff to reflect these changes.
- 2) Directed that court requests due to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses approved after March 15 and until June 30 be distributed to the court as a cash advance loan until the following fiscal year when the court, if necessary, could apply for supplemental funding from the TCTF 2 percent reserve at the Judicial Council’s October business meeting in order to repay the cash advance loan. These court requests are to be reviewed and recommended to the Judicial Council.
- 3) Directed the TCBAC, working with the Court Executive Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, and the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, to recommend proposed amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve, to be included as trailer bill language to the 2015 Budget Act. These recommended amendments are to be presented at the Judicial Council’s business meeting in either January or February 2015.

The 2 Percent Methodology Working Group met on November 20 and December 17, 2014, to consider options for amendments to the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve statute. Each option reviewed, along with a description of the option, is provided below.

Options for Amendments to the Statute that Establishes the 2 Percent Reserve

Option 1: Review the approved changes to the process for the allocation of the 2 percent state-level reserve by the Judicial Council at its October 28, 2014 meeting, in one year, prior to proposing any amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), which establishes the reserve.

¹ <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemM.pdf>

Option 2: The Judicial Council would set-aside one-half of one percent instead of the current two-percent, of the total funds appropriated in TCTF Program 45.10 of the annual Budget Act. This one-half of one percent is based on a historical percentage that was set aside for urgent needs in the Trial Court Improvement Fund. (Government Code section 77209 was repealed and replaced with the current statute.)

Option 2 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

“Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall set aside ~~2~~ .5 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund....”

Option 3: The Judicial Council would determine the amount of the emergency reserve to be set aside annually and the process for managing the funds. The council might consider a percentage or flat amount based on prior years experience, or historical trends based on requests made for prior emergency set asides process. It also gives the council the discretion to determine the process and timing for courts to apply for emergency funding, and for distributing any unexpended funds.

Option 3 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

“Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall establish a percentage or amount to be set aside ~~2 percent~~ of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund...~~Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.~~”

Option 4: The Judicial Council would establish a percentage and/or amount to be set aside for an emergency reserve from the total funds appropriated in TCTF Program 45.10 of the annual Budget Act. This emergency reserve fund would be allocated directly from the TCTF. For this reason, there would be no need to return the monies to the trial courts. If emergency monies were unspent during the fiscal year, the amount in the fund would roll over. The result would be to reduce any additional amount set aside for emergency funding in the subsequent fiscal year and therefore increase the funding available for allocations to the trial courts. This would replace the current model of allocating the funds, then reducing the allocation and then returning the allocation to the courts.

Option 4 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

~~“Prior to Upon the preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall establish a percentage or amount to be set aside 2 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund. . . . Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.”~~

Option 5: The Judicial Council would set-aside no more than one-half of one percent instead of the current two percent, of the total funds appropriated in TCTF Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the 2014 Budget Act. This option also would give the council discretion to determine the process and timing for courts to apply for emergency funding. The emergency reserve set-aside would be capped at no more than \$9.5 million and would remain in the TCTF. Any unspent funds by the end of each fiscal year would be rolled over to the next fiscal year.

Option 5 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

~~“Prior to Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall set aside no more than .5 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual-2014 Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund. . . . Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.”~~

Recommendation

The working group recommends Option 5. The working group chose this option because it applies the historical percentage that was set aside for urgent needs in the Trial Court Improvement Fund, caps the amount at the 2014–2015 TCTF appropriation level in order to eliminate annual allocation adjustments, and gives the Judicial Council discretion to determine the process and timing for courts to apply for emergency funding.

Item 4
Allocation of Benefits Funding for 2015-2016
(Action Item)

Issue

How should the return of \$10.8 million included in the 2015 Governor's Budget for trial courts that have now made progress towards meeting the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 standard (PEPRA) be allocated?

Background

2014–2015 Trial Court Benefits Funding

In Fall of 2013, a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) in the amount of \$64.8 million was submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) to address the ongoing cost of the retirement, employee health, and retiree health cost changes that occurred in FY 2012–2013 and the full year impact of those benefit cost changes that had or were anticipated to occur in FY 2013–2014. The 2014 Budget Act included an augmentation of \$42.8 million specifically for the benefit cost changes in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014, which took into account a reduction in the amount of \$22 million, based on the DOF estimate of what the trial courts were currently spending to cover the employee share of cost for retirement. Judicial Council staff disagreed with this calculation and provided their own calculation to the DOF before the May Revision to the Governor's Budget, but the adjusted calculation was not taken into consideration in the augmentation.

Because the level of funding provided was insufficient to fully fund the courts' total benefit cost changes, a working group of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) was formed to review the issue and present options for allocation of the funding to the full TCBAC. During the period in which the working group was meeting, the 2013–2014 benefit premiums and employer share amounts for all courts were finalized. This resulted in an overall funding need of \$63.9 million (\$61.3 million for non-interpreter staff and \$2.6 million for interpreter staff).

At the July 7 TCBAC meeting, Judge Earl, chair of the TCBAC, advised committee members that the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the TCBAC would consider the issue of determining benefits funding needs based on the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) in the fall for 2015–2016. The TCBAC reviewed the allocation options presented by the working group and voted to recommend prorating the \$42.8 million in new funding to the courts based on each court's percentage of the total funding need of \$63.9 million. This option would result in all courts receiving approximately 67 percent of their total funding need. The TCBAC made this recommendation to the Judicial Council at its July 29, 2014 meeting. The council approved allocating the new benefits funding by prorating \$41.0 million (non-interpreters) to the trial courts based on each court's percentage of the total 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost change of \$61.3 million (non-interpreters). Staff was to coordinate with

the DOF to augment the TCTF Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters) appropriation with the remaining \$1.8 million in new benefits funding for court interpreter benefits.

2015–2016 Trial Court Benefits Funding

The DOF developed a new process for obtaining future augmentations for trial court benefits cost increases starting in 2015–2016. The funding for trial court benefits would be provided for full-year cost increases for employee health, retiree health, and retirement. For example, the ongoing funding for benefits increases that occur in 2014–2015 would be provided in 2015–2016. The Governor’s Budget proposal in January will identify a funding estimate based on confirmed and unconfirmed rates for trial court benefits increases. The May Revision to the Governor’s Budget proposal will identify the final amount of funding for trial court benefits cost increases for the budget year. If the final benefits costs for some courts are still unknown at the time of the May Revision, and later there are changes when costs are finalized, the adjustments will be incorporated during the following year’s benefits cost change process submission to the DOF.

Retirement cost adjustments would be considered by the DOF for courts that negotiated a change in the employer subsidies of employee retirement contributions during the prior year, which was 2013–2014 for this year’s request. As mentioned before, the DOF reduced the statewide benefits augmentation in the Budget Act of 2014 to account for what it calculated as the savings courts could have realized if they did not subsidize the employee retirement contribution. Some courts indicated that they had made changes during 2013–2014, reducing or eliminating the amount of the subsidy they provided to their employees. This consideration would be the opportunity to make adjustments to this funding reduction.

On October 9, 2014, Judicial Council of California (JCC) staff submitted to the DOF for inclusion in the 2015–2016 Governor’s Budget, a funding request of \$31.9 million for 2014–2015 trial court benefits full-year cost increases for employee health, retiree health, and retirement. The request included confirmed and unconfirmed estimated benefits costs that were obtained from trial courts by staff. In addition, a request for a \$2.4 million adjustment to the \$22 million reduction based on the DOF estimate of what the trial courts were currently spending to cover the employee share of cost for retirement was included. The \$2.4 million included amounts for courts that negotiated a change in the employer subsidies of employee retirement contributions during 2013–2014 and provided the actual costs to subsidize from 2013–2014 in order to correct for errors in the DOF’s \$22 million estimate.

After submission of the request, JCC staff discussed the slow process of adjusting the \$22 million with the DOF and asked them to consider all current year (2014–2015) negotiated changes to the employer paid employee’s share of retirement as full-year adjustments to the \$22 million for the 2015–2016 trial court benefits funding augmentation. The DOF gave JCC staff one week to submit all known negotiated changes and agreed to review the information with no

guarantee of accepting it. Staff gathered information from the trial courts for specific negotiated changes and calculated the adjustment to be an additional \$8.4 million to the already previously determined adjustment of \$2.4 million, for a total of \$10.8 million. This information was provided to the DOF on Friday, October 17, 2014. When the Governor's Budget proposal was released on January 9, 2015, it included the \$10.8 million in funding for trial courts that made progress towards meeting the PEPR standard.

2015–2016 Allocation of \$10.8 Million Retirement Subsidy Adjustment

At the September 9, 2014 TCBAC meeting, Judge Earl announced that she had appointed Chris Volkers to head a TCBAC working group to look at addressing retirement cost issues and whether the employer paid portion of employee retirement costs should be addressed in WAFM. The other members of the working group are: Judge Borris, Judge Walsh, Rick Feldstein, Shawn Landry, and Mary Beth Todd.

The Benefits Group met on November 4, 2014 and January 14, 2015 to consider options to address whether the employer paid portion of employee retirement costs should be addressed in WAFM. At the working group's first meeting, it was decided that no options would be considered until the 2015 Governor's Budget is released in January 2015 to see if there was to be any return of the \$22 million for courts that had negotiated a change in the portion paid of the employee retirement share. At the group's January meeting, the members considered options for the allocation of the \$10.4 million for non-interpreters augmentation to the TCTF Program 45.10 Court Operations Program included in the Governor's Budget. The remaining \$400,000 is to augment the TCTF Court Interpreter Program 45.45 which is allocated by region and not by individual trial court. The working group decided that since there appeared to be a significant number of courts negotiating reductions to the employer paid retirement subsidy there was no reason at this time for employee retirement cost issues to be addressed in WAFM. In addition, since an updated benefits request was to be submitted in mid-February 2015 which would reflect final confirmed benefits costs, it was decided by the working group that if there were changes to the subsidy amounts the approved option could be updated after the release of the May Revise. Each option reviewed, along with a description of the option, is provided in the Allocation Option section below.

2015–2016 Spring Benefits Updated Request

Since the working group met in January 2015, the Judicial Council staff submitted a Spring benefits updated request on February 18, 2015, which reflects final confirmed benefits costs (to the extent possible) of \$25.4 million. Included in the request is an adjustment for any courts' reported negotiated changes that occurred in the months since the submission in early October 2014 and is estimated to be \$2.6 million in addition to the previous adjustment of \$10.8 million for a total of \$13.4 million (\$13.3 million non-interpreters and \$100,000 for interpreters). The 2015–2016 benefits request for inclusion in the May Revise totals \$38.8 million. The \$3.9 million decrease from the 2015 Governor's Budget amount of \$42.7 million is attributed to

health and retiree health premiums coming in lower than was estimated by courts at the time of the submission of the October 2014 request.

Allocation Options

All options below exclude interpreters. The total amount is \$10.4 million for non-interpreters.

Option 1

Allocate 100% pro-rata to all courts.

- All courts are funded at 84% of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.

Option 2

Allocate 100% pro-rata to courts that provide no employee retirement subsidy.

- Courts that do not subsidize the employee share of costs for retirement would receive 95% of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.
- Courts that do subsidize the employee share of costs for retirement would continue to receive 67% of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.

Option 3

Allocate 50% to all courts and an additional 50% to courts that provide no employee retirement subsidy in 2015–2016. This 50/50 methodology would be done on a one-time basis for 2015–2016. Beginning in 2016–2017, courts that continue to provide employee retirement subsidies would not share in an allocation for any funding provided from trial court's that made progress towards meeting the PEPRA standard.

- Courts that do not subsidize the employee share of costs for retirement would receive 90% of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.
- Courts that do subsidize the employee share of costs for retirement would receive 75% of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.

Note, Option 3 is the recommended allocation methodology by the Benefits Working Group and has been calculated to reflect the recently submitted Spring benefits updated request for inclusion in the 2015 May Revise in Attachment 2 as information only.

Option 4

Allocate 75% to all courts and an additional 25% to courts that provide no employee retirement subsidy. In 2016–2017 any funding for trial court's that made progress toward meeting the PEPRA standard would be allocated 50% to all courts and 50% to those courts that do not provide a subsidy. Beginning in 2017–2018 courts that continue to provide employee retirement subsidies would not share in an allocation for any funding for trial court's that made progress toward meeting the PEPRA standard.

- Courts that do not subsidize the employee share of costs for retirement would receive 87% of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.
- Courts that do subsidize the employee share of costs for retirement would receive 80% of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.

Recommendation

The Benefits Working Group recommends that the TCBAC make a recommendation to the Judicial Council at its April 17, 2015 meeting that the trial courts employee benefits funding contained in the Budget Act of 2014 be allocated using Option 3. The working group decided not to recommend to pro-rate the \$10.4 million retirement subsidy adjustment (Option 1), because courts that do not subsidize any portion of the employee retirement share should not be penalized by receiving a lower allocation of the funding in order to provide a higher amount of funding to those courts that do subsidize. However, members recognized that allocating 100% of \$10.4 million (Option 2) only to courts that do not subsidize would unfairly penalize courts with long-standing contracts that include payment of a portion of the employee share of retirement and will take time to work with the unions to reduce the subsidy to the employees. Option 3, the working group's recommendation, allows courts that do not subsidize to have 15% more of their benefit cost increases from 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 funded than courts that subsidize but also allows some funding to be allocated in 2015–2016 to courts that provide a subsidy to give them one additional year to negotiate. Doing a phased-in approach in Option 4 gives two-years to courts that provide employee retirement subsidies with long-standing contracts to work with the unions to reduce the subsidy. On the other hand, because Option 4 would give courts that do not subsidize only 7% more in funding than courts that subsidize employee retirement and take a longer time period for them to recoup their unfunded benefit cost increases from 2012–2013 and 2013–2014, the working group members decided not to recommend this option.

Option 1 - Allocation 100% Pro-Rata to All Courts of \$10.4 Million (Excludes Interpreters)

	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Benefit Cost Increases	DOF 2013- 2014 Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Governor's Budget - Restored Employee Retirement Subsidy	\$11.04 Million DOF Remaining Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Allocate 100% Pro-Rata to All Courts	Total Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014	Total Allocation with \$10.4 Million	Percentage Funded of 2012-13 and 2013-14 Benefit Cost Increases
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Alameda	2,404,882	-	-	-	407,224	1,609,137	2,016,361	84%
Alpine	9,334	-	-	-	1,581	6,245	7,826	84%
Amador	35,611	112,195	112,195	-	6,030	23,828	29,858	84%
Butte	236,868	159,578	708	158,870	40,109	158,491	198,601	84%
Calaveras	68,405	115,529	61,698	53,831	11,583	45,771	57,354	84%
Colusa	23,919	51,247	36,605	14,642	4,050	16,004	20,054	84%
Contra Costa	1,524,425	605,358	-	605,358	258,135	1,020,012	1,278,147	84%
Del Norte	68,299	114,094	114,094	-	11,565	45,700	57,265	84%
El Dorado	28,321	-	-	-	4,796	18,950	23,745	84%
Fresno	1,379,806	-	-	-	233,646	923,246	1,156,892	84%
Glenn	35,960	74,491	43,198	31,294	6,089	24,061	30,151	84%
Humboldt	205,112	-	-	-	34,732	137,243	171,975	84%
Imperial	305,765	-	-	-	51,776	204,591	256,367	84%
Inyo	48,932	69,346	29,720	39,626	8,286	32,741	41,027	84%
Kern	824,430	579,495	(924)	580,419	139,603	551,636	691,239	84%
Kings	33,089	-	-	-	5,603	22,140	27,743	84%
Lake	4,780	102,976	102,976	-	809	3,199	4,008	84%
Lassen	8,339	51,826	37,019	14,807	1,412	5,580	6,992	84%
Los Angeles	18,086,349	-	-	-	3,062,605	12,101,803	15,164,408	84%
Madera	67,969	-	-	-	11,509	45,479	56,988	84%
Marin	535,883	314,528	113,299	201,229	90,742	358,566	449,309	84%
Mariposa	5,321	39,738	(398)	40,136	901	3,560	4,461	84%
Mendocino	351,518	-	-	-	59,523	235,205	294,729	84%
Merced	463,597	-	-	-	78,502	310,199	388,701	84%
Modoc	5,296	38,111	38,111	-	897	3,544	4,441	84%
Mono	16,922	-	-	-	2,865	11,323	14,188	84%
Monterey	395,286	-	-	-	66,935	264,491	331,426	84%
Napa	271,633	8,425	-	8,425	45,996	181,753	227,749	84%
Nevada	179,790	210,404	210,404	-	30,444	120,300	150,744	84%
Orange	8,646,423	-	(37,077)	37,077	1,464,120	5,785,430	7,249,550	84%
Placer	425,144	-	-	-	71,991	284,469	356,460	84%
Plumas	8,989	-	(11,577)	11,577	1,522	6,015	7,537	84%
Riverside	2,455,806	3,598,767	830,572	2,768,195	415,848	1,643,210	2,059,058	84%
Sacramento	3,433,576	-	-	-	581,416	2,297,449	2,878,865	84%
San Benito	25,173	44,351	44,351	-	4,263	16,844	21,106	84%
San Bernardino	1,993,070	3,412,861	3,412,861	-	337,491	1,333,588	1,671,079	84%
San Diego	6,159,623	6,898,465	2,317,736	4,580,729	1,043,024	4,121,481	5,164,505	84%
San Francisco	2,235,743	-	-	-	378,584	1,495,964	1,874,547	84%
San Joaquin	800,849	-	-	-	135,610	535,858	671,468	84%
San Luis Obispo	182,698	776,914	(93,422)	870,337	30,937	122,246	153,182	84%
San Mateo	901,455	409,182	-	409,182	152,646	603,175	755,820	84%
Santa Barbara	182,310	-	-	-	30,871	121,986	152,857	84%
Santa Clara	1,233,654	2,746,214	2,664,335	81,879	208,898	825,453	1,034,351	84%
Santa Cruz	230,629	10,638	-	10,638	39,053	154,317	193,370	84%
Shasta	274,996	32,504	6,174	26,330	46,566	184,003	230,569	84%
Sierra	13,363	17,744	8,872	8,872	2,263	8,941	11,204	84%
Siskiyou	88,816	2,660	2,660	-	15,039	59,428	74,467	84%
Solano	743,044	508,096	238,925	269,171	125,821	497,180	623,001	84%
Sonoma	921,983	-	-	-	156,122	616,911	773,032	84%
Stanislaus	1,223,925	-	-	-	207,250	818,944	1,026,194	84%
Sutter	107,922	135,520	80,739	54,781	18,275	72,212	90,487	84%
Tehama	37,162	-	-	-	6,293	24,866	31,158	84%
Trinity	29,858	-	-	-	5,056	19,978	25,034	84%
Tulare	154,445	-	-	-	26,152	103,341	129,493	84%
Tuolumne	28,768	-	-	-	4,871	19,249	24,120	84%
Ventura	810,216	-	-	-	137,196	542,126	679,321	84%
Yolo	251,806	184,712	20,671	164,041	42,639	168,486	211,125	84%
Yuba	98,968	-	-	-	16,758	66,221	82,979	84%
Total	61,326,254	21,425,970	10,384,524	11,041,446	10,384,524	41,034,166	51,418,690	84%

Option 2 - Allocation 100% Pro-Rata to Courts With No Retirement Subsidy of \$10.4 Million (Excludes Interpreters)

	2012-2013 and 2013- 2014 Benefit Cost Increases	DOF 2013-2014 Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Governor's Budget - Restored Employee Retirement Subsidy	\$11.04 Million DOF Remaining Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Allocate 100% Pro-Rata to Courts with No Retirement Subsidy	Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014	Total Allocation with \$10.4 Million	Percentage Funded of 2012-13 and 2013-14 Benefit Cost Increases
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Alameda	2,404,882	-	-	-	683,613	1,609,137	2,292,749	95%
Alpine	9,334	-	-	-	2,653	6,245	8,899	95%
Amador	35,611	112,195	112,195	-	10,123	23,828	33,951	95%
Butte	236,868	159,578	708	158,870	-	158,491	158,491	67%
Calaveras	68,405	115,529	61,698	53,831	-	45,771	45,771	67%
Colusa	23,919	51,247	36,605	14,642	-	16,004	16,004	67%
Contra Costa	1,524,425	605,358	-	605,358	-	1,020,012	1,020,012	67%
Del Norte	68,299	114,094	114,094	-	19,415	45,700	65,115	95%
El Dorado	28,321	-	-	-	8,050	18,950	27,000	95%
Fresno	1,379,806	-	-	-	392,224	923,246	1,315,470	95%
Glenn	35,960	74,491	43,198	31,294	-	24,061	24,061	67%
Humboldt	205,112	-	-	-	58,305	137,243	195,548	95%
Imperial	305,765	-	-	-	86,917	204,591	291,508	95%
Inyo	48,932	69,346	29,720	39,626	-	32,741	32,741	67%
Kern	824,430	579,495	(924)	580,419	-	551,636	551,636	67%
Kings	33,089	-	-	-	9,406	22,140	31,546	95%
Lake	4,780	102,976	102,976	-	1,359	3,199	4,558	95%
Lassen	8,339	51,826	37,019	14,807	-	5,580	5,580	67%
Los Angeles	18,086,349	-	-	-	5,141,232	12,101,803	17,243,035	95%
Madera	67,969	-	-	-	19,321	45,479	64,800	95%
Marin	535,883	314,528	113,299	201,229	-	358,566	358,566	67%
Mariposa	5,321	39,738	(398)	40,136	-	3,560	3,560	67%
Mendocino	351,518	-	-	-	99,923	235,205	335,128	95%
Merced	463,597	-	-	-	131,782	310,199	441,981	95%
Modoc	5,296	38,111	38,111	-	1,506	3,544	5,049	95%
Mono	16,922	-	-	-	4,810	11,323	16,133	95%
Monterey	395,286	-	-	-	112,364	264,491	376,855	95%
Napa	271,633	8,425	-	8,425	-	181,753	181,753	67%
Nevada	179,790	210,404	210,404	-	51,107	120,300	171,407	95%
Orange	8,646,423	-	(37,077)	37,077	-	5,785,430	5,785,430	67%
Placer	425,144	-	-	-	120,851	284,469	405,320	95%
Plumas	8,989	-	(11,577)	11,577	-	6,015	6,015	67%
Riverside	2,455,806	3,598,767	830,572	2,768,195	-	1,643,210	1,643,210	67%
Sacramento	3,433,576	-	-	-	976,030	2,297,449	3,273,479	95%
San Benito	25,173	44,351	44,351	-	7,156	16,844	24,000	95%
San Bernardino	1,993,070	3,412,861	3,412,861	-	566,551	1,333,588	1,900,139	95%
San Diego	6,159,623	6,898,465	2,317,736	4,580,729	-	4,121,481	4,121,481	67%
San Francisco	2,235,743	-	-	-	635,533	1,495,964	2,131,497	95%
San Joaquin	800,849	-	-	-	227,650	535,858	763,508	95%
San Luis Obispo	182,698	776,914	(93,422)	870,337	-	122,246	122,246	67%
San Mateo	901,455	409,182	-	409,182	-	603,175	603,175	67%
Santa Barbara	182,310	-	-	-	51,824	121,986	173,810	95%
Santa Clara	1,233,654	2,746,214	2,664,335	81,879	-	825,453	825,453	67%
Santa Cruz	230,629	10,638	-	10,638	-	154,317	154,317	67%
Shasta	274,996	32,504	6,174	26,330	-	184,003	184,003	67%
Sierra	13,363	17,744	8,872	8,872	-	8,941	8,941	67%
Siskiyou	88,816	2,660	2,660	-	25,247	59,428	84,675	95%
Solano	743,044	508,096	238,925	269,171	-	497,180	497,180	67%
Sonoma	921,983	-	-	-	262,083	616,911	878,994	95%
Stanislaus	1,223,925	-	-	-	347,913	818,944	1,166,857	95%
Sutter	107,922	135,520	80,739	54,781	-	72,212	72,212	67%
Tehama	37,162	-	-	-	10,564	24,866	35,429	95%
Trinity	29,858	-	-	-	8,487	19,978	28,466	95%
Tulare	154,445	-	-	-	43,902	103,341	147,243	95%
Tuolumne	28,768	-	-	-	8,178	19,249	27,426	95%
Ventura	810,216	-	-	-	230,312	542,126	772,438	95%
Yolo	251,806	184,712	20,671	164,041	-	168,486	168,486	67%
Yuba	98,968	-	-	-	28,133	66,221	94,353	95%
Total	61,326,254	21,425,970	10,384,524	11,041,446	10,384,524	41,034,166	51,418,690	84%

Option 3 - Allocation 50% All Courts & Additional 50% Courts With No Retirement Subsidy of \$10.4 Million (Excludes Interpreters)

Court	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Benefit Cost Increases	DOF 2013-2014 Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Governor's Budget - Restored Employee Retirement Subsidy	\$11.04 Million DOF Remaining Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Allocate 50% All Courts Pro-Rata	Allocate Additional 50% Pro-Rata to Courts with No Retirement Subsidy	Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014	Total Allocation with \$10.4 Million	Percentage Funded of 2012-13 and 2013-14 Benefit Cost Increases
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Alameda	2,404,882	-	-	-	203,612	341,806	1,609,137	2,154,555	90%
Alpine	9,334	-	-	-	790	1,327	6,245	8,362	90%
Amador	35,611	112,195	112,195	-	3,015	5,061	23,828	31,904	90%
Butte	236,868	159,578	708	158,870	20,055	-	158,491	178,546	75%
Calaveras	68,405	115,529	61,698	53,831	5,792	-	45,771	51,562	75%
Colusa	23,919	51,247	36,605	14,642	2,025	-	16,004	18,029	75%
Contra Costa	1,524,425	605,358	-	605,358	129,067	-	1,020,012	1,149,079	75%
Del Norte	68,299	114,094	114,094	-	5,783	9,707	45,700	61,190	90%
El Dorado	28,321	-	-	-	2,398	4,025	18,950	25,373	90%
Fresno	1,379,806	-	-	-	116,823	196,112	923,246	1,236,181	90%
Glenn	35,960	74,491	43,198	31,294	3,045	-	24,061	27,106	75%
Humboldt	205,112	-	-	-	17,366	29,153	137,243	183,762	90%
Imperial	305,765	-	-	-	25,888	43,458	204,591	273,938	90%
Inyo	48,932	69,346	29,720	39,626	4,143	-	32,741	36,884	75%
Kern	824,430	579,495	(924)	580,419	69,801	-	551,636	621,438	75%
Kings	33,089	-	-	-	2,802	4,703	22,140	29,645	90%
Lake	4,780	102,976	102,976	-	405	679	3,199	4,283	90%
Lassen	8,339	51,826	37,019	14,807	706	-	5,580	6,286	75%
Los Angeles	18,086,349	-	-	-	1,531,303	2,570,616	12,101,803	16,203,722	90%
Madera	67,969	-	-	-	5,755	9,660	45,479	60,894	90%
Marin	535,883	314,528	113,299	201,229	45,371	-	358,566	403,938	75%
Mariposa	5,321	39,738	(398)	40,136	450	-	3,560	4,011	75%
Mendocino	351,518	-	-	-	29,762	49,961	235,205	314,928	90%
Merced	463,597	-	-	-	39,251	65,891	310,199	415,341	90%
Modoc	5,296	38,111	38,111	-	448	753	3,544	4,745	90%
Mono	16,922	-	-	-	1,433	2,405	11,323	15,161	90%
Monterey	395,286	-	-	-	33,467	56,182	264,491	354,140	90%
Napa	271,633	8,425	-	8,425	22,998	-	181,753	204,751	75%
Nevada	179,790	210,404	210,404	-	15,222	25,554	120,300	161,075	90%
Orange	8,646,423	-	(37,077)	37,077	732,060	-	5,785,430	6,517,490	75%
Placer	425,144	-	-	-	35,995	60,426	284,469	380,890	90%
Plumas	8,989	-	(11,577)	11,577	761	-	6,015	6,776	75%
Riverside	2,455,806	3,598,767	830,572	2,768,195	207,924	-	1,643,210	1,851,134	75%
Sacramento	3,433,576	-	-	-	290,708	488,015	2,297,449	3,076,172	90%
San Benito	25,173	44,351	44,351	-	2,131	3,578	16,844	22,553	90%
San Bernardino	1,993,070	3,412,861	3,412,861	-	168,746	283,275	1,333,588	1,785,609	90%
San Diego	6,159,623	6,898,465	2,317,736	4,580,729	521,512	-	4,121,481	4,642,993	75%
San Francisco	2,235,743	-	-	-	189,292	317,767	1,495,964	2,003,022	90%
San Joaquin	800,849	-	-	-	67,805	113,825	535,858	717,488	90%
San Luis Obispo	182,698	776,914	(93,422)	870,337	15,468	-	122,246	137,714	75%
San Mateo	901,455	409,182	-	409,182	76,323	-	603,175	679,497	75%
Santa Barbara	182,310	-	-	-	15,436	25,912	121,986	163,334	90%
Santa Clara	1,233,654	2,746,214	2,664,335	81,879	104,449	-	825,453	929,902	75%
Santa Cruz	230,629	10,638	-	10,638	19,526	-	154,317	173,843	75%
Shasta	274,996	32,504	6,174	26,330	23,283	-	184,003	207,286	75%
Sierra	13,363	17,744	8,872	8,872	1,131	-	8,941	10,073	75%
Siskiyou	88,816	2,660	2,660	-	7,520	12,623	59,428	79,571	90%
Solano	743,044	508,096	238,925	269,171	62,911	-	497,180	560,090	75%
Sonoma	921,983	-	-	-	78,061	131,042	616,911	826,013	90%
Stanislaus	1,223,925	-	-	-	103,625	173,957	818,944	1,096,526	90%
Sutter	107,922	135,520	80,739	54,781	9,137	-	72,212	81,349	75%
Tehama	37,162	-	-	-	3,146	5,282	24,866	33,294	90%
Trinity	29,858	-	-	-	2,528	4,244	19,978	26,750	90%
Tulare	154,445	-	-	-	13,076	21,951	103,341	138,368	90%
Tuolumne	28,768	-	-	-	2,436	4,089	19,249	25,773	90%
Ventura	810,216	-	-	-	68,598	115,156	542,126	725,880	90%
Yolo	251,806	184,712	20,671	164,041	21,319	-	168,486	189,806	75%
Yuba	98,968	-	-	-	8,379	14,066	66,221	88,666	90%
Total	61,326,254	21,425,970	10,384,524	11,041,446	5,192,262	5,192,262	41,034,166	51,418,690	84%

Option 4 - Allocation 75% All Courts & Additional 25% Courts With No Retirement Subsidy of \$10.4 Million (Excludes Interpreters)

Court	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Benefit Cost Increases	DOF 2013-2014 Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Governor's Budget - Restored Employee Retirement Subsidy	\$11.04 Million DOF Remaining Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Allocate 75% All Courts Pro-Rata	Allocate Additional 25% Pro-Rata to Courts with No Retirement Subsidy	Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014	Total Allocation with \$10.4 Million	Percentage Funded of 2012-13 and 2013-14 Benefit Cost Increases
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
Alameda	2,404,882	-	-	-	305,418	170,903	1,609,137	2,085,458	87%
Alpine	9,334	-	-	-	1,185	663	6,245	8,094	87%
Amador	35,611	112,195	112,195	-	4,523	2,531	23,828	30,881	87%
Butte	236,868	159,578	708	158,870	30,082	-	158,491	188,573	80%
Calaveras	68,405	115,529	61,698	53,831	8,687	-	45,771	54,458	80%
Colusa	23,919	51,247	36,605	14,642	3,038	-	16,004	19,042	80%
Contra Costa	1,524,425	605,358	-	605,358	193,601	-	1,020,012	1,213,613	80%
Del Norte	68,299	114,094	114,094	-	8,674	4,854	45,700	59,228	87%
El Dorado	28,321	-	-	-	3,597	2,013	18,950	24,559	87%
Fresno	1,379,806	-	-	-	175,234	98,056	923,246	1,196,536	87%
Glenn	35,960	74,491	43,198	31,294	4,567	-	24,061	28,628	80%
Humboldt	205,112	-	-	-	26,049	14,576	137,243	177,868	87%
Imperial	305,765	-	-	-	38,832	21,729	204,591	265,152	87%
Inyo	48,932	69,346	29,720	39,626	6,214	-	32,741	38,955	80%
Kern	824,430	579,495	(924)	580,419	104,702	-	551,636	656,338	80%
Kings	33,089	-	-	-	4,202	2,351	22,140	28,694	87%
Lake	4,780	102,976	102,976	-	607	340	3,199	4,145	87%
Lassen	8,339	51,826	37,019	14,807	1,059	-	5,580	6,639	80%
Los Angeles	18,086,349	-	-	-	2,296,954	1,285,308	12,101,803	15,684,065	87%
Madera	67,969	-	-	-	8,632	4,830	45,479	58,941	87%
Marin	535,883	314,528	113,299	201,229	68,057	-	358,566	426,623	80%
Mariposa	5,321	39,738	(398)	40,136	676	-	3,560	4,236	80%
Mendocino	351,518	-	-	-	44,643	24,981	235,205	304,829	87%
Merced	463,597	-	-	-	58,877	32,946	310,199	402,021	87%
Modoc	5,296	38,111	38,111	-	673	376	3,544	4,593	87%
Mono	16,922	-	-	-	2,149	1,203	11,323	14,674	87%
Monterey	395,286	-	-	-	50,201	28,091	264,491	342,783	87%
Napa	271,633	8,425	-	8,425	34,497	-	181,753	216,250	80%
Nevada	179,790	210,404	210,404	-	22,833	12,777	120,300	155,910	87%
Orange	8,646,423	-	(37,077)	37,077	1,098,090	-	5,785,430	6,883,520	80%
Placer	425,144	-	-	-	53,993	30,213	284,469	368,675	87%
Plumas	8,989	-	(11,577)	11,577	1,142	-	6,015	7,156	80%
Riverside	2,455,806	3,598,767	830,572	2,768,195	311,886	-	1,643,210	1,955,096	80%
Sacramento	3,433,576	-	-	-	436,062	244,007	2,297,449	2,977,518	87%
San Benito	25,173	44,351	44,351	-	3,197	1,789	16,844	21,830	87%
San Bernardino	1,993,070	3,412,861	3,412,861	-	253,119	141,638	1,333,588	1,728,344	87%
San Diego	6,159,623	6,898,465	2,317,736	4,580,729	782,268	-	4,121,481	4,903,749	80%
San Francisco	2,235,743	-	-	-	283,938	158,883	1,495,964	1,938,785	87%
San Joaquin	800,849	-	-	-	101,707	56,912	535,858	694,478	87%
San Luis Obispo	182,698	776,914	(93,422)	870,337	23,203	-	122,246	145,448	80%
San Mateo	901,455	409,182	-	409,182	114,484	-	603,175	717,659	80%
Santa Barbara	182,310	-	-	-	23,153	12,956	121,986	158,095	87%
Santa Clara	1,233,654	2,746,214	2,664,335	81,879	156,673	-	825,453	982,126	80%
Santa Cruz	230,629	10,638	-	10,638	29,290	-	154,317	183,606	80%
Shasta	274,996	32,504	6,174	26,330	34,924	-	184,003	218,927	80%
Sierra	13,363	17,744	8,872	8,872	1,697	-	8,941	10,638	80%
Siskiyou	88,816	2,660	2,660	-	11,280	6,312	59,428	77,019	87%
Solano	743,044	508,096	238,925	269,171	94,366	-	497,180	591,546	80%
Sonoma	921,983	-	-	-	117,091	65,521	616,911	799,523	87%
Stanislaus	1,223,925	-	-	-	155,438	86,978	818,944	1,061,360	87%
Sutter	107,922	135,520	80,739	54,781	13,706	-	72,212	85,918	80%
Tehama	37,162	-	-	-	4,720	2,641	24,866	32,226	87%
Trinity	29,858	-	-	-	3,792	2,122	19,978	25,892	87%
Tulare	154,445	-	-	-	19,614	10,976	103,341	133,931	87%
Tuolumne	28,768	-	-	-	3,653	2,044	19,249	24,947	87%
Ventura	810,216	-	-	-	102,897	57,578	542,126	702,601	87%
Yolo	251,806	184,712	20,671	164,041	31,979	-	168,486	200,465	80%
Yuba	98,968	-	-	-	12,569	7,033	66,221	85,823	87%
Total	61,326,254	21,425,970	10,384,524	11,041,446	7,788,393	2,596,131	41,034,166	51,418,690	84%

Option 3 - Allocation 50% All Courts & Additional 50% Courts With No Retirement Subsidy of \$13.3 Million (Excludes Interpreters)

Court	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Benefit Cost Increases	DOF 2013-2014 Estimate of Employee Subsidy	May Revise Request Million - Return Employee Subsidy	\$8.15 DOF Remaining Estimate of Employee Retirement Subsidy	Allocate 50% All Courts Pro-Rata	Allocate Additional 50% Pro-Rata to Courts with No Retirement Subsidy	Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014	Total Allocation with \$13.3 Million	Percentage Funded of 2012-13 and 2013-14 Benefit Cost Increases
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Alameda	2,404,882			-	260,283	454,630	1,609,137	2,324,049	97%
Alpine	9,334			-	1,010	1,765	6,245	9,020	97%
Amador	35,611	112,195	112,195	-	3,854	6,732	23,828	34,414	97%
Butte	236,868	159,578	708	158,870	25,636	-	158,491	184,128	78%
Calaveras	68,405	115,529	61,698	53,831	7,404	-	45,771	53,174	78%
Colusa	23,919	51,247	46,009	5,238	2,589	-	16,004	18,593	78%
Contra Costa	1,524,425	605,358	415,479	189,880	164,990	-	1,020,012	1,185,002	78%
Del Norte	68,299	114,094	114,094	-	7,392	12,912	45,700	66,004	97%
El Dorado	28,321			-	3,065	5,354	18,950	27,369	97%
Fresno	1,379,806			-	149,338	260,845	923,246	1,333,428	97%
Glenn	35,960	74,491	43,198	31,293	3,892	-	24,061	27,953	78%
Humboldt	205,112			-	22,199	38,775	137,243	198,218	97%
Imperial	305,765			-	33,093	57,803	204,591	295,488	97%
Inyo	48,932	69,346	29,720	39,626	5,296	-	32,741	38,037	78%
Kern	824,430	579,495	463,449	116,046	89,229	-	551,636	640,865	78%
Kings	33,089	-	-	-	3,581	6,255	22,140	31,977	97%
Lake	4,780	102,976	102,976	-	517	904	3,199	4,620	97%
Lassen	8,339	51,826	51,826	-	903	1,576	5,580	8,059	97%
Los Angeles	18,086,349			-	1,957,503	3,419,124	12,101,803	17,478,430	97%
Madera	67,969			-	7,356	12,849	45,479	65,684	97%
Marin	535,883	314,528	113,299	201,229	57,999	-	358,566	416,566	78%
Mariposa	5,321	39,738	(398)	40,136	576	-	3,560	4,136	78%
Mendocino	351,518	-	-	-	38,045	66,453	235,205	339,703	97%
Merced	463,597			-	50,176	87,640	310,199	448,015	97%
Modoc	5,296	38,111	38,111	-	573	1,001	3,544	5,118	97%
Mono	16,922			-	1,831	3,199	11,323	16,353	97%
Monterey	395,286	-	-	-	42,782	74,727	264,491	382,000	97%
Napa	271,633	8,425	-	8,425	29,399	-	181,753	211,152	78%
Nevada	179,790	210,404	194,617	15,787	19,459	-	120,300	139,758	78%
Orange	8,646,423	-	(37,077)	37,077	935,811	-	5,785,430	6,721,241	78%
Placer	425,144			-	46,014	80,371	284,469	410,854	97%
Plumas	8,989	-	(8,664)	8,664	973	-	6,015	6,988	78%
Riverside	2,455,806	3,598,767	3,431,222	167,545	265,794	-	1,643,210	1,909,005	78%
Sacramento	3,433,576			-	371,619	649,099	2,297,449	3,318,167	97%
San Benito	25,173	44,351	44,351	-	2,725	4,759	16,844	24,327	97%
San Bernardino	1,993,070	3,412,861	3,243,661	169,200	215,712	-	1,333,588	1,549,300	78%
San Diego	6,159,623	6,898,465	2,317,736	4,580,729	666,662	-	4,121,481	4,788,143	78%
San Francisco	2,235,743			-	241,977	422,655	1,495,964	2,160,595	97%
San Joaquin	800,849			-	86,677	151,396	535,858	773,931	97%
San Luis Obispo	182,698	776,915	(93,422)	870,337	19,774	-	122,246	142,019	78%
San Mateo	901,455	409,182	-	409,182	97,565	-	603,175	700,740	78%
Santa Barbara	182,310			-	19,732	34,465	121,986	176,183	97%
Santa Clara	1,233,654	2,746,214	1,962,799	783,415	133,520	-	825,453	958,973	78%
Santa Cruz	230,629	10,638	-	10,638	24,961	-	154,317	179,278	78%
Shasta	274,996	32,504	6,174	26,330	29,763	-	184,003	213,766	78%
Sierra	13,363	17,744	8,872	8,872	1,446	-	8,941	10,387	78%
Siskiyou	88,816	2,660	2,660	-	9,613	16,790	59,428	85,831	97%
Solano	743,044	508,096	508,096	-	80,420	140,468	497,180	718,068	97%
Sonoma	921,983			-	99,787	174,296	616,911	890,994	97%
Stanislaus	1,223,925			-	132,467	231,376	818,944	1,182,787	97%
Sutter	107,922	135,520	80,739	54,781	11,681	-	72,212	83,893	78%
Tehama	37,162			-	4,022	7,025	24,866	35,913	97%
Trinity	29,858			-	3,232	5,645	19,978	28,855	97%
Tulare	154,445			-	16,716	29,197	103,341	149,253	97%
Tuolumne	28,768			-	3,114	5,438	19,249	27,801	97%
Ventura	810,216			-	87,690	153,167	542,126	782,983	97%
Yolo	251,806	184,712	20,671	164,041	27,253	-	168,486	195,739	78%
Yuba	98,968			-	10,711	18,709	66,221	95,641	97%
Total	61,326,254	21,425,970	13,274,798	8,151,173	6,637,399	6,637,399	41,034,166	54,308,964	89%

Item 2
**2015–2016 Allocations for Various Programs from the State Trial Court
Improvement and Modernization Fund and the Trial Court Trust Fund**
(Action Item)

Issue

Consideration of the recommendations of the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee, including recommended 2015–2016 allocation levels for various programs funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). At current estimated revenue and expenditure levels, the IMF is projected to end 2015–2016 with a negative \$11.1 million fund balance. The subcommittee is recommending that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) adopt these recommendations and provide them to the Judicial Council for consideration at the council’s April 17, 2015 business meeting.

BackgroundRevenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

The subcommittee met in Sacramento on March 10-11, 2015 to consider and deliberate on allocation reduction options for programs funded from the IMF as well as allocation levels for programs funded from the TCTF. The subcommittee reviewed all planned project and program allocations as well as reduction options and impacts provided by the Judicial Council staff for IMF-funded programs and projects (see Attachment 2H, Attachment 2H pages 111 to 189). In addition, the subcommittee was provided detailed survey information submitted by 56 superior courts regarding the projects and programs funded by the IMF (see Attachment 2H, Attachment 2H pages 29 to 107) and the statutes that authorize the IMF and that authorized its predecessor funds (see Attachment 2I). In considering the allocation levels for projects and programs funded from the IMF, the subcommittee identified the following criteria or principles to help guide the decision-making process: are programs/projects mandated, the number of courts served, value to the courts and the branch according to the survey results, the appropriateness of the IMF as the fund source, and the impact program and project funding reductions would have on individual courts and the judicial branch. Recommendations regarding allocations and reductions were developed based on this review. The subcommittee formed a six-member ad hoc group to meet in the next few months to further review in detail the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), Enterprise Policy and Planning, and Phoenix programs and report back to the subcommittee with any recommendations.

Previous Judicial Council and Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Action

At its August 14, 2006, business meeting, the council approved a recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Working Group, now TCBAC, and Judicial Council staff specifying which expenses for statewide administrative infrastructure services would be paid from the IMF or

TCTF and which would be paid for by the courts (see Attachment 2B, pages 7 and 8).¹ At its October 26, 2012, business meeting, the council approved shifting \$6.769 million in Phoenix Financial Services direct process services costs previously reimbursed by the courts to the IMF and no longer charging courts for these services beginning in 2012–2013.

At its August 23, 2013, business meeting, the council exercised its authority provided by statute and delegated to the Administrative Director the limited authority to transfer allocations between projects and programs that are funded from the IMF, subject to the following criteria:

1. The sum of allocation transfers cannot exceed 20 percent of the allocation to be reduced or 20 percent of the allocation to be augmented.
2. The Administrative Director must notify the chair of the council's Executive and Planning Committee and the co-chairs of the TCBAC in advance of any transfer.
3. The Administrative Director must report back to the council on the rationale for and amounts of any approved adjustments after the end of the fiscal year.

The TCBAC's recommendations to move the \$6.3 million allocation for costs of the Criminal and Traffic (V2) and Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) case management systems to the IMF, discontinue the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF, and to move the \$625,000 allocation for the costs of the Statewide Support for Collections Programs to the TCTF in 2014–2015, were approved by the council in April 2014. In response to the Governor's May Revision proposal for the 2014–2015 Budget, the council in June 2014 approved the TCBAC 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 continued in 2014–2015.

Fiscal Status of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund

As noted in the fiscal status of the TCTF, the Governor proposes to discontinue the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF in 2015–2016. Assuming the V3 system moves to the IMF and no reduction to the 2014–2015 allocation levels, the projected 2015–2016 ending fund balance of the IMF is negative \$11.1 million with a structural deficit of \$15.9 million (see Attachment 2C, column D, rows 21 and 22). The deficit in the IMF is mainly due to declining revenues and transfers to the TCTF to support court operations. The net of General Fund revenues and transfers declined by \$106 million, from a peak of \$149 million in 2005–2006 to an estimated \$43 million in 2014–2015.² Expenditures declined over the same time period by \$72 million from \$139 million to an estimated \$67 million in 2014–2015. The main driver of the decrease in revenues is the 50/50 excess fines split, which declined by \$48 million from a peak

¹ Report to the Judicial Council. April 21, 2006, <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/jc/documents/reports/0406ItemF-2.pdf>

² In 2012–2013, two separate special funds, the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF) and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Mod Fund), were merged into a single fund, the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. The figures for years prior to 2012–2013 are for the combined TCIF and Mod Fund.

of \$71 million in 2006–2007 to an estimated \$23 million in 2014–2015. In terms of transfers to the TCTF, a \$31.6 million transfer started in 2006–2007 to backfill unfunded negotiated salary increases and a \$20 million transfer started in 2011–2012 to offset trial court funding reductions.³ Assuming the subcommittee allocation recommendations are approved the projected 2015–2016 ending fund balance becomes \$1.7 million with only one allocation of \$600,000 still pending (see 2C, column E, row 21). Based on the recommended allocations, the IMF would operate at a much smaller deficit of \$3.0 million in 2015–2016, with the deficit being offset by an estimated beginning fund balance of \$4.7 million for the year (see Attachment 2C, column E, rows 1 and 22). Assuming revenues continue at the 2015–2016 levels in 2016–2017 and assuming 2016–2017 base allocations from the subcommittee’s recommendations, the fund will end with a negative fund balance in 2016–2017 unless further reductions to allocations are made.

Fiscal Status of the Trial Court Trust Fund

In the Governor’s proposed 2015 budget, the Governor proposes to discontinue the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF and a \$50.7 million General Fund backfill for the continued decline in fee and assessment revenues that support courts’ base allocation. Assuming no more costs for the V2 system, the V3 system moves to the IMF, and the Governor’s proposed backfill does not change, the projected 2015–2016 ending fund balance of the TCTF is \$20.6 million (see Attachment 2D, column F, row 32). Excluding about \$17.0 million in fund balance that is either statutorily restricted or restricted by the council (mainly savings related to the Program 45.45 court interpreter appropriation), the unrestricted fund balance is projected to be \$3.7 million (see Attachment 2D, column F, row 41). Assuming \$3.2 million in judges’ compensation savings in 2015–2016, the TCTF would have a revenue shortfall of \$5.6 million (see Attachment 2D, column F, row 43). The TCBAC will address any projected shortfall at a subsequent meeting.

Recommendation 1 – Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Review of All IMF and TCTF Funding Proposals

The subcommittee unanimously recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Require that any proposal that would rely on Trial Court Trust Fund or State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund funding shall be reviewed by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee prior to presentation to the Judicial Council for consideration.

³ In 2012–2013, with the establishment of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, the \$31.6 million transfer amount required in statute was changed to \$13.4 million and the 1% transfer of the TCTF Program 45.10 Budget Act Appropriation to the TCIF was removed from statute. The \$13.4 million reflected the estimated amount of the \$31.6 million transferred to the TCTF net of what the 1% transfer from the TCTF to the TCIF would have been in 2012–2013.

Rationale for Recommendation 1

By requiring all IMF and TCTF program and project allocation proposals to be reviewed by the TCBAC, the TCBAC can fully carry out its charge to provide the council input on the use of trial court related funds.

Recommendation 2 – Resource Assessment Study Interim Caseweight Adjustment for Complex Case Filings

By a vote of eleven to two, the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council:

2. Direct the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) to include in the Resource Assessment Study computation of workload need, the paid complex case fee filings, and assign to them the asbestos weighting of about 3,546 minutes, until such time as WAAC reviews the validity of the weighting.

Rationale for Recommendation 2

This recommendation was made in the context of eliminating IMF funding for the complex civil litigation program (see recommendation 3f). When computing workload need, the subcommittee believes it is more accurate to use the caseweight of one of the specifically measured unlimited civil case types, asbestos cases, for complex case filings, rather than the overall caseweight applied to all unlimited civil cases. The difference of 2,750 minutes in the caseweights (3,546 minutes for asbestos and 796 minutes for unlimited civil) is significant and could make a material difference in the computation of courts' workload and funding need. The asbestos caseweight is only intended as an interim caseweight solution for computing workload related to complex civil cases until the WAAC is able to review the validity of the weighting.

Recommendations 3 through 7 – 2015–2016 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Allocations

Column C of Attachment 2E displays the recommended 2015–2016 allocation for each program or project. The Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee recommendations were unanimous or near unanimous for all of the allocations for various projects and programs funded from the IMF. The subcommittee's recommendation regarding the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Report allocation is pending on whether or not courts can pay for the valuation from their OPEB trust accounts. The subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council:

3. Allocate \$64.9 million from the IMF in 2015–2016 for various programs and projects, including the elimination of all IMF funding, totaling \$5.77 million, starting in 2015–2016 for the following programs and projects:
 - a. Human Resources - Court Investigation (\$94,500)
 - b. Workers' Compensation Reserve (\$1.23 million)

- c. Audit Contract (\$150,000)
 - d. Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services (\$200,700)
 - e. Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers (\$75,000)
 - f. Complex Civil Litigation Program (\$4,001,000)
 - g. Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter (\$17,100).
4. Reconsider its decision to not allocate any IMF funding for Jury Management Systems in 2015–2016 and allocate 2015–2016 jury royalties deposited into IMF first for Jury System Improvement Projects and any remaining royalties for Jury Management Systems (see 2E, lines 35 and 42).
 5. Grant an exception to its policy on statewide administrative infrastructure services that are to be paid from either the TCTF or IMF by requiring courts to pay for a portion of the costs previously paid from the IMF for the Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) case management system and Interim Case Management System, and by requiring courts to pay for all the costs previously paid from the IMF for the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Systems/Integration program.
 6. Allow the Governing Committee of Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) to decide how to assign the recommended total allocation of \$1.202 million for education programs among the five education program categories (see Attachment 2E, lines 7 to 11).
 7. Direct that staff of the litigation management program bring before the subcommittee any claims whose costs cannot be covered within the amount allocated for funding consideration from the IMF (see Attachment 2E, line 43).

Rationale for Recommendations 3 through 7

Assuming the V3 case management system moves to the IMF and no reduction to the 2014–2015 allocation levels, the projected 2015–2016 ending fund balance of the IMF is negative \$11.1 million with a structural deficit of \$15.9 million (see Attachment 2C, column D, rows 21 and 22). Faced with this severe estimated shortfall, the subcommittee recommends either the significant reduction or elimination of funding for a number of programs and projects funded from the IMF (see Attachment 2E, column C, lines 1 through 48). In considering the allocation levels for projects and programs funded from the IMF, the subcommittee identified the following criteria or principles to help guide the decision-making process: are programs/projects mandated, the number of courts served, value to the courts and the branch according to the survey results, the appropriateness of the IMF as the fund source, and the impact program and project funding reductions would have on individual courts and the judicial branch. Regarding recommendation 3a, see recommendation 15. Regarding recommendation 3b, no more workers' compensation tail claims settlements with counties are anticipated. If a settlement does occur, JC staff will work with the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program Advisory Committee to determine whether the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund can and should be used to pay for any settlement. Regarding recommendation 3f, see recommendation 2.

Regarding recommendation 4, the subcommittee believes the council was likely unaware that jury royalties, which by statute must be used for jury system improvements, will be available to fund the Jury Management System when it approved a recommendation to eliminate funding in 2015-16 at its February 2015 meeting. Regarding recommendation 5, as the three programs are considered statewide administrative infrastructure services, the Judicial Council will need to approve an exception to its policy regarding services/costs to be paid from the IMF or TCTF and those to be paid by courts to allow the participating courts to be charged for these services. This is not without precedent. The council approved a change in this policy in October 2012 when shifting \$6.769 million in Phoenix Financial Services direct process services costs previously required to be reimbursed by the courts to the IMF and no longer charging courts for these services beginning in 2012–2013. The programs' TCTF allocation amounts that would be impacted by this decision are reflected in Attachment 2F (see rows 14 through 16). The subcommittee will recommend a methodology for allocating the costs previously paid for from the IMF among the participating courts at a subsequent TCBAC meeting.

Recommendation 8 – 2016–2017 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Allocations

The subcommittee unanimously recommends that the Judicial Council:

8. Eliminate \$347,600 in IMF funding starting in 2016–2017 for the JusticeCorps program, direct JC staff to work with all interested courts for possible participation in the JusticeCorps program, have JC staff continue to provide centralized administrative support, and require courts to fund their share of the cost of the program.

Rationale for Recommendation 8

The subcommittee is recommending that the IMF contribution for the program be continued only through 2015–2016, since 2015–2016 is final year of the current 3-year grant, and that, apart from any grant funding from AmeriCorps, courts fund their share of the cost of the program. There currently is no formal application process for courts to request participation. Interested courts contact the JC program staff and are briefed on the requirements for participation.

Recommendations 9 through 15 – Shifting Current IMF Costs to Other State Funds, Courts, or Other Source

The Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee recommendations were unanimous or near unanimous for recommendations 9 through 15. The subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council:

9. Consider shifting the costs of the Trial Court Security Grants program to the state constructions funds starting in 2015–2016, if possible.

10. Consider shifting the costs of one position from the Trial Court Procurement program to the state construction funds starting in 2015–2016, if possible.
11. Consider shifting the costs of translating domestic violence forms under the Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program to the TCTF Program 45.45 Court Interpreter appropriation.
12. Consider shifting the “core central office” costs of the CIP - Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education, Treasury Services - Cash Management, Audit Services, Uniform Civil Fees, and Regional Office Assistance Group programs to the General Fund beginning in 2016–2017.
13. Direct JC staff to determine if a cost recovery model with justice partners that share the materials can be established for the CFCC Publications program beginning in 2016–2017 and report back to the TCBAC (see 2E, line 3).
14. Direct staff to explore a reimbursable option for the CCPOR program in 2016–2017 and onward and evaluate the effects of the recommendation to have courts fund the CLETS program instead of the IMF on the CCPOR program (see 2E, line 31).
15. Maintain JC management of the court investigations programs, but have courts pay for the service starting in 2015-16.

Rationale for Recommendations 9 to 15

Regarding recommendation 10, the procurement position performs work related to new facilities. Regarding recommendation 11, the subcommittee believes the budget act language that specifies what the TCTF Program 45.45 appropriation can be used for permits the use of the appropriation for the cost of translating domestic violence forms.⁴ Regarding recommendation 12, the subcommittee believes the programs that they identified as “core central office” functions, those typically performed by a central administrative office, and initially funded under the council’s statewide administrative infrastructure initiative (excluding the CIP program), should not be funded from the IMF.

Recommendations 16 and 17 – Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations

The Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee recommendations were unanimous or near unanimous for all but one of the allocations for various projects and programs funded from the TCTF Judicial Council (Program 30.05), Trial Court Operations (Program 30.15), and Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10) appropriations. The replacement screening station reimbursement allocation amount was approved on a 6 to 5 vote. Any recommendations approved by the TCBAC would be subject to TCBAC review and revision following enactment of the State Budget for 2015–2016.

⁴ The Budget Act of 2014 includes the following language related to the Program 45.45 appropriation: “The funds appropriated in Schedule (4) shall be for payments to contractual court interpreters, and certified or registered court interpreters employed by the courts for services provided during court proceedings and other services related to pending court proceedings, including services provided outside a courtroom...”

The subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council:

16. Allocate \$141.4 million in 2015-16 from the Trial Court Trust Fund Judicial Council (Program 30.05), Trial Court Operations (Program 30.15), and Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10) appropriations for various programs and projects as well as specific allocations that reimburse trial court costs.

JC staff recommends that the Judicial Council:

17. For the jury reimbursement, direct JC staff to make, if eligible jury costs exceed the total allocation, a year-end allocation adjustment so that each court receives a share of the approved allocation based on their share of the statewide allowable jury expenditures.

Rationale for Recommendations 16 and 17

Table 1 below displays the recommended 2015-16 allocations by program or project through three TCTF appropriations (see Attachment 2H, Attachment 2H pages 9-23 for a description of these programs and projects). The TCBAC will have an opportunity to revisit any allocations from the Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation approved by the council in April 2015 after the passage of a Budget Act and prior to making final recommendations to the Judicial Council when it considers other allocations from the Program 45.10 appropriations.

Table 1 -- Recommended 2015–2016 TCTF Allocations

Program or Project Title	2014–2015 Allocation	2015–2016 Estimated Restricted Revenue or Court Reimbursement	2015–2016 Recommended Maximum Allocation	Total Recommended 2015–2016 Allocation
Judicial Council (Program 30.05)				
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	\$500,000	\$500,000		\$500,000
Equal Access Fund	\$262,000	\$194,000		\$194,000
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	\$260,000	\$260,000		\$260,000
Statewide Support for Collections Programs	\$625,000		\$625,000	\$625,000
Phoenix Financial Services	\$106,434	\$107,000		\$107,000
Phoenix Human Resources Services	\$1,349,000	\$1,360,000		\$1,360,000
CLETS Services/Integration	\$0	\$114,000		\$114,000
Subtotal, Judicial Council	\$3,102,434	\$2,535,000	\$625,000	\$3,160,000
Trial Court Operations (Program 30.15)				

Program or Project Title	2014–2015 Allocation	2015–2016 Estimated Restricted Revenue or Court Reimbursement	2015–2016 Recommended Maximum Allocation	Total Recommended 2015–2016 Allocation
Children in Dependency Case Training	\$113,000		\$113,000	\$113,000
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	\$7,738,000	\$7,686,000		\$7,686,000
Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	\$6,463,000	\$2,358,000		\$2,358,000
California Courts Technology Center	\$1,602,750	\$1,606,000		\$1,606,000
Interim Case Management System	\$956,207	\$1,741,000		\$1,741,000
Human Resources – Court Investigation	\$0	\$94,500		\$94,500
CLETS Services/Integration	\$0	\$400,000		\$400,000
Subtotal, Trial Court Operations	\$16,872,957	\$13,885,500	\$113,000	\$13,998,500
Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10)				
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	\$103,725,445		\$103,725,445	\$103,725,445
Jury Reimbursements	\$16,000,000		\$14,500,000	\$14,500,000
Replacement Screening Stations Reimbursements	\$2,286,000		\$2,286,000	\$2,286,000
Self-Help Center Reimbursements	\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
Elder Abuse Reimbursements	\$332,000		\$332,000	\$332,000
California State Auditor Audits Reimbursement	\$325,000	\$325,000		\$325,000
CAC Dependency Counsel Collections Reimbursement	\$996,574	\$525,139		\$525,139
Subtotal, Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	\$126,165,019	\$850,139	\$123,343,445	\$124,193,584
Total	\$146,140,410	\$17,270,639	\$124,081,445	\$141,352,084

The Judicial Council (Program 30.05) appropriation is used to fund the costs of Judicial Council staff. The Trial Court Operations (Program 30.15) appropriation is used to fund the operational costs for statewide administrative infrastructure programs that support the trial courts and a grant program, the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program. The Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10) appropriation primarily funds distributions, including base allocations, to the trial courts, but also is used to transfer the worker's compensation insurance premiums paid by courts to the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund, make payments to dependency counsel on behalf of the courts that participate in the court-appointed counsel Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program, and pay

certain allowable facilities-related costs that are reimbursed by the courts. Attachment 2G displays all estimated allocations from the 2015-16 appropriation as proposed by the Governor.

Of the programs and projects recommended to be funded from the Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriation in 2015–2016, all but two are either funded by revenues that, per statute, are to be used solely by that program with their recommended allocation amounts reflecting current estimated revenues (Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program, Equal Access Fund, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections), or whose allocations, based on Judicial Council policy, are fully reimbursed by courts and their recommended allocation amounts reflecting the estimated costs to be reimbursed based on anticipated current service levels (Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS, California Courts Technology Center, Interim Case Management System, Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services, CLETS Services/Integration), or whose costs the subcommittee is recommending be paid for by courts (CLETS Services/Integration, recommendation 5, and human resource related court investigations, recommendation 15).⁵ These allocations have no impact on the TCTF unrestricted fund balance as unspent revenues would be restricted in the fund balance or there is no actual cost to the fund at all. The program’s or project’s allocations, if necessary, will be adjusted to reflect the actual program revenues or the actual program costs to be reimbursed.

The recommended allocation amounts for the V3, ICMS, and CLETS assumes the recommendation to grant exceptions to the Judicial Council policy on statewide administrative infrastructure services is approved (Recommendation 5). If the policy change is not approved, certain programs or program costs would not be allocated from the TCTF since the intention was to only fund those costs to the extent participating courts would be reimbursing the TCTF.

The subcommittee is not recommending any changes to the 2014–2015 allocation level for the Children in Dependency Case Training and Statewide Support for Collections Programs. The TCTF received a General Fund transfer increase in 2007–2008 to fund the Children in Dependency Case Training program to help the Judicial Branch comply with Assembly Bill 2480 (Stats. 2006, ch. 385), which concerns the appointment of counsel for children in appeals of dependency court orders. The council approved the move of the Statewide Support for Collections Programs allocation to the TCTF from the IMF starting in 2014-2015 at its April 2014 meeting.

From the TCTF Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10) appropriation, the subcommittee’s recommendation is limited to those programs that reimburse trial court costs, as other allocations depend on enactment of the State Budget or are items that don’t require Judicial Council action. Two programs are either funded by statutorily-restricted revenues or statutorily-mandated at a specific amount and, as a result, give the Judicial Council no substantive

⁵ Report to the Judicial Council. April 21, 2006, <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/jc/documents/reports/0406ItemF-2.pdf>

discretion in the allocation amount of these programs. Regarding the California State Auditor audits allocation, the current budget bill (Assembly Bill 103) includes provisional language that “\$325,000 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits.” For the court-appointed dependency counsel collections allocation, statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted through the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council’s approved standard. The \$525,139 recommended allocation reflects the estimated 2014–2015 revenue available for distribution to the courts from the program in 2015–2016. The program’s allocation, if necessary, will be adjusted to reflect the actual program revenues. The council has already approved a formula for allocating monies related to the dependency collections program

For four of the five other programs which defray or help defray unavoidable and essential trial court costs, court-appointed dependency counsel, self-help centers, replacement screening stations, and elder abuse, the recommendation is to maintain their allocations at the 2014–2015 level as over the past three years, these programs have generally distributed their full allocation to the courts. It should also be noted that in the current budget bill (Assembly Bill 103), there is a provision for the TCTF stating that “\$103,700,000 is available to support Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel workload.”

The subcommittee recommends reducing the allocation for the fifth program from its 2014–2015 amount of \$16 million to \$14.5 million in 2015–2016. Recent jury reimbursement activity indicates that this reduced allocation amount would still be sufficient to defray trial court costs, allowing for the savings to offset any TCTF revenue shortfalls. The reimbursement for 2013–2014 was \$13.9 million. The 2014–2015 reimbursement is estimated to be \$14.0 million. The latest five year average of program expenditures is \$15.1 million and the latest three year average is \$14.5 million. If statewide allowable jury expenditures exceed the approved allocation, a year-end adjustment can be made to courts’ allocations to ensure each court receives a share of the approved allocation based on their share of the statewide allowable jury expenditures. This would allow courts to benefit equally from the allocation regardless of when their jury expenditures are incurred.

TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Expenditure Authority

There is estimated to be sufficient expenditure authority for the recommended allocations. The Governor’s proposed State Budget for 2015 (Assembly Bill 103) provides \$4.85 million in expenditure authority for Judicial Council allocations and \$13.03 million for Trial Court Operations allocations. The recommended allocations are \$3.16 million from the Judicial Council appropriation and \$14.00 million from the Trial Court Operations appropriation (see Attachment 2F, columns D and E, line 17). Though the recommended Trial Court Operations allocations exceed the current proposed expenditure authority, provisional language allows up to \$11.274 million to be transferred to the Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations

appropriation authority for the recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts and would address this.

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: William C. Vickrey, Administrative Director of the Courts
Ronald G. Overholt, Chief Deputy Director
Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division and Chair, Trial Court
Budget Working Group, 415-865-7951, tina.hansen@jud.ca.gov

DATE: April 14, 2006

SUBJECT: Approval of Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services Funding
Process and Delegation of Authority to Allocate Funds From the Trial
Court Trust Fund and the Trial Court Improvement Fund (Action Required)

Issue Statement

So that the judicial branch may continue the development and deployment of statewide trial court administrative infrastructure initiatives currently underway, it has become necessary for the courts to pay the cost of certain services related to the implementation of these systems that are directly attributable to individual trial courts. In addition, in order to have adequate staffing to implement and operate these systems at the local level, some courts may need to add staffing and other resources. In some instances individual courts will not be able to absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets or within new funding provided through the State Appropriations Limit (SAL) process. As a result, a supplemental funding process for the trial courts is necessary to facilitate the courts' ability to pay for these services.

In an effort to implement a fair and consistent approach for charging the courts, the Trial Court Budget Working Group (TCBWG) has recommended which costs are appropriately paid at the statewide level and which are appropriately paid by the court receiving the direct benefit of the service. In addition, the TCBWG has recommended a process to enable those courts that cannot absorb the additional costs to request one-time and/or ongoing supplemental funding from any available fund balances in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) or the Trial Court Improvement Fund (Improvement Fund). Authority to allocate these funds, consistent with the supplemental funding process, needs to be delegated to the Administrative Director of the Courts.

In addition, it may become necessary to directly pay critical statewide costs associated with the trial court administrative services and technology initiatives from the TCTF to the extent that one-time funding is available. The authority to allocate these funds needs to be delegated to the Administrative Director of the Courts. The authority for this direct payment from the TCTF is consistent with the authority granted to the Administrative Director of the Courts by the Judicial Council for allocation of the Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Modernization Fund). Allocation of one-time funding from the TCTF to the courts for this purpose would not reduce approved current or future allocations to the trial courts.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Working Group and staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) recommend that the Judicial Council take the following action:

1. Approve the proposed statewide funded expenses and proposed court expenses for statewide administrative infrastructure services (attached at pages 7 and 8).
2. Approve the supplemental funding process for statewide administrative infrastructure services (attached at pages 9–12).

In addition, AOC staff recommends that the Judicial Council:

3. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to allocate one-time and ongoing unallocated funds from the TCTF and Improvement Fund to the courts in accordance with the supplemental funding request process, and, if it becomes necessary, to make direct payment for statewide administrative infrastructure costs from one-time funding in the TCTF, which would not reduce approved current or future allocations to the trial courts.
4. Require that AOC staff report annually to the Judicial Council in December as to the amount of funding from the TCTF and Improvement Fund allocated to the courts through the supplemental funding process, as well as any amounts paid directly out of the TCTF in the previous fiscal year for statewide administrative infrastructure costs.

Rationale for Recommendation

For the past several years, the AOC, in partnership with the trial courts and as directed by the Judicial Council, has initiated the development and implementation of various statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives. These include the Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS), the Court Human Resources Information System (CHRIS), the California Case Management System (CCMS), and the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), among others. These programs will enable the courts to plan for and manage their funding, personnel, resources, records, and cases as part of the

effort to increase the independence and accountability of the judicial branch (Goal II, Strategic Plan of the California judicial branch).

As with other necessary infrastructure improvements, these services have substantial one-time and ongoing costs. No General Fund monies have been received to address administrative infrastructure initiatives for the courts since fiscal year (FY) 2001–2002. In FY 2000–2001, \$22 million in one-time funding with a three-year availability period was approved in the Budget Act. This funding supported the beginning development of what has become known as the CCMS. In addition, funding was approved in the 2001 Budget Act to establish core positions within the AOC to support the initial development of the CARS project.

Since that time, these infrastructure initiatives have been funded through a variety of sources, including the Improvement Fund, the Modernization Fund, and, beginning in FY 2004–2005, direct billing of the trial courts for the provision of these services. Requests for new state funding have been submitted over the past few years but have been unsuccessful. With the advent of the SAL budget process for the trial courts in FY 2005–2006, the ability to submit budget change proposals for specific initiatives, except those resulting from new legislation or extraordinary circumstances, was discontinued. The State Department of Finance did agree, however, to one additional request for a baseline adjustment for technology, primarily because of the Governor’s vetoes in the 2005 Budget Act. Consequently, as part of the FY 2006–2007 budget process, a budget change proposal (BCP) was submitted for a General Fund augmentation in the amount of \$12.341 million to support the development and implementation of administrative services to the trial courts. This BCP is still pending in the legislative budget process.

As courts have transitioned to the newly developed statewide systems, the AOC has worked with the courts to determine how much they would pay locally toward the support of these systems. In addition, courts implementing the CCMS agreed that they should fund court-specific deployment costs to the extent funding is available. Initially, charges were based on each court’s ability to pay. After further review of the process and based on input received from the trial courts, AOC staff recommend that in order to accurately reflect all court specific expenditures in each court’s budget, all courts should pay the actual costs attributable to their own court. Additionally, it was recommended that a consistent methodology be developed across all projects for which expenses should be paid at the statewide level versus the local level. While some courts will be able to deal with the full costs, other courts may determine that the amount they are charged for one or more of these services is more than they can afford. It is also possible that adopting these new systems will require some courts to add staff to operate them and to incur one-time costs to deploy the systems. To address these concerns, a process needed to be developed that enables these courts to seek supplemental funding to provide the difference between what they will be charged and the amount they are able to pay for themselves. The proposed process is attached (attached at pages 9–12).

The process provides for creation of a Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Funding Committee that will review AOC staff recommendations on individual court requests. The committee consists of two representatives from each region (presiding judges or court executive officers may serve), the three AOC regional administrative directors, the AOC chief financial officer, and the AOC chief deputy director. The types of circumstances the committee will consider in reviewing a request are included in the process description. The committee's recommendations are then presented to the Administrative Director of the Courts for a final decision, based on the availability of unallocated funds in the TCTF or Improvement Fund. However, if statewide administrative infrastructure has been approved as a Judicial Council budget priority in a particular year and sufficient funds are not available in the TCTF or Improvement Fund to address the needs, the review committee's recommendations will be forwarded to the TCBWG for review. In reviewing the recommendations, the TCBWG will consider all other operational funding needs of the courts, other Judicial Council budget priorities for that year, and the amount of funding, if any, available for allocation through SAL. The TCBWG will then make recommendations for council action on the requests.

Currently, the Executive and Planning Committee approves the annual budget for the Improvement Fund and the Modernization Fund, which includes significant funding supporting the development and implementation of statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives. Once the committee approves the budget, pursuant to internal guidelines for the Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund approved by the Judicial Council, the Administrative Director of the Courts has the delegated authority to allocate additional funds to the approved projects. If adequate resources are not available in the Improvement Fund or Modernization Fund for the approved projects, and consistent with the delegation authority for those funds, authority needs to be delegated to the Administrative Director of the Courts to cover costs from the TCTF to the extent that one-time funding is available. These allocations of one-time funding from the TCTF would not reduce approved allocations to the trial courts.

A provision for staff to report back to the Judicial Council annually on the funding provided to the courts in support of the supplemental funding request process and any amounts paid directly out of the TCTF for statewide administrative infrastructure costs is included in the process in order to keep council members apprised of the purposes to which these public resources were utilized either by or on behalf of the courts.

Alternative Actions Considered

One alternative considered was not to charge the courts for the cost of any of these administrative infrastructure systems. However, if the courts were not charged, there would be no ability to continue to develop and implement them. The courts would either have to continue to use old, inadequate systems, or, if a county currently provides the services to a court and then decides to discontinue them, the court would be forced to

develop its own ad hoc systems or manage its business without these types of systems. Given the fiscal responsibility and accountability requirements of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (AB 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850), these requirements would be extremely difficult, if not impossible to fulfill. For these reasons, this alternative is not recommended.

Another alternative considered was not to provide an opportunity for courts to seek supplemental funding if they determined that they could not absorb the increased costs of the systems. This alternative is not recommended because, realistically, some courts will not be able to afford the total cost of the services either because they were previously paying the county less for these types of services, or they were not receiving these services at all. In either of these instances, a court may not have enough funding available to offset the charge for the new systems. If assistance is not provided to these courts to meet the costs, the existing diverse and aging administrative infrastructure services systems spread throughout the state in many cases will continue providing inadequate service, until they ultimately collapse. For the courts to meet accountability requirements and provide adequate management of their funding, personnel, resources, and records, they need to be able to employ infrastructure systems that are designed specifically to address these purposes.

Comments From Interested Parties

The Administrative Cost Structure Subcommittee of the TCBWG was formed last summer. In addition to TCBWG members, the subcommittee includes members recommended by the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee. Among other activities, the subcommittee developed recommendations regarding those services that should be paid for on a statewide basis and those that individual courts should be charged for. The group recognized the need for a supplemental funding process. The process they developed was subsequently presented to the TCBWG at its March 8, 2006, meeting.

Some revisions were made to the process based on the TCBWG's discussion. One change was to increase the court representation on the Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Funding Committee from one court executive officer from each region to two representatives from each region, presiding judges or court executive officers. An earlier version of the process provided that only costs directly related to statewide administrative infrastructure services could be requested. The proposed process now includes clarifying language stating that courts may also request funds to address other costs that are the result of system implementation. The TCBWG expressed their approval of the proposed process with these revisions.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

As described in the proposed process, the costs to address this recommendation will be met through one-time or ongoing unallocated funding from either the TCTF or the

Improvement Fund. This may include SAL funding specifically reserved for this purpose, if administrative infrastructure services is determined to be a Judicial Council budget priority in a particular year and specific funding is approved by the council. Supplemental funding will be provided to a court once a request has been approved by the Administrative Director of the Courts, or the Judicial Council, if statewide administrative infrastructure is a budget priority.

Attachments

**Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services
Proposed Statewide Funded Expenses**

- AOC staffing for indirect services
- Licensing, except Citrix licenses for Interim CMS (Sustain)
- Hardware and software maintenance (except for court-specific telecommunication equipment)
- California Courts Technology Center (CTCC) overhead
- CTCC disaster recovery costs
- Development and deployment costs (except CCMS deployment costs; courts to directly pay vendor)
- Hardware and software costs (related to statewide initiatives hosted at the CTCC)
- Upgrades (related to statewide initiatives hosted at the CTCC)
- Outside legal assistance
- End user training (for AOC-sponsored statewide initiatives)

Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services Proposed Court Expenses

- AOC staffing to provide court specific services—Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS), Court Human Resources Information System (CHRIS), and California Case Management System (CCMS)
- Court-specific CTCC costs, including network, operations, and equipment support; help desk operations; and CARS, CHRIS, CCMS, and Integration Services Backbone (ISB) application support. Optional services, including CTCC exchange services and equipment, e-mail, directory services, authentication services, and local desk-side support
- Deployment for CCMS (court to directly pay vendor)
- AOC provision of court specific jury check services (optional service)—CARS
- Direct court-specific collection services (optional service)—CARS
- Application support, on-site infrastructure services, staging and production, and Citrix license—Interim CMS
- Court-specific professional services associated with using the ISB for conversion services

Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services Supplemental Funding Process

Application Process

Upon notification¹ by the AOC or realization by the court that it will incur new costs, the court must submit a Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services Supplemental Funding Request Form if it determines that it cannot absorb the proposed new costs.

Courts may apply for supplemental funding to address one-time, limited-term, and/or ongoing costs that will occur during the current year and/or budget year and beyond. The source of funding for these requests will be from any existing balances in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) or the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF). To the extent the Judicial Council approves Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services as a trial court funding priority in any given year, these requests will be incorporated into that review and approval process.

Note:

- No invoicing of costs will occur until courts are notified of costs and provided the opportunity to apply for and receive supplemental funding.
- Courts already incurring costs at the time of adoption and implementation of this process are also eligible to apply for supplemental funding.

The court's supplemental funding request must be related to statewide administrative infrastructure services, which may include the following:

1. Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS);
2. Court Human Resource Information System (CHRIS);
3. California Case Management System (CCMS);
4. Interim Case Management System or Sustain;
5. California Courts Technology Center (CTCC);
6. Data integration; and

¹ This process also applies to Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services costs paid directly by the court to vendors. AOC notification may not occur in all of these instances.

7. Telecommunications.

Supplemental funding requests unrelated to statewide administrative infrastructure services or discretionary services, such as jury check services or CTCC help desk services, will not be considered as part of this process.

In addition to the program costs directly related to the systems described above, the court may request funds to address costs resulting from system implementation.

Deadline for Submitting Requests

The court must submit the request for supplemental funding within 30 days of notification of the charges for an administrative service if the court determines it cannot absorb either the charges or the cost of any additional resource needs resulting from the services. If it is later determined that the system has created the need for additional resources that were unknown or unrealized prior to implementation, the court will have up to one year from date of implementation to submit a request.

Request Considerations

The following circumstances will be considered in the analysis of requests for additional resources:

- Implementation of the new system resulting in increased costs as compared to historical costs for like services;
- Implementation of the new system resulting in increased costs as compared to current costs for like services;
- Additional resource needs resulting from implementation of the new system;
- If additional costs were a result of a court decision and the method is not the most cost effective approach;
- The level of reserves not encumbered or reserved for critical planned projects and expenditures;
- Budgeted and actual expenditures of all court revenue, including civil assessment and undesignated fees;
- The court's consideration of alternatives to mitigate costs;

- If the court requests funding for ongoing staffing for the budget year and beyond, the court's ability to address the costs for the budget year and beyond with the funding provided through the SAL adjustment process;
- Status of the court's operational issues such as backlogs; and
- Other areas of review as appropriate.

Approval Process

AOC budget staff will review and analyze all requests. Recommendations by AOC budget staff will be forwarded to the court for response. The recommendations and responses will then be reviewed by the Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services Funding Committee. This review committee will consist of two representatives from each of the regions (presiding judges or court executive officers may serve), the three AOC regional administrative directors, the AOC chief financial officer, and the AOC chief deputy director. This committee will review all applications and AOC staff recommendations and then make recommendations to the Administrative Director of the Courts for final decision.

If the recommendation is to include the request as a Judicial Council-approved funding priority, the review committee's recommendations will be forwarded to the Trial Court Budget Working Group for recommendation to the Judicial Council.

Timing of Approval Process

AOC staff will review and analyze the funding requests and forward their recommendations for funding to the requesting court, within 30 days of receiving the request.

The court will have two weeks to respond to the AOC staff recommendations. The recommendations and court responses will then be forwarded for review by the Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services Funding Committee at its next scheduled monthly meeting.

Process for Distributing Supplemental Funding and Charging Costs

Once the funding decisions have been approved and the court has been notified, any supplemental funding will be distributed as part of the monthly allocation process. The final charges will appear as monthly reductions to the base budget.

If at mid-year revised projected expenditures are less than initial projections, charges will be adjusted. At year-end, if actual expenditures are less than charges, funds will be either rebated or offset against next year's costs. If costs are more, the costs will be paid at the statewide level by the TCTF, TCIF, or Modernization Fund.

Adjustments to Future Costs and Allocations

In the event that costs increase in future years, courts will have an opportunity to apply for supplemental funding (or an increase if supplemental funding has been previously provided). Likewise, if future year costs are less than projected, to the extent that supplemental funding was received to pay these costs the supplemental funding allocation will be reduced.

IMF -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description					Estimated 2015-16	
		2012-2013 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2013-2014 (Year-end Financial Statement)	Estimated 2014-15	No Reduction to 14-15 Allocation Level ¹	Subcommittee Recommended Allocations	
		A	B	C	D	E	
1	Beginning Balance	48,128,575	44,827,741	26,207,006	4,659,586	4,659,586	
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	11,547,967	4,410,172	2,654,362	150,000	150,000	
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	59,676,542	49,237,913	28,861,368	4,809,586	4,809,586	
4	<i>Revenues</i>						
5	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	31,920,133	26,873,351	23,384,535	22,898,778	22,898,778	
6	2% Automation Fund Revenue	15,753,200	15,242,700	14,471,411	13,916,340	13,916,340	
7	Jury Instructions Royalties	518,617	445,365	484,063	484,063	484,063	
8	Interest from SMIF	201,201	124,878	89,244	89,244	89,244	
9	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	2,875	24,476	3,097	-	-	
10	<i>Transfers</i>						
11	From State General Fund	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	
12	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	(23,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	
13	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	
14	Net Revenues and Transfers	50,114,026	47,428,770	43,150,350	62,106,425	62,106,425	
15	Total Resources	109,790,568	96,666,683	72,011,718	66,916,011	66,916,011	
16	<i>Expenditures</i>						
17	Allocation	71,923,000	73,961,680	71,466,600	77,724,737	64,896,037	
18	Less: Unused Allocation	(7,123,067)	(4,082,985)	(4,412,049)	-	-	
19	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	162,894	580,982	297,581	297,581	297,581	
20	Total Expenditures	64,962,827	70,459,677	67,352,132	78,022,318	65,193,618	
21	Fund Balance	44,827,741	26,207,006	4,659,586	(11,106,307)	1,722,393	
22	Revenue/Transfers Over/(Under) Exp	(14,848,801)	(23,030,907)	(24,201,782)	(15,915,893)	(3,087,193)	

1. Includes non-reimbursed civil case management system allocation that is being funded out of the TCTF in 2014-15 and the planned allocation for other post-employment benefit costs.

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

	FY 2012-13 (Year-End Financial Statement)	FY 2013-14 (Year-End Financial Statement)	FY 2014-15 (Estimated) - Without Savings	FY 2014-15 Estimated Savings	FY 2014-15 (Estimated) - With Savings (C + D)	FY 2015-16 (Estimated)	
#	Description	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F
1	Beginning Balance	105,535,205	82,346,997	21,218,232	-	21,218,232	26,203,748
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	19,260,408	(2,688,884)	-	2,319,271	2,319,271	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	124,795,613	79,658,114	21,218,232	2,319,271	23,537,503	26,203,748
4	Revenue	1,400,425,164	1,374,450,890	1,329,580,637	-	1,329,580,637	1,333,991,351
5	<i>Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue</i>	<i>658,893,532</i>	<i>658,755,572</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	-	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>
6	<i>Civil Fee Revenue</i>	<i>408,289,141</i>	<i>384,474,327</i>	<i>358,115,125</i>	-	<i>358,115,125</i>	<i>355,545,183</i>
7	<i>Court Operations Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>156,455,686</i>	<i>149,578,279</i>	<i>140,834,114</i>	-	<i>140,834,114</i>	<i>131,251,329</i>
8	<i>Civil Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>149,100,873</i>	<i>154,784,402</i>	<i>146,573,331</i>	-	<i>146,573,331</i>	<i>162,148,023</i>
9	<i>Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>25,194,026</i>	<i>25,360,674</i>	<i>23,582,039</i>	-	<i>23,582,039</i>	<i>24,682,669</i>
10	<i>Interest from SMIF</i>	<i>218,660</i>	<i>94,882</i>	<i>61,232</i>	-	<i>61,232</i>	<i>61,232</i>
11	<i>Sanctions and Contempt Fines</i>	<i>1,484,984</i>	<i>1,237,263</i>	<i>1,178,372</i>	-	<i>1,178,372</i>	<i>1,140,809</i>
12	<i>Miscellaneous Revenue</i>	<i>788,263</i>	<i>165,492</i>	<i>185,923</i>	-	<i>185,923</i>	<i>111,604</i>
13	General Fund Transfer	263,691,000	742,319,017	922,649,000	-	922,649,000	1,048,915,000
14	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	-	-	30,900,000	-	30,900,000	50,700,000
15	Reduction Offset Transfers	86,709,000	26,080,000	26,080,000	-	26,080,000	6,080,000
16	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	(1,639,392)	(4,256,953)	(4,427,415)	-	(4,427,415)	(3,886,415)
17	Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	1,749,185,772	2,138,592,954	2,304,782,222	-	2,304,782,222	2,435,799,935
18	Total Resources	1,873,981,385	2,218,251,067	2,326,000,454	2,319,271	2,328,319,725	2,462,003,683
19	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations						
20	Program 30 - Expenditures/Allocations	23,610,313	22,672,123	21,679,128	-	21,679,128	18,877,500
21	Program 30.05 - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,692,227	3,764,788	4,418,152	-	4,418,152	4,879,000
22	Program 30.15 - Trial Court Operations	19,918,086	18,907,335	17,260,976	-	17,260,976	13,998,500
23							
24	Program 45 - Expenditures/Allocations	1,767,802,888	2,174,214,014	2,287,786,850	(7,600,000)	2,280,186,850	2,422,492,323
25	Program 45.10 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,344,726,911	1,737,394,306	1,833,101,698	(2,000,000)	1,831,101,698	1,962,114,165
26	Program 45.25 - Comp. of Superior Court Judges	304,004,469	310,788,986	325,831,000	(5,600,000)	320,231,000	330,011,000
27	Program 45.35 - Assigned Judges	24,624,238	25,496,371	26,047,000	-	26,047,000	26,047,000
28	Program 45.45 - Court Interpreters	84,483,339	90,983,918	94,559,834	-	94,559,834	96,295,834
29	Program 45.55 - Grants	9,963,931	9,550,433	8,247,318	-	8,247,318	8,024,325
30	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	221,186	146,697	250,000	-	250,000	-
31	Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	1,791,634,387	2,197,032,835	2,309,715,978	(7,600,000)	2,302,115,978	2,441,369,823
32	Ending Fund Balance	82,346,997	21,218,232	16,284,477	9,919,271	26,203,748	20,633,860
33							
34	Fund Balance Detail						
35	Restricted Fund Balance	16,219,124	18,564,478	16,963,659	-	16,963,659	16,963,659
36	<i>Court Interpreter Program</i>	<i>12,924,808</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>	-	<i>14,734,148</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>
37	<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	<i>2,315,264</i>	<i>1,003,276</i>	<i>820,910</i>	-	<i>820,910</i>	<i>820,910</i>
38	<i>Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements</i>	<i>1,778,814</i>	<i>1,632,117</i>	<i>1,382,117</i>	-	<i>1,382,117</i>	<i>1,382,117</i>
39	<i>Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services</i>	-	<i>1,168,453</i>	-	-	-	-
40	<i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel</i>	<i>(799,762)</i>	<i>26,484</i>	<i>26,484</i>	-	<i>26,484</i>	<i>26,484</i>
41	Unrestricted Fund Balance	66,127,873	2,653,755	(679,182)	9,919,271	9,240,089	3,670,201
42							
43	Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	(42,448,616)	(58,439,881)	(4,933,756)	7,600,000	2,666,244	(5,569,888)

IMF -- Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee Recommendations to TCBAAC by Program/Project

#	Project/Program Title	2015-16 Subcommittee Recommendation								
		2014-15 Judicial Council Allocation	One-Time Adjustment	Jury Royalty	Possible Cost Shift or Recovery in 16-17	Assumed 2016-17 Base Allocation	2015-16 Allocation	Court Pay in 15-16 or 16-17	Eliminate Funding in 15-16 or 16-17	Move to Other Fund
		A	B1	B2	B3	B4	C	D	E	F
1	CFCC Educational Programs	90,000				67,000	67,000			
2	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	60,000				60,000	60,000			
3	CFCC Publications	20,000			20,000		20,000			Y
4	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	20,000			17,000		17,000			Y
5	Self-Help Center	5,000,000				5,000,000	5,000,000			
6	Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	100,000				100,000	100,000			
7	Distance Learning	147,000				125,000	125,000			
8	Essential/Other Education for Court Management	46,000				39,000	39,000			
9	Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	92,000				78,000	78,000			
10	Faculty and Curriculum Development	288,000				245,000	245,000			
11	Mandated, Essential & Other Education for JOs	841,000				715,000	715,000			
13	CIP - Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education	168,000			143,000		143,000			Y
14	JusticeCorp (Court Access and Education)	347,600	347,600				347,600	Y	Y	
15	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	13,000				13,000	13,000			
16	Trial Court Security Grants	1,200,000				0	0			Y
17	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	50,000				50,000	50,000			
18	Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuation Report	0			pending	pending	pending			
19	Treasury Services - Cash Management	238,000			238,000		238,000			Y
20	Trial Court Procurement	244,000				122,000	122,000			Y
21	Human Resources - Court Investigation	94,500				0	0	Y	Y	
22	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	34,700				25,700	25,700			
23	Workers' Compensation Reserve	1,231,000				0	0		Y	
24	Audit Contract	150,000				0	0		Y	
25	Audit Services	660,000			660,000		660,000			Y
26	CLETS Services/Integration	433,400				0	0	Y		
27	Data Integration	3,903,600				3,849,600	3,849,600			
28	Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services	200,700				0	0		Y	
29	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	133,700				141,000	141,000			
30	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	10,487,200				10,487,200	10,487,200			
31	CCPOR (ROM)	585,600	130,000			585,600	715,600			
32	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	5,658,137	(1,132,000)			5,658,000	4,526,000	Y		

IMF -- Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee Recommendations to TCBAAC by Program/Project

#	Project/Program Title	2015-16 Subcommittee Recommendation								
		2014-15 Judicial Council Allocation	One-Time Adjustment	Jury Royalty	Possible Cost Shift or Recovery in 16-17	Assumed 2016-17 Base Allocation	2015-16 Allocation	Court Pay in 15-16 or 16-17	Eliminate Funding in 15-16 or 16-17	Move to Other Fund
		A	B1	B2	B3	B4	C	D	E	F
33	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	5,268,500				5,220,500	5,220,500			
34	Interim Case Management Systems	1,246,800	(249,000)			1,246,800	997,800	Y		
35	Jury Management System	0		465,000			465,000			
36	Telecommunications Support	11,705,000	(1,055,000)			11,705,000	10,650,000			
37	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	624,300	(624,300)			624,300	0			
38	Uniform Civil Fees	343,000			366,000		366,000			Y
39	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	75,000				0	0		Y	
40	Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,000				0	0		Y	
41	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	966,600				966,600	966,600			
42	Jury System Improvement Projects	19,000		19,000			19,000			
43	Litigation Management Program	4,500,000				4,000,000	4,000,000			
44	Regional Office Assistance Group	1,460,000			1,460,000		1,460,000			Y
45	Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	17,100				0	0		Y	
46	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	451,000				451,000	451,000			
47	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	25,000				19,000	19,000			
48	Phoenix Program	13,885,300	(1,389,000)			13,885,300	12,496,300			
49	Total	71,466,600	(3,971,700)	484,000	2,904,000	65,479,600	64,895,900	5	8	9

TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Appropriations Allocations

Attachment 2F

#	Project and Program Title	2014-15 JC- Approved Allocation	2014-15 Reimbursed by Courts	2014-15 Approved Total Allocation	FY 2015-16 TCBAC Revenue & Expenditure Subcommittee Recommendations		
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col A + B)	Judicial Council (Staff) ¹	Trial Court Operations ¹	Total
					Col. D	Col. E	Col F (Col. D + E)
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	113,000		113,000	-	113,000	113,000
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	8,238,000		8,238,000	500,000	7,686,000	8,186,000
3	Equal Access Fund	262,000		262,000	194,000	-	194,000
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000		260,000	260,000	-	260,000
5	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	625,000		625,000	625,000	-	625,000
6	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	5,658,137	804,863	6,463,000	-	625,000	625,000
7	Criminal and Traffic (V2) CMS	647,916	326,947	974,863	-	-	-
8	California Courts Technology Center		1,602,750	1,602,750	-	1,606,000	1,606,000
9	Interim Case Management System		956,207	956,207	-	843,000	843,000
10	Phoenix Financial Services		106,434	106,434	107,000	-	107,000
11	Phoenix HR Services		1,349,000	1,349,000	1,360,000	-	1,360,000
12	Human Resources - Court Investigation			-	-	94,500	94,500
13	Need Judicial Council approval of change in statewide administrative infrastructure services policy on court expenses:						
14	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS			-	-	1,733,000	1,733,000
15	Interim Case Management System			-	-	898,000	898,000
16	CLETS Services/Integration			-	114,000	400,000	514,000
17	Total, Program/Project Allocations	15,804,053	5,146,201	20,950,254	3,160,000	13,998,500	17,158,500
18	Estimated State Controller's Office services charges				1,719,000	-	1,719,000
20	Estimated Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,879,000	13,999,000	18,878,000
21	Appropriation Balance	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	500	500

1. Provisional language in the State Budget Bill for 2015 (Assembly Bill 103) allows the Judicial Council appropriation authority to be increased for increased revenues that support the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot, Equal Access Fund, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections. Provisional language also allows up to \$11.274 million to be transferred to the Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriation authority for the recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts.

FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations

#	Description	Type	Estimated 2014-15 Col. A	Estimated 2015-16 Col. B	For TCBCAC Consideration on March 23 Col. C
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,518,726,356	1,591,880,055	
3	II. Adjustments				
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-702,811	-818,121	
6	III. FY 2014-2015 Allocations				
7	\$86.3 Million in New Funding	Base	86,300,000		
8	\$42.8 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	41,034,166		
9	\$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall	Base	-22,700,000		
10	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-37,882,840	-39,810,420	
11	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to Courts	Non-Base	37,882,840	39,810,420	
12	Final 1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-1,711,712		
13	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-10,000,000	-50,000,000	
14	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000	
15	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding (FY 2012-13 costs)	Non-Base	130,450		
16	FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	-29,405,750		
17	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-1,371,906		
19	IV. FY 2015-2016 Allocations (Governor's Budget)				
20	\$41.0 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base		41,008,000	
21	\$90.1 Million in New Funding	Base		90,060,000	
22	\$26.9 Million Prop 47 workload	Base		26,900,000	
24	V. Allocation for Reimbursements				
25	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	103,725,445	103,725,445	103,725,445
26	Jury	Non-Base	16,000,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
27	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	2,286,000	2,286,000
28	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
29	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	332,000	332,000
30	CSA Audits ¹	Non-Base	325,000	325,000	325,000
31	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	996,574	525,139	525,139
33	VI. Estimated Revenue Distributions				
34	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	98,050,601	113,845,294	
35	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	24,132,589	23,015,939	
36	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	10,907,494	
37	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,126,882	2,948,108	
38	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,464,384	2,323,487	
39	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840	
41	VII. Miscellaneous Charges				
42	Repayment of FY 2013-14 Cash Advance	Non-Base	-1,734,355		
43	Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment- Phoenix Services	Non-Base	1,205,668		
44	Judicial Branch Worker's Compensation Fund Premiums	Non-Base	-16,536,015	-16,536,015	
45	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-5,146,201	-7,780,500	
46	Total		1,833,101,698	1,962,114,165	124,193,584
48	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriation Budget Act		1,894,142,000	1,990,521,000	
49	Transfer to Compensation of Superior Court Judges appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships		-2,755,000	-3,573,000	
50	Transfer to Court Interpreters appropriation due to court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding		-1,765,834	-1,765,834	
51	Transfer to JBWCF		-16,536,015	-16,536,015	
52	Adjusted Appropriation		1,873,085,151	1,968,646,151	
54	Estimated Remaining Appropriation		39,983,453	6,531,986	

¹ Provision 12 of the 2014 Budget Act requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE SUBCOMMITTEE

Materials for March 10-11, 2015 Meeting

Table of Contents

Action and Discussion Items

Item 1 – FY 2015–2016 Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations from the Judicial Council, Trial Court Operations, and Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriations (Action Item)	1
Item 2 – Fiscal Status of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (Discussion Item)	24
Item 3 – State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Survey (Discussion Item)	
Attachment 3A – “Use” of IMF by Courts table	26
Attachment 3B – Court Clusters	28
Attachment 3C – Survey Summaries	29
Attachment 3D – Summary by Program/Project.....	36
Item 4 – IMF Allocation Reduction Options (Action Item)	
Attachment 4A – Table 1: IMF – Reduction Options by Program/Project.....	108
Attachment 4B – Table 2: IMF Reduction Targets and Amounts -- Summary by Office and Option.....	109
Attachment 4C – Table 3: IT Reduction Options Based on Planned 2015–16 Allocation Need.....	110
Attachment 4D – IMF Allocation Reduction Options	111
Attachment 4E – Information Regarding Phoenix Program, Regional Office Assistance Group, and IT Staff and Consultants.....	189
Appendix A – TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee October 2013 Meeting Materials	
Appendix B – Judicial Council Report to the Legislature on IMF 2013–2014 Expenses	
Appendix C– Legislative Analyst’s Office Report on the Governor’s Criminal Justice Proposals for 2015–2016 (February 2015)	

FY 2015–2016 Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations from the Judicial Council, Trial Court Operations, and Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriations

Issue

The Judicial Council Finance Office recommends the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee consider making allocation recommendations at this meeting for the programs and projects funded from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Judicial Council (Program 30.05) and Trial Court Operations (Program 30.15) appropriations as well as specific programs that reimburse trial court costs from the Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10) appropriation. These allocations can be considered earlier in the budget process because the majority of these programs' and projects' allocation amounts would be considered non-discretionary and uninfluenced by the Budget Act as they are either funded by statutorily-restricted revenues, statutorily-mandated at a specific amount, or have no impact on TCTF fund balance as they are services that, per Judicial Council policy, are fully reimbursed by some or all trial courts in return for requested services (Recommendations 1 and 3). For those programs and projects whose allocation amounts are not dictated by statute or council policy, subcommittee recommendations could be made allowing for the contingency that the allocations could be revisited, if necessitated by material changes in the Budget Act (Recommendations 2 and 4).

Previous Judicial Council and Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Action

The intent is for the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to bring these recommendations to the Judicial Council's April 16, 2015 business meeting.

For 2014–2015, the TCBAC's recommendations to move the \$6.3 million allocation for costs of the V2 and V3 case management systems to the IMF, discontinue the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF, and to move the \$625,000 allocation for the costs of the Statewide Support for Collections Programs to the TCTF were approved by the council in April 2014. In response to the Governor's May Revision proposal for the 2014–2015 Budget, the council in June 2014 approved the TCBAC 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 continued in 2014–2015.

Fiscal Status of the Trial Court Trust Fund

In the Governor's proposed 2015 budget, the Governor proposes to discontinue the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF and a \$50.7 million General Fund backfill for the continued decline in fee and assessment revenues that support courts' base allocation. Assuming no more costs for the V2 system, the V3 system moves to the IMF, and that the Governor's proposed backfill does not change, the projected 2015–2016 ending fund balance of the TCTF is \$20.6 million (see 1B, column F, row 32). Because about \$17.0 million 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 \$3.7 million (see 1B, column F, row 41). Assuming \$3.2 million in judges' compensation savings in 2015–2016, the TCTF would have a revenue shortfall of \$5.6 million (see 1B, column F, row 43). The subcommittee is not being asked to address this shortfall at this meeting, but can consider this information when reviewing Recommendation 4.

Recommendations 1 and 2

The Judicial Council Finance Office recommends the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee recommend to the TCBCAC for consideration by the Judicial Council:

1. Allocate \$13.181 million from the TCTF Judicial Council (Program 30.05) and Trial Court Operations (Program 30.15) appropriations for those programs and projects funded by statutorily-restricted revenues or have no impact on TCTF fund balance as they are fully reimbursed by the courts; and
2. Allocate \$738,000 from the TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations to the Children in Dependency Case Training program and Statewide Support for Collections Programs continuing their 2014–2015 amounts.

Recommendations 1 and 2 Rationale

The Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations respectively fund the costs of Judicial Council staff and the operational costs for statewide administrative infrastructure programs that support the trial courts. In addition, the Trial Court Operations appropriation funds a grant program, the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program.

Of the programs and projects recommended to be funded from Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations expenditure authority in FY 2015–2016, those included in Recommendation 1 are either funded by revenues that, per statute, are to be used solely by that program with their recommended allocation amounts reflecting current estimated revenues (Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program, Equal Access Fund, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections), or whose allocations, based on Judicial Council policy, are fully reimbursed by courts and their recommended allocation amounts reflecting the estimated costs to be reimbursed based on anticipated services (Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS, California Courts Technology Center, Interim Case Management System, Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services).¹ In both instances, these allocations have no impact on the TCTF unrestricted fund balance as unspent revenues would be restricted in the fund balance or there is no actual cost to the fund at all. The program's or project's budgets, if necessary, will be updated to reflect the actual program revenues or the actual program costs to be reimbursed.

The two other programs contained in Recommendation 2, with no proposed changes from their 2014–2015 allocation level, are the Children in Dependency Case Training program and

¹ Report to the Judicial Council. April 21, 2006, <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/jc/documents/reports/0406ItemF-2.pdf>

Statewide Support for Collections Programs. The TCTF received a General Fund transfer increase in FY 2007–2008 to fund the Children in Dependency Case Training program to help the Judicial Branch comply with Assembly Bill 2480 (Stats. 2006, ch. 385) which concerns the appointment of counsel for children in appeals of dependency court orders. The council approved the move of the Statewide Support for Collections Programs allocation to the TCTF from the IMF in April 2014.

Table 1 displays the proposed allocations from the TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations expenditure authority organized by recommendation. Attachment 1C provides additional detail of the allocation amounts by program and project. Attachment 1D provides the description of these projects and programs.

Table 1. Recommended 2015–2016 TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations One-Time Allocations

Program or Project Title	2014–2015 Allocation	Recommended 2015–2016 Allocation
Recommendation 1		
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	\$8,238,000	\$8,186,000
Equal Access Fund	\$262,000	\$194,000
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	\$260,000	\$260,000
Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	\$6,463,000	\$625,000
California Courts Technology Center	\$1,602,750	\$1,606,000
Interim Case Management System	\$956,207	\$843,000
Phoenix Financial Services	\$106,434	\$107,000
Phoenix Human Resources Services	\$1,349,000	\$1,360,000
Subtotal, Recommendation 1	\$19,237,391	\$13,181,000
Recommendation 2		
Children in Dependency Case Training	\$113,000	\$113,000
Statewide Support for Collections Programs	\$625,000	\$625,000
Subtotal, Recommendation 2	\$738,000	\$738,000
Total	\$19,975,391	\$13,919,000

TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Expenditure Authority.

There is estimated to be sufficient expenditure authority for the recommended allocations. The Governor's proposed State Budget for 2015 (Assembly Bill 103) provides \$4.85 million in expenditure authority for Judicial Council allocations and \$13.03 million for Trial Court Operations allocations. The recommended allocations are \$3.05 million from the Judicial Council appropriation and \$10.87 million from the Trial Court Operations appropriation (see Attachment 1C, columns D and E, line 12). There is also provisional language in the State Budget bill that allows for this authority to be increased, if needed.

Recommendations 3 and 4

The Judicial Council Finance Office recommends the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee recommend to the TCBCAC for consideration by the Judicial Council:

3. Allocate \$850,139 from the TCTF Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10) appropriation to reimburse trial court costs for court-appointed dependency counsel collections and California State Auditor audits, allocations that are funded by statutorily-restricted revenues or statutorily-mandated at a specific amount; and
4. Allocate \$123.343 million from the TCTF Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10) appropriation for specific programs that reimburse trial court costs.

Recommendations 3 and 4 Rationale

The subcommittee is being asked to consider only specific programs that reimburse trial court costs from the TCTF Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation as other allocations depend on enactment of the State Budget or are items that don't require Judicial Council action. Attachment 1E provides the estimated allocation amounts for 2015–2016 for the Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation and identifies those allocations recommended for the subcommittee's consideration at this meeting (see Column C, rows 25 to 31).

The two programs contained in Recommendation 3 are funded by statutorily-restricted revenues or statutorily-mandated at a specific amount and, as a result, give the Judicial Council no substantive discretion in the allocation amount of these programs. Regarding the California State Auditor audits allocation, the Budget bill (Assembly Bill 103) includes provisional language that "\$325,000 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits." For the court-appointed dependency counsel collections allocation, statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted through the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard. The \$525,139 recommended allocation reflects the estimated 2014–2015 revenue available for distribution to the courts from the program in 2015–2016. The program's budget, if necessary, will be updated to reflect the actual program revenues. The council has already approved a formula for allocating monies related to the dependency collections program

For four of the five programs included in Recommendation 4, because they defray or help defray unavoidable and essential trial court costs, the 2015–2016 recommended allocation of \$108.8 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund, using Support for Operation of the Trial Courts expenditure authority, should be maintained at the 2014–2015 levels for the following items:

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

Over the past three years, these programs have generally distributed their full allocation. It should also be noted that in the current State Budget bill, there is a provision for the TCTF stating that “\$103,700,000 is available to support Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel workload.”

For the fifth program, jury reimbursements, the Finance Office recommends the 2015–2016 allocation of \$14.5 million, a reduction of \$1.5 million from the 2014–2015 allocation amount. Recent jury reimbursement activity indicates that this reduced allocation amount would still be sufficient to defray trial court costs, allowing for the savings to offset any TCTF revenue shortfalls. The reimbursement for 2013–2014 was \$13.9 million. The 2014–2015 reimbursement is estimated to be \$14.0 million. The latest five year average of program expenditures is \$15.1 million and the latest three year average is \$14.5 million. Staff also recommend that if statewide allowable jury expenditures exceed the allocation, that a year-end adjustment be made to courts’ allocations to ensure each court receives a share of the \$14.5 allocation based on their share of the statewide allowable jury expenditures. This would allow courts to benefit equally from the allocation regardless of when their jury expenditures are incurred.

If the amount of funding provided in the 2015 Budget Act is materially different from what was proposed in the Governor’s Budget, the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee or TCBAC may revisit these allocations and present revised recommendations for the Judicial Council’s consideration at its July 23, 2015 meeting.

Attachment 1F provides the description of these programs.

Pending FY 2015–2016 TCTF allocation recommendations for Judicial Council.

Assuming the timely enactment of the 2015 State Budget, the TCBAC intends to bring recommendations for the council’s consideration at its July 23, 2015 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, Proposition 47 workload-related 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 \$5.6 million projected revenue shortfall. The TCBAC may also bring back changes to what is being recommended in this report.

There are a number of items that the council will not be asked to act on because they either are required by the Budget Act (a \$50 million distribution from the Immediate & Critical Needs Account for court operations, (see 1E, Column B, row 13), have already been acted upon by the council (various revenue distributions), are required by statute (various revenue distributions), and are authorized charges for the cost of programs.

Alternative to Recommendation 4

The 2015–2016 allocations for programs that reimburse trial court costs are reduced from their 2014–2015 levels to offset a portion of the projected revenue shortfall.

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	FY 2012-13 (Year-End Financial Statement)	FY 2013-14 (Year-End Financial Statement)	FY 2014-15 (Estimated) - Without Savings	FY 2014-15 Estimated Savings	FY 2014-15 (Estimated) - With Savings (C + D)	FY 2015-16 (Estimated)
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F
1	Beginning Balance	105,535,205	82,346,997	21,218,232	-	21,218,232	26,203,748
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	19,260,408	(2,688,884)	-	2,319,271	2,319,271	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	124,795,613	79,658,114	21,218,232	2,319,271	23,537,503	26,203,748
4	Revenue	1,400,425,164	1,374,450,890	1,329,580,637	-	1,329,580,637	1,333,991,351
5	<i>Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue</i>	<i>658,893,532</i>	<i>658,755,572</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	-	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>
6	<i>Civil Fee Revenue</i>	<i>408,289,141</i>	<i>384,474,327</i>	<i>358,115,125</i>	-	<i>358,115,125</i>	<i>355,545,183</i>
7	<i>Court Operations Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>156,455,686</i>	<i>149,578,279</i>	<i>140,834,114</i>	-	<i>140,834,114</i>	<i>131,251,329</i>
8	<i>Civil Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>149,100,873</i>	<i>154,784,402</i>	<i>146,573,331</i>	-	<i>146,573,331</i>	<i>162,148,023</i>
9	<i>Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>25,194,026</i>	<i>25,360,674</i>	<i>23,582,039</i>	-	<i>23,582,039</i>	<i>24,682,669</i>
10	<i>Interest from SMIF</i>	<i>218,660</i>	<i>94,882</i>	<i>61,232</i>	-	<i>61,232</i>	<i>61,232</i>
11	<i>Sanctions and Contempt Fines</i>	<i>1,484,984</i>	<i>1,237,263</i>	<i>1,178,372</i>	-	<i>1,178,372</i>	<i>1,140,809</i>
12	<i>Miscellaneous Revenue</i>	<i>788,263</i>	<i>165,492</i>	<i>185,923</i>	-	<i>185,923</i>	<i>111,604</i>
13	General Fund Transfer	263,691,000	742,319,017	922,649,000	-	922,649,000	1,048,915,000
14	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	-	-	30,900,000	-	30,900,000	50,700,000
15	Reduction Offset Transfers	86,709,000	26,080,000	26,080,000	-	26,080,000	6,080,000
16	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	(1,639,392)	(4,256,953)	(4,427,415)	-	(4,427,415)	(3,886,415)
17	Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	1,749,185,772	2,138,592,954	2,304,782,222	-	2,304,782,222	2,435,799,935
18	Total Resources	1,873,981,385	2,218,251,067	2,326,000,454	2,319,271	2,328,319,725	2,462,003,683
19	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations						
20	Program 30 - Expenditures/Allocations	23,610,313	22,672,123	21,679,128	-	21,679,128	15,638,000
21	Program 30.05 - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,692,227	3,764,788	4,418,152	-	4,418,152	4,765,000
22	Program 30.15 - Trial Court Operations	19,918,086	18,907,335	17,260,976	-	17,260,976	10,873,000
23							
24	Program 45 - Expenditures/Allocations	1,767,802,888	2,174,214,014	2,287,786,850	(7,600,000)	2,280,186,850	2,425,731,823
25	Program 45.10 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,344,726,911	1,737,394,306	1,833,101,698	(2,000,000)	1,831,101,698	1,965,353,665
26	Program 45.25 - Comp. of Superior Court Judges	304,004,469	310,788,986	325,831,000	(5,600,000)	320,231,000	330,011,000
27	Program 45.35 - Assigned Judges	24,624,238	25,496,371	26,047,000	-	26,047,000	26,047,000
28	Program 45.45 - Court Interpreters	84,483,339	90,983,918	94,559,834	-	94,559,834	96,295,834
29	Program 45.55 - Grants	9,963,931	9,550,433	8,247,318	-	8,247,318	8,024,325
30	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	221,186	146,697	250,000	-	250,000	-
31	Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	1,791,634,387	2,197,032,835	2,309,715,978	(7,600,000)	2,302,115,978	2,441,369,823
32	Ending Fund Balance	82,346,997	21,218,232	16,284,477	9,919,271	26,203,748	20,633,860
33							
34	Fund Balance Detail						
35	Restricted Fund Balance	16,219,124	18,564,478	16,963,659	-	16,963,659	16,963,659
36	<i>Court Interpreter Program</i>	<i>12,924,808</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>	-	<i>14,734,148</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>
37	<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	<i>2,315,264</i>	<i>1,003,276</i>	<i>820,910</i>	-	<i>820,910</i>	<i>820,910</i>
38	<i>Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements</i>	<i>1,778,814</i>	<i>1,632,117</i>	<i>1,382,117</i>	-	<i>1,382,117</i>	<i>1,382,117</i>
39	<i>Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services</i>	-	<i>1,168,453</i>	-	-	-	-
40	<i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel</i>	<i>(799,762)</i>	<i>26,484</i>	<i>26,484</i>	-	<i>26,484</i>	<i>26,484</i>
41	Unrestricted Fund Balance	66,127,873	2,653,755	(679,182)	9,919,271	9,240,089	3,670,201
42							
43	Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	(42,448,616)	(58,439,881)	(4,933,756)	7,600,000	2,666,244	(5,569,888)

TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Appropriations Allocations

#	Project and Program Title	2014-15 JC- Approved Allocation	2014-15 Reimbursed by Courts	2014-15 Approved Total Allocation	FY 2015-16 TCBCAC Revenue & Expenditure Subcommittee Recommendations		
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col A + B)	Judicial Council (Staff) ¹	Trial Court Operations	Total
					Col. D	Col. E	Col F (Col. D + E)
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	113,000		113,000	-	113,000	113,000
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	8,238,000		8,238,000	500,000	7,686,000	8,186,000
3	Equal Access Fund	262,000		262,000	194,000	-	194,000
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000		260,000	260,000	-	260,000
5	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	625,000		625,000	625,000	-	625,000
6	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	5,658,137	804,863	6,463,000	-	625,000	625,000
7	Criminal and Traffic (V2) CMS	647,916	326,947	974,863	-	-	-
8	California Courts Technology Center		1,602,750	1,602,750	-	1,606,000	1,606,000
9	Interim Case Management System		956,207	956,207	-	843,000	843,000
10	Phoenix Financial Services		106,434	106,434	107,000	-	107,000
11	Phoenix HR Services		1,349,000	1,349,000	1,360,000	-	1,360,000
12	Total, Program/Project Allocations	15,804,053	5,146,201	20,950,254	3,046,000	10,873,000	13,919,000
13	Estimated State Controller's Office services charges				1,719,000	-	1,719,000
14	Estimated Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,852,000	13,025,000	17,877,000
15	Appropriation Balance	N/A	N/A	N/A	87,000	2,152,000	2,239,000

1. Provisional language in the FY 2014-15 Budget Act allows the Judicial Council appropriation authority to be increased for increased revenues that support the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot, Equal Access Fund, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections.

Description of Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations
 Projects/Programs Proposed to the TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure
 Subcommittee by the JCC for FY 2015–2016

Table of Contents

<i>Center for Families, Children, and the Courts</i>	9
<i>Children in Dependency Case Training</i>	9
<i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program</i>	10
<i>Equal Access Fund</i>	11
<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	12
<i>Finance Office</i>	12
<i>Statewide Support for Collections Programs</i>	12
<i>Information Technology Office</i>	13
<i>Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System</i>	13
<i>California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations</i>	13
<i>Interim Case Management System</i>	14
<i>Trial Court Administrative Services Office</i>	14
<i>Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services</i>	14

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Children in Dependency Case Training

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$113,000; no change from 2014–2015

Description:

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.

Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$8,186,000; \$52,000 decrease from 2014–2015

Description:

This directed funding implements a pilot program required by Government Code section 68651 (AB 590-Feuer). Project funds come from a restricted \$10 supplemental filing fee on certain postjudgment motions. The funding supports six 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.

Pilot programs were selected through a competitive RFP process and approved by the Judicial Council. The projects are located in Kern, Los Angeles, 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.”

Equal Access Fund

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$194,000; \$68,000 decrease from 2014–2015

Description:

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.

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$260,000, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

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.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

Finance Office

Statewide Support for Collections Programs

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$625,000, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

The JCC Revenue and Collections Unit represents the only centralized professional and technical assistance team available to courts and counties statewide regarding issues relating to the collection and distribution of court-ordered debt and associated revenue. Support provided ranges from assistance with annual reporting requirements, collections master and participation agreements, operational reviews of individual collection programs, as well as daily assistance with policy and statutory guidance. The unit recently assumed lead responsibility for responding to trial court revenue distribution inquiries as well as the planning and execution of related statewide training in partnership with the State Controller's Office.

Information Technology Office

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

Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$625,000, \$5,838,000 decrease from FY 2014–2015

Description:

The Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health case management system (CMS V3) is deployed at the California Court Technology Center (CCTC) for three Superior Courts: Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Ventura. It is hosted locally by two Superior Courts: Orange and San Diego. CMS 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.

The TCTF V3 program costs are fully reimbursed by the participating hosted courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual Schedule C process, where the V3 courts confirm agreed upon technical charges. Once V3 charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the year in the amount of the charges.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$1,606,000, \$3,250 increase from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

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.

The TCTF CCTC program costs are fully reimbursed by the participating courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual Schedule C process, where the courts confirm agreed upon technical charges. Once charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the year in the amount of the charges.

Interim Case Management System

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$843,000, \$113,207 decrease from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

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 ITO 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.

The TCTF ICMS program costs are fully reimbursed by the participating courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual Schedule C process, where the courts confirm agreed upon technical charges. Once charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the year in the amount of the charges.

Trial Court Administrative Services Office

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$1,467,000, \$11,566 increase from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

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.

The TCTF Phoenix program costs are fully reimbursed by the participating courts. For Phoenix Financial Services, these costs relate only to the Virtual Buyer program. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual Schedule C process, where the courts confirm agreed upon technical charges. Once charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the year in the amount of the charges.

FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations

#	Description	Type	Estimated 2014-15 Col. A	Estimated 2015-16 Col. B	For TCBCAC Subcommittee Consideration on March 10 Col. C
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,518,726,356	1,591,880,055	
3	II. Adjustments				
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-702,811	-818,121	
6	III. FY 2014-2015 Allocations				
7	\$86.3 Million in New Funding	Base	86,300,000		
8	\$42.8 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	41,034,166		
9	\$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall	Base	-22,700,000		
10	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-37,882,840	-39,810,420	
11	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to Courts	Non-Base	37,882,840	39,810,420	
12	Final 1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-1,711,712		
13	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-10,000,000	-50,000,000	
14	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000	
15	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding (FY 2012-13 costs)	Non-Base	130,450		
16	FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	-29,405,750		
17	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-1,371,906		
19	IV. FY 2015-2016 Allocations (Governor's Budget)				
20	\$41.0 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base		41,008,000	
21	\$90.1 Million in New Funding	Base		90,060,000	
22	\$26.9 Million Prop 47 workload	Base		26,900,000	
24	V. Allocation for Reimbursements				
25	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	103,725,445	103,725,445	103,725,445
26	Jury	Non-Base	16,000,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
27	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	2,286,000	2,286,000
28	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
29	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	332,000	332,000
30	CSA Audits ¹	Non-Base	325,000	325,000	325,000
31	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	996,574	525,139	525,139
33	VI. Estimated Revenue Distributions				
34	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	98,050,601	113,845,294	
35	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	24,132,589	23,015,939	
36	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	10,907,494	
37	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,126,882	2,948,108	
38	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,464,384	2,323,487	
39	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840	
41	VII. Miscellaneous Charges				
42	Repayment of FY 2013-14 Cash Advance	Non-Base	-1,734,355		
43	Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment- Phoenix Services	Non-Base	1,205,668		
44	Judicial Branch Worker's Compensation Fund Premiums	Non-Base	-16,536,015	-16,536,015	
45	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-5,146,201	-4,541,000	
46	Total		1,833,101,698	1,965,353,665	124,193,584
48	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriation Budget Act		1,894,142,000	1,990,521,000	
49	Transfer to Compensation of Superior Court Judges appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships		-2,755,000	-3,573,000	
50	Transfer to Court Interpreters appropriation due to court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding		-1,765,834	-1,765,834	
51	Transfer to JBWCF		-16,536,015	-16,536,015	
52	Adjusted Appropriation		1,873,085,151	1,968,646,151	
54	Estimated Remaining Appropriation		39,983,453	3,292,486	

¹ Provision 12 of the 2014 Budget Act requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits.

Description of Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Programs
Proposed to the TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee by the
JCC for FY 2015–2016

Table of Contents

<i>Center for Families, Children, and the Courts</i>	17
<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel</i>	17
<i>Self-Help Centers</i>	18
<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	19
<i>Court Operations Special Services Office</i>	20
<i>Screening Equipment Replacement</i>	20
<i>Finance Office</i>	21
<i>Jury</i>	21
<i>Elder Abuse</i>	22
<i>California State Auditor Audits</i>	23

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$103,725,445, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

For 2014–2015, 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 2014–2015 reimbursements are estimated to be about \$103.725 million. A statewide increase in juvenile dependency filings has increased the demand for dependency representation.

A working group of the TCBAC called the Court Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations Working Group is currently reviewing the methodology for allocating this funding to the courts and will report to the TCBAC in March.

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. 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 2015–2016 Allocation – \$2,500,000, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

For 2014–2015, 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 2014–2015 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 (IMF) (\$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 TCBAC, the Judicial Council has allocated an additional \$6,200,000 for self-help services from the Trial Court Trust Fund since 2007.

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$525,139, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

The Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) is a program under which courts collect reimbursements from parents and other responsible persons liable for the cost of dependency-related legal services to the extent that those persons are able to pay. Statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted through the JDCCP to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard.

At its August 23, 2013 meeting, the council adopted amendments to the JDCCP Guidelines by adding current section 14, which addressed the outstanding issue of how the Judicial Council could equitably allocate the funds remitted through the JDCCP among the trial courts in compliance with the statutory mandate that the funds be used to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads. Section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines describes the allocation methodology, which considers each court's participation in the program and each court's percentage of the statewide court-appointed counsel funding need.

For a court to be eligible to receive an allocation of these funds, it must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. Every court that has satisfied those requirements receives an allocation. Each eligible court's allocated share of the JDCCP funds is equivalent to its share of the aggregate funding need of all the eligible courts.

To the extent the actual revenue for FY 2014–2015 differs from the estimate used here, the court allocations would be adjusted for FY 2015–2016. Any portion of a court's allocated funds not spent and distributed in FY 2015–2016 would be carried forward for distribution to the court in FY 2016–2017 and subsequent years, even if a court is not eligible for an allocation in the subsequent fiscal year.

Court Operations Special Services Office

Screening Equipment Replacement

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$2,286,000, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

The anticipated budget for 2015-2016 is \$2,286,000. While estimated costs to meet total projected court needs exceed the budget, we will cover all service agreements and adjust the equipment purchases to fit within the budget in the following manner: approximately \$470,000 is anticipated for service agreement extensions at this time and approximately \$1,816,000 is anticipated for equipment replacement, although these approximations may be adjusted for reasons more fully explained below.

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 due in 2014-2015 exceeded 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 agreement extensions for the balance of the life of the equipment.

To stay within budget, the Office of Security delayed replacement of 13 x-ray machines.

The estimated cost for equipment replacement and service agreement extensions in 2015-2016 will exceed the budget for the same reasons as in 2014-2015, and will again require delayed replacement of equipment. The exact number cannot be determined until after the inventory has been updated for 2015-2016. In addition, the release of a Request for Proposal for service agreement vendors is anticipated in the next few months, which may alter the estimates.

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 2010cal to the sms 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.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

Finance Office

Jury

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$14,500,000, \$1,500,000 decrease from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

For 2014–2015, 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 2013–2014 have averaged \$15.4 million. The latest five year average is \$15.1 million and the latest three year average is \$14.5 million. The reimbursement for 2013–2014 was \$13.9 million. The 2014–2015 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 2015–2016 Allocation – \$332,000, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

For 2014–2015, the TCBAC recommended and the council approved that the program’s \$332,340 allocation 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 second quarter in 2014–2015, eligible reimbursements total \$355,015.

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 Judicial Council the number of EA-100 forms filed.

Table 1 -- Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Allocation Savings and Shortfalls, 2001–2002 to 2014–2015

Fiscal Year	EA-100 Filings Reported by Courts	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	3,497	646,945	332,340	(314,605)
2014–2015**	1,919	355,015	332,340	(22,675)

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

** As of second quarter of current fiscal year.

California State Auditor Audits

Proposed 2015–2016 Allocation – \$325,000, no change from FY 2014–2015 Allocation

Description:

Provision 12 of the current State Budget bill for 2015 requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the council to reimburse the California State Auditor to the extent costs of trial court audits are incurred by the California State Auditor under section 19210 of the Public Contract Code during 2015–2016.

IMF -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	Estimated 2015-16					
		2012-2013 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2013-2014 (Year-end Financial Statement)	Estimated 2014 15	No Reduction to 14-15 Allocation Level ¹	Highest 15% Reduction Option ²	Highest 25% Reduction Option ³
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Beginning Balance	48,128,575	44,827,741	26,207,006	4,659,586	4,659,586	4,659,586
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	11,547,967	4,410,172	2,654,362		-	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	59,676,542	49,237,913	28,861,368	4,659,586	4,659,586	4,659,586
4	<i>Revenues</i>						
5	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	31,920,133	26,873,351	23,384,535	22,898,778	22,898,778	22,898,778
6	2% Automation Fund Revenue	15,753,200	15,242,700	14,471,411	13,916,340	13,916,340	13,916,340
7	Jury Instructions Royalties	518,617	445,365	484,063	484,063	484,063	484,063
8	Interest from SMIF	201,201	124,878	89,244	89,244	89,244	89,244
9	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	2,875	24,476	3,097	-	-	-
10	<i>Transfers</i>						
11	From State General Fund	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000
12	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	(23,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)
13	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)
14	Net Revenues and Transfers	50,114,026	47,428,770	43,150,350	62,106,425	62,106,425	62,106,425
15	Total Resources	109,790,568	96,666,683	72,011,718	66,766,011	66,766,011	66,766,011
16	<i>Expenditures</i>						
17	Allocation	71,923,000	73,961,680	71,466,600	77,724,737	77,724,737	77,724,737
18	Less: Unused Allocation	(7,123,067)	(4,082,985)	(4,412,049)	-	(13,479,277)	(20,800,410)
19	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	162,894	580,982	297,581	297,581	297,582	297,582
20	Total Expenditures	64,962,827	70,459,677	67,352,132	78,022,318	64,543,042	57,221,909
21	Fund Balance	44,827,741	26,207,006	4,659,586	(11,256,307)	2,222,969	9,544,102
22	Revenue/Transfers Over/(Under) Exp	(14,848,801)	(23,030,907)	(24,201,782)	(15,915,893)	(2,436,617)	4,884,516

1. Includes non-reimbursed civil case management system allocation that is being funded out of the TCTF in 2014-15 and the planned allocation for other post-employment benefit costs. See Table 2 (column H, row 50).

2. The highest 15% reduction is \$13,479,277. See row 18 of this table and Table 2 (column E, row 10)

3. The sum of the highest 25% reduction options for each office is \$20,800,410. See row 18 of this table and Table 2 (column J, row 10)

Components of 50-50 Excess Split Revenue

	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	% Change from 05-06 to 13-14
Revenue Component	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Recording & Indexing Fee	57,595,599	46,025,052	27,136,554	21,550,780	21,763,207	24,087,832	26,366,391	33,062,213	21,545,849	-63%
\$1 of every \$2.5 from every parking ticket	18,132,666	19,732,098	18,817,863	19,087,160	20,550,643	17,768,599	17,419,675	16,530,226	15,954,192	-12%
75% of base fines from county	63,082,101	65,000,836	64,163,118	60,920,192	56,133,963	55,785,613	53,328,230	48,114,718	46,988,386	-26%
75% of county's percentage of base fines from city	13,848,886	11,253,954	11,997,078	12,032,330	11,579,506	11,243,145	11,992,561	11,042,039	10,615,060	-23%
\$25 Administrative Screening Fee	1,561,917	841,033	968,207	2,133,898	2,313,593	987,757	1,004,949	958,224	818,684	-48%
\$10 Citation Processing Fee	806,303	1,632,608	838,861	872,349	799,341	790,518	694,044	549,800	484,851	-40%
30% of State Penalty including TBI Penalty	69,069,348	70,474,991	71,747,445	70,959,453	67,029,610	64,613,500	59,225,688	54,886,040	52,350,950	-24%
Traffic Violator School Fee (77% of collections distributed to County GF)	106,128,359	110,749,210	122,762,850	117,321,215	104,801,396	107,073,533	98,213,294	97,464,700	98,094,183	-8%
Traffic Violator School (\$49 Fee - 49% of Collections)	39,506,143	40,075,291	39,121,898	38,021,349	35,824,432	34,165,731	29,562,465	27,256,352	26,440,903	-33%
Total	369,731,321	365,785,073	357,553,873	342,898,726	320,795,690	316,516,228	297,807,298	289,864,311	273,293,058	-26%
1994-95 Base Level	227,321,069	227,321,069	227,321,069	227,321,069	227,321,069	227,321,069	227,321,069	227,321,070	227,321,070	0%
50/50 Excess Revenue to TCIF/IMF	70,844,937	71,336,032	67,280,506	57,843,774	46,612,971	44,718,887	35,443,013	31,920,133	26,873,351	-62%

"Use" of IMF Funds by Courts

#	Program/Project Manager	Program/Project	FY 2014-15 Allocation	Funding Distributed to Courts?	# of Courts Receiving Distribution	Court Cost Subsidized	# of Courts Receiving Subsidy	Notes
1	Legal Services Office	Alternative Dispute Resolution	75,000	No	n/a			The program contracts for the development of materials to help support court-connected ADR programs across the state.
2	Legal Services Office	Complex Civil Litigation Program	4,001,000	Yes	6			
3	Legal Services Office	Litigation Management Program	4,500,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
4	Legal Services Office	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	966,600	No	n/a	Yes	58	
5	Legal Services Office	Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	17,100	No	n/a	Yes	58	
6	Legal Services Office	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	451,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
7	Legal Services Office	Jury System Improvement Projects	19,000	No	n/a		All courts provided jury instructions.	The program funds the two advisory committees that prepare the official jury instructions that are used by all courts.
8	Legal Services Office	Regional Office Assistance Group	1,460,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
9	Center for Families, Children & Courts		60,000	No	n/a	Yes	Available to all courts.	Interactive Software program develops smart forms and document assembly products to specifications from local court, then scales them to statewide availability.
10	Center for Families, Children & Courts	CFCC Programs	90,000	No	n/a	Yes	Open to all courts	CFCC program supports Youth Summit available to Youth/Peer Court youth and programs in every court; Family Law Educational programs meeting training requirements and mandates for court professionals is available to employees of all courts.
11	Center for Families, Children & Courts	CFCC Publications	20,000	No	n/a		Available online to all courts	CFCC Publications program supports online information available to all courts and dependency professionals across the state.
12	Center for Families, Children & Courts	Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	100,000	No	n/a		Available to all courts.	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support program primarily supports web-based resources (e.g., Statewide Self-Help Website) that are available to all courts and to the public.
13	Center for Families, Children & Courts	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	20,000	No	n/a		Available to all courts.	DV - FLIP program provides translations of DV-related forms.
14	Center for Families, Children & Courts	Self-Help Center	5,000,000	Yes	58			
15	Education	Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	56,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Required for new judges. Needs vary with annual judicial appointments
16	Education	B.E. Witkin Judicial College of CA	170,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
17	Education	Court Personnel Institutes	77,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Needs analysis and planning
18	Education	Curriculum Committee - Statewide Education Plan Development	2,000	No	n/a	Yes	Curriculum Committee members are drawn from many courts	
19	Education	Distance Education - Online Video, Resources, Webinar	10,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	All recent survey respondents reported using this education (90% response rate)
20	Education	Distance Education - Satellite Broadcast	137,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Presentation, facilitation and instructional design skills
21	Education	Faculty Development	30,000	No	n/a	Yes	Faculty are drawn from many courts	
22	Education	Judicial Institutes	159,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
23	Education	Leadership Training - Judicial	55,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
24	Education	Manager and Supervisor Training	46,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Required for new judges. Needs vary with annual judicial appointments
25	Education	Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	121,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Required for new judges. Needs vary with annual judicial appointments
26	Education	Primary Assignment Orientation and Overviews	274,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
27	Education	Regional and Local Court Staff Education Courses	15,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
28	Education	Regional and Local Judicial Education Courses	6,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Funding supports travel and other costs for trial court course faculty drawn from many courts
29	Education	Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Program	256,000	No	n/a	Yes	Faculty are drawn from many courts	
30	Court Operations Special Services	JusticeCorps	347,600	Yes	3	Yes	6	JusticeCorps members provide services at 6 courts.

"Use" of IMF Funds by Courts

#	Program/Project Manager	Program/Project	FY 2014-15 Allocation	Funding Distributed to Courts?	# of Courts Receiving Distribution	Court Cost Subsidized	# of Courts Receiving Subsidy	Notes
31	Court Operations Special Services	TC Performance and Accountability	13,000	Yes	15	Yes	15	Reimbursement of Workload Assessment Advisory Committee members who travel to in-person meetings and trial court staff who participate in focus groups.
32	Court Operations Special Services	CIP - Testing, Recruitment and Education	168,000	No	n/a			All courts who use certified/registered interpreters benefit. Courts are required to use certified/registered interpreters on the council's master list if and when available.
33	Court Operations Special Services	Trial Court Security Grants	1,200,000	Yes	Varies year to year	Yes	Varies year to year	The program provides security equipment on a replacement cycle and security services to trial courts.
34	Finance	Budget Focused Training/Meetings	50,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	The program reimburses the members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee for attending in-person meetings and covers non-staff costs related to budget training for trial court staff (e.g., conference line for webinars).
35	Finance	Treasury Services	238,000	No	n/a	Yes	58	
36	Finance	Trial Court Procurement	244,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts can use master contracts.	
37	Internal Audit Services	Audit Contract	150,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
38	Internal Audit Services	Internal Audits	660,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
39	Information Technology Services	Enterprise Policy/Statewide Planning and Deployment	5,268,500	No	n/a	Yes	58	
40	Information Technology Services	Telecommunications Support	11,705,000	No	n/a	Yes	58	
41	Information Technology Services	Data Integration	3,903,600	No	n/a	Yes	47	
42	Information Technology Services	CA Law Enforcement Telecommunication (CLETS)	433,400	No	n/a	Yes	9	
43	Information Technology Services	Interim Case Management System (ICMS)	1,246,800	No	n/a	Yes	8	
44	Information Technology Services	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	585,600	No	n/a	Yes	40	
45	Information Technology Services	Uniform Civil Fees	343,000	No	n/a	Yes	58	
46	Information Technology Services	Justice Partner Outreach / E-Services	200,700	No	n/a	Yes	58	
47	Information Technology Services	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	10,487,200	No	n/a	Yes	58	
48	Information Technology Services	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service (Orange Court)	133,700	Yes	1	Yes	58	
49	Information Technology Services	Testing Tools	624,300	No	n/a	Yes	58	
50	Human Resources Services	Labor Relations Academy	34,700	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
51	Human Resources Services	Workers Compensation Reserve	1,231,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
52	Human Resources Services	Human Resources - Court Investigation	94,500	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
53	Trial Court Administrative Services	Phoenix Project	13,885,300	No	n/a	Yes	58	
54	Trial Court Administrative Services	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	25,000	No	n/a		Available to all courts.	The Task Force will be recommending revenue distribution methodologies and policies that will be used by all 58 courts.
55		Total	71,466,600					

COURT CLUSTERS			
1	2	3	4
Alpine	Butte	Contra Costa	Alameda
Amador	El Dorado	Fresno	Los Angeles
Calaveras	Humboldt	Kern	Orange
Colusa	Imperial	Monterey	Riverside
Del Norte	Kings	San Joaquin	Sacramento
Inyo	Lake	San Mateo	San Bernardino
Lassen	Madera	Santa Barbara	San Diego
Mariposa	Mendocino	Solano	San Francisco
Modoc	Merced	Sonoma	Santa Clara
Mono	Napa	Stanislaus	
Plumas	Nevada	Tulare	
San Benito	Placer	Ventura	
Sierra	San Luis Obispo		
Trinity	Santa Cruz		
	Shasta		
	Siskiyou		
	Sutter		
	Tehama		
	Tuolumne		
	Yolo		
	Yuba		

BENEFIT PROVIDED TO JUDICIAL BRANCH, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY STATEWIDE AVERAGE

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	Self-Help Centers	9.29	9.57	9.67	9.33	9.48	56
2	Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers	8.64	9.52	9.25	8.89	9.14	56
3	Phoenix Program	9.42	8.38	9.17	9.44	9.00	56
4	Telecommunication Support	9.14	7.95	9.50	9.44	8.73	56
5	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	8.29	8.71	9.00	8.11	8.68	56
6	Budget-focused Training and Meetings	8.57	8.76	8.50	8.78	8.66	56
7	Litigation Management Program	8.93	8.90	9.17	7.89	8.62	56
8	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	8.36	8.67	9.00	8.11	8.57	56
9	Trial Court Security Grants	8.57	9.10	8.10	7.67	8.52	56
10	Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)	7.36	8.57	8.83	9.44	8.46	56
11	CFCC Educational Programs	7.79	8.14	8.67	8.67	8.25	56
12	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	7.79	8.38	8.25	8.11	8.16	56
13	Essential and other Education for Court Personnel	8.36	8.10	8.42	7.56	8.14	56
14	Essential and other Education for Court Management	7.86	8.24	8.25	8.00	8.11	56
15	Treasury Services- Case Management	8.07	8.19	8.42	7.56	8.11	56
16	Audit Services	7.36	7.67	8.42	8.78	7.93	56
17	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	6.50	7.90	8.67	7.78	7.70	56
18	Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program	7.57	7.71	8.25	6.56	7.61	56
19	Jury Management System	6.93	8.05	7.17	7.67	7.61	56
20	Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	6.86	7.81	7.33	8.33	7.61	56
21	California Courts Protective Order Registry (ROM)	7.14	7.52	7.92	7.89	7.57	56
22	Faculty and Curriculum Development	7.29	7.57	8.25	7.00	7.55	56
23	Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms	7.43	7.62	7.75	7.11	7.52	56
24	Other Post-employment Benefits Valuation Report	7.21	7.33	8.00	7.44	7.46	56
25	Distance Learning	8.07	7.33	7.67	6.44	7.45	56
26	Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program	6.86	6.96	8.58	7.67	7.41	56
27	Jury System Improvement Projects	6.79	7.24	7.75	7.78	7.36	56
28	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.36	7.86	6.25	5.56	7.27	56
29	Human Resources- Court Investigation	6.93	7.86	7.67	4.57	7.07	56
30	Workers' Compensation Reserve	5.79	7.38	8.42	6.20	7.02	56
31	California Language Access Plan	7.00	6.67	7.25	7.22	6.96	56
32	Regional Office Assistance Group	6.64	7.24	6.83	6.56	6.89	56
33	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services	7.29	5.76	7.83	7.11	6.80	56
34	Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension	7.36	7.00	6.33	5.78	6.75	56
35	Trial Court Procurement	7.50	6.62	7.58	4.33	6.68	56
36	CFCC Publications	6.43	7.10	6.25	6.22	6.61	56
37	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	5.86	6.76	6.42	5.33	6.32	56
38	2015 Language Needs Study	6.64	6.05	6.42	5.00	6.11	56
39	Subscription Costs— <i>Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	5.86	5.19	6.42	6.78	6.02	56
40	Data Integration	6.64	6.29	4.92	5.56	5.96	56
41	Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Development)	5.36	6.10	4.83	6.33	5.68	56
42	Audit Contract	6.29	5.86	5.42	3.44	5.48	56
43	Complex Civil Litigation Program	6.71	4.90	4.75	5.33	5.39	56
44	Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services	6.64	4.86	4.50	5.70	5.36	56
45	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	6.14	4.38	4.67	4.67	5.07	56
46	Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	5.79	4.19	6.00	4.67	5.04	56
47	JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	4.43	3.76	4.67	6.56	4.57	56
48	Interim Case Management Systems	4.29	4.24	4.17	3.56	4.13	56
49	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	3.50	2.81	3.58	4.00	3.34	56

**NUMBER OF COURTS RECEIVING DIRECT BENEFIT, BY CLUSTER
SORTED BY TOTAL**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Total
1	Self-Help Centers	14	21	12	9	56
2	Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers	14	21	12	8	55
3	Phoenix Program	14	21	12	8	55
4	Essential and other Education for Court Management	12	20	12	9	53
5	Audit Services	12	20	11	9	52
6	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	13	19	11	9	52
7	Telecommunication Support	12	20	11	9	52
8	CFCC Educational Programs	13	18	11	9	51
9	Essential and other Education for Court Personnel	13	20	10	8	51
10	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	11	21	11	8	51
11	Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	12	20	11	8	51
12	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	13	18	11	8	50
13	Treasury Services- Case Management	11	19	12	7	49
14	Litigation Management Program	11	17	12	9	49
15	Distance Learning	12	19	10	7	48
16	Budget-focused Training and Meetings	11	17	11	9	48
17	Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program	8	20	12	7	47
18	Jury Management System	10	19	11	7	47
19	Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)	7	19	10	8	44
20	Trial Court Security Grants	10	17	10	6	43
21	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	7	17	12	7	43
22	Jury System Improvement Projects	10	17	10	6	43
23	California Courts Protective Order Registry (ROM)	11	18	8	5	42
24	Regional Office Assistance Group	13	18	8	3	42
25	Faculty and Curriculum Development	6	18	10	7	41
26	Other Post-employment Benefits Valuation Report	7	18	8	8	41
27	Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program	7	17	11	5	40
28	Subscription Costs— <i>Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	5	18	10	6	39
29	Trial Court Procurement	12	13	9	4	38
30	Human Resources- Court Investigation	7	18	9	3	37
31	CFCC Publications	8	12	9	7	36
32	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	5	13	10	6	34
33	Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension	8	14	8	4	34
34	Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms	7	13	8	5	33
35	Workers’ Compensation Reserve	7	13	8	5	33
36	California Language Access Plan	5	11	9	5	30
37	Judicial Council’s Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	8	13	7	2	30
38	Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Development)	5	11	5	8	29
39	Audit Contract	7	10	7	1	25
40	2015 Language Needs Study	4	9	7	3	23
41	Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	8	7	5	3	23
42	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services	4	6	8	3	21
43	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	5	4	5	2	16
44	Data Integration	4	5	2	3	14
45	Complex Civil Litigation Program	3	0	3	5	11
46	Interim Case Management Systems	4	5	1	0	10
47	JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	0	0	1	5	6
48	Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services	2	2	0	2	6
49	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	0	0	2	3	5

**BENEFIT PROVIDED TO COURT, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY STATEWIDE AVERAGE**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	Self-Help Centers	9.43	9.80	9.75	9.56	9.65	55
2	Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers	8.85	9.56	9.41	9.22	9.29	52
3	Phoenix Program	9.64	8.50	9.09	9.56	9.09	54
4	Trial Court Security Grants	9.44	9.56	8.45	8.17	9.05	42
5	Budget-focused Training and Meetings	8.73	9.36	8.73	9.22	9.04	48
6	Litigation Management Program	9.58	9.00	9.27	9.00	9.02	48
7	Telecommunication Support	9.54	8.50	9.75	8.25	8.92	51
8	Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)	8.50	8.75	9.09	9.00	8.85	41
9	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	8.73	8.88	9.08	8.38	8.81	48
10	CFCC Educational Programs	8.09	9.00	8.92	8.89	8.76	49
11	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	8.08	9.00	8.50	8.17	8.67	43
12	Essential and other Education for Court Personnel	9.00	8.50	8.50	8.63	8.64	50
13	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	8.55	7.79	8.25	8.22	8.51	51
14	Essential and other Education for Court Management	7.80	8.62	8.50	8.33	8.38	50
15	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	8.33	8.40	8.55	8.00	8.35	40
16	Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms	8.13	8.47	9.42	7.00	8.34	38
17	Treasury Services- Case Management	8.70	8.53	8.25	7.38	8.29	45
18	Audit Services	8.20	7.89	8.42	8.89	8.27	49
19	Faculty and Curriculum Development	8.40	8.63	8.46	7.11	8.22	41
20	Workers' Compensation Reserve	8.71	7.77	8.50	8.17	8.22	36
21	Jury Management System	8.00	8.63	8.00	7.50	8.20	44
22	Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program	7.20	8.33	8.00	8.63	8.18	44
23	Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	6.92	8.50	8.10	8.63	8.04	51
24	California Courts Protective Order Registry (ROM)	7.83	7.75	8.50	8.60	8.02	47
25	Other Post-employment Benefits Valuation Report	8.33	7.76	8.88	7.38	8.00	39
26	Regional Office Assistance Group	7.38	7.78	7.91	9.00	7.85	48
27	Jury System Improvement Projects	7.08	8.06	8.00	8.60	7.77	44
28	Human Resources- Court Investigation	9.14	7.84	7.73	5.40	7.74	42
29	Distance Learning	8.46	7.95	7.67	5.78	7.61	54
30	Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program	7.13	7.65	8.08	7.13	7.58	48
31	Trial Court Procurement	8.18	6.67	7.91	7.00	7.44	41
32	California Language Access Plan	8.29	6.71	6.89	9.20	7.43	35
33	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.72	7.73	6.92	5.78	7.41	51
34	Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension	7.55	7.28	7.80	6.57	7.34	44
35	CFCC Publications	7.43	7.18	7.75	6.29	7.18	39
36	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services	8.25	5.17	8.44	10.00	7.18	28
37	Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Development)	6.83	7.14	6.25	6.50	6.75	36
38	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6.00	7.07	6.29	8.25	6.67	39
39	2015 Language Needs Study	7.33	6.60	6.60	6.14	6.64	33
40	Subscription Costs— <i>Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	6.45	5.87	6.50	7.13	6.45	44
41	Data Integration	7.00	6.67	4.00	5.67	6.07	28
42	Audit Contract	7.29	6.14	5.50	3.80	5.86	36
43	Complex Civil Litigation Program	7.85	4.00	5.40	5.00	5.47	23
44	Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	6.22	4.83	6.20	5.00	5.35	31
45	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	6.13	3.71	5.50	5.75	5.08	26
46	Interim Case Management Systems	6.67	5.42	2.80	3.50	5.04	25
47	Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services	6.86	3.89	2.50	5.25	4.58	26
48	JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	3.25	1.60	3.14	8.17	4.18	22
49	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	2.67	2.67	4.60	6.00	3.86	22

**BENEFIT PROVIDED TO COURT, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY CLUSTER 1**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	Phoenix Program	9.64	8.50	9.09	9.56	9.09	54
2	Litigation Management Program	9.58	9.00	9.27	9.00	9.02	48
3	Telecommunication Support	9.54	8.50	9.75	8.25	8.92	51
4	Trial Court Security Grants	9.44	9.56	8.45	8.17	9.05	42
5	Self-Help Centers	9.43	9.80	9.75	9.56	9.65	55
6	Human Resources- Court Investigation	9.14	7.84	7.73	5.40	7.74	42
7	Essential and other Education for Court Personnel	9.00	8.50	8.50	8.63	8.64	50
8	Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers	8.85	9.56	9.41	9.22	9.29	52
9	Budget-focused Training and Meetings	8.73	9.36	8.73	9.22	9.04	48
10	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	8.73	8.88	9.08	8.38	8.81	48
11	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.72	7.73	6.92	5.78	7.41	51
12	Workers' Compensation Reserve	8.71	7.77	8.50	8.17	8.22	36
13	Treasury Services- Case Management	8.70	8.53	8.25	7.38	8.29	45
14	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	8.55	7.79	8.25	8.22	8.51	51
15	Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)	8.50	8.75	9.09	9.00	8.85	41
16	Distance Learning	8.46	7.95	7.67	5.78	7.61	54
17	Faculty and Curriculum Development	8.40	8.63	8.46	7.11	8.22	41
18	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	8.33	8.40	8.55	8.00	8.35	40
19	Other Post-employment Benefits Valuation Report	8.33	7.76	8.88	7.38	8.00	39
20	California Language Access Plan	8.29	6.71	6.89	9.20	7.43	35
21	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services	8.25	5.17	8.44	10.00	7.18	28
22	Audit Services	8.20	7.89	8.42	8.89	8.27	49
23	Trial Court Procurement	8.18	6.67	7.91	7.00	7.44	41
24	Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms	8.13	8.47	9.42	7.00	8.34	38
25	CFCC Educational Programs	8.09	9.00	8.92	8.89	8.76	49
26	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	8.08	9.00	8.50	8.17	8.67	43
27	Jury Management System	8.00	8.63	8.00	7.50	8.20	44
28	Complex Civil Litigation Program	7.85	4.00	5.40	5.00	5.47	23
29	California Courts Protective Order Registry (ROM)	7.83	7.75	8.50	8.60	8.02	47
30	Essential and other Education for Court Management	7.80	8.62	8.50	8.33	8.38	50
31	Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension	7.55	7.28	7.80	6.57	7.34	44
32	CFCC Publications	7.43	7.18	7.75	6.29	7.18	39
33	Regional Office Assistance Group	7.38	7.78	7.91	9.00	7.85	48
34	2015 Language Needs Study	7.33	6.60	6.60	6.14	6.64	33
35	Audit Contract	7.29	6.14	5.50	3.80	5.86	36
36	Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program	7.20	8.33	8.00	8.63	8.18	44
37	Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program	7.13	7.65	8.08	7.13	7.58	48
38	Jury System Improvement Projects	7.08	8.06	8.00	8.60	7.77	44
39	Data Integration	7.00	6.67	4.00	5.67	6.07	28
40	Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	6.92	8.50	8.10	8.63	8.04	51
41	Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services	6.86	3.89	2.50	5.25	4.58	26
42	Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Development)	6.83	7.14	6.25	6.50	6.75	36
43	Interim Case Management Systems	6.67	5.42	2.80	3.50	5.04	25
44	Subscription Costs— <i>Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	6.45	5.87	6.50	7.13	6.45	44
45	Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	6.22	4.83	6.20	5.00	5.35	31
46	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	6.13	3.71	5.50	5.75	5.08	26
47	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6.00	7.07	6.29	8.25	6.67	39
48	JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	3.25	1.60	3.14	8.17	4.18	22
49	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	2.67	2.67	4.60	6.00	3.86	22

**BENEFIT PROVIDED TO COURT, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY CLUSTER 2**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	Self-Help Centers	9.43	9.80	9.75	9.56	9.65	55
2	Trial Court Security Grants	9.44	9.56	8.45	8.17	9.05	42
3	Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers	8.85	9.56	9.41	9.22	9.29	52
4	Budget-focused Training and Meetings	8.73	9.36	8.73	9.22	9.04	48
5	Litigation Management Program	9.58	9.00	9.27	9.00	9.02	48
6	CFCC Educational Programs	8.09	9.00	8.92	8.89	8.76	49
7	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	8.08	9.00	8.50	8.17	8.67	43
8	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	8.73	8.88	9.08	8.38	8.81	48
9	Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)	8.50	8.75	9.09	9.00	8.85	41
10	Faculty and Curriculum Development	8.40	8.63	8.46	7.11	8.22	41
11	Jury Management System	8.00	8.63	8.00	7.50	8.20	44
12	Essential and other Education for Court Management	7.80	8.62	8.50	8.33	8.38	50
13	Treasury Services- Case Management	8.70	8.53	8.25	7.38	8.29	45
14	Phoenix Program	9.64	8.50	9.09	9.56	9.09	54
15	Telecommunication Support	9.54	8.50	9.75	8.25	8.92	51
16	Essential and other Education for Court Personnel	9.00	8.50	8.50	8.63	8.64	50
17	Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	6.92	8.50	8.10	8.63	8.04	51
18	Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms	8.13	8.47	9.42	7.00	8.34	38
19	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	8.33	8.40	8.55	8.00	8.35	40
20	Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program	7.20	8.33	8.00	8.63	8.18	44
21	Jury System Improvement Projects	7.08	8.06	8.00	8.60	7.77	44
22	Distance Learning	8.46	7.95	7.67	5.78	7.61	54
23	Audit Services	8.20	7.89	8.42	8.89	8.27	49
24	Human Resources- Court Investigation	9.14	7.84	7.73	5.40	7.74	42
25	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	8.55	7.79	8.25	8.22	8.51	51
26	Regional Office Assistance Group	7.38	7.78	7.91	9.00	7.85	48
27	Workers' Compensation Reserve	8.71	7.77	8.50	8.17	8.22	36
28	Other Post-employment Benefits Valuation Report	8.33	7.76	8.88	7.38	8.00	39
29	California Courts Protective Order Registry (ROM)	7.83	7.75	8.50	8.60	8.02	47
30	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.72	7.73	6.92	5.78	7.41	51
31	Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program	7.13	7.65	8.08	7.13	7.58	48
32	Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension	7.55	7.28	7.80	6.57	7.34	44
33	CFCC Publications	7.43	7.18	7.75	6.29	7.18	39
34	Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Development)	6.83	7.14	6.25	6.50	6.75	36
35	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6.00	7.07	6.29	8.25	6.67	39
36	California Language Access Plan	8.29	6.71	6.89	9.20	7.43	35
37	Trial Court Procurement	8.18	6.67	7.91	7.00	7.44	41
38	Data Integration	7.00	6.67	4.00	5.67	6.07	28
39	2015 Language Needs Study	7.33	6.60	6.60	6.14	6.64	33
40	Audit Contract	7.29	6.14	5.50	3.80	5.86	36
41	Subscription Costs— <i>Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	6.45	5.87	6.50	7.13	6.45	44
42	Interim Case Management Systems	6.67	5.42	2.80	3.50	5.04	25
43	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services	8.25	5.17	8.44	10.00	7.18	28
44	Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	6.22	4.83	6.20	5.00	5.35	31
45	Complex Civil Litigation Program	7.85	4.00	5.40	5.00	5.47	23
46	Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services	6.86	3.89	2.50	5.25	4.58	26
47	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	6.13	3.71	5.50	5.75	5.08	26
48	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	2.67	2.67	4.60	6.00	3.86	22
49	JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	3.25	1.60	3.14	8.17	4.18	22

**BENEFIT PROVIDED TO COURT, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY CLUSTER 3**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	Self-Help Centers	9.43	9.80	9.75	9.56	9.65	55
2	Telecommunication Support	9.54	8.50	9.75	8.25	8.92	51
3	Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms	8.13	8.47	9.42	7.00	8.34	38
4	Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers	8.85	9.56	9.41	9.22	9.29	52
5	Litigation Management Program	9.58	9.00	9.27	9.00	9.02	48
6	Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)	8.50	8.75	9.09	9.00	8.85	41
7	Phoenix Program	9.64	8.50	9.09	9.56	9.09	54
8	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	8.73	8.88	9.08	8.38	8.81	48
9	CFCC Educational Programs	8.09	9.00	8.92	8.89	8.76	49
10	Other Post-employment Benefits Valuation Report	8.33	7.76	8.88	7.38	8.00	39
11	Budget-focused Training and Meetings	8.73	9.36	8.73	9.22	9.04	48
12	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	8.33	8.40	8.55	8.00	8.35	40
13	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	8.08	9.00	8.50	8.17	8.67	43
14	Essential and other Education for Court Management	7.80	8.62	8.50	8.33	8.38	50
15	Essential and other Education for Court Personnel	9.00	8.50	8.50	8.63	8.64	50
16	Workers' Compensation Reserve	8.71	7.77	8.50	8.17	8.22	36
17	California Courts Protective Order Registry (ROM)	7.83	7.75	8.50	8.60	8.02	47
18	Faculty and Curriculum Development	8.40	8.63	8.46	7.11	8.22	41
19	Trial Court Security Grants	9.44	9.56	8.45	8.17	9.05	42
20	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services	8.25	5.17	8.44	10.00	7.18	28
21	Audit Services	8.20	7.89	8.42	8.89	8.27	49
22	Treasury Services- Case Management	8.70	8.53	8.25	7.38	8.29	45
23	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	8.55	7.79	8.25	8.22	8.51	51
24	Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	6.92	8.50	8.10	8.63	8.04	51
25	Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program	7.13	7.65	8.08	7.13	7.58	48
26	Jury Management System	8.00	8.63	8.00	7.50	8.20	44
27	Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program	7.20	8.33	8.00	8.63	8.18	44
28	Jury System Improvement Projects	7.08	8.06	8.00	8.60	7.77	44
29	Regional Office Assistance Group	7.38	7.78	7.91	9.00	7.85	48
30	Trial Court Procurement	8.18	6.67	7.91	7.00	7.44	41
31	Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension	7.55	7.28	7.80	6.57	7.34	44
32	CFCC Publications	7.43	7.18	7.75	6.29	7.18	39
33	Human Resources- Court Investigation	9.14	7.84	7.73	5.40	7.74	42
34	Distance Learning	8.46	7.95	7.67	5.78	7.61	54
35	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.72	7.73	6.92	5.78	7.41	51
36	California Language Access Plan	8.29	6.71	6.89	9.20	7.43	35
37	2015 Language Needs Study	7.33	6.60	6.60	6.14	6.64	33
38	Subscription Costs— <i>Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	6.45	5.87	6.50	7.13	6.45	44
39	Judicial Council's Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6.00	7.07	6.29	8.25	6.67	39
40	Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Development)	6.83	7.14	6.25	6.50	6.75	36
41	Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	6.22	4.83	6.20	5.00	5.35	31
42	Audit Contract	7.29	6.14	5.50	3.80	5.86	36
43	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	6.13	3.71	5.50	5.75	5.08	26
44	Complex Civil Litigation Program	7.85	4.00	5.40	5.00	5.47	23
45	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	2.67	2.67	4.60	6.00	3.86	22
46	Data Integration	7.00	6.67	4.00	5.67	6.07	28
47	JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	3.25	1.60	3.14	8.17	4.18	22
48	Interim Case Management Systems	6.67	5.42	2.80	3.50	5.04	25
49	Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services	6.86	3.89	2.50	5.25	4.58	26

**BENEFIT PROVIDED TO COURT, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY CLUSTER 4**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Services	8.25	5.17	8.44	10.00	7.18	28
2	Self-Help Centers	9.43	9.80	9.75	9.56	9.65	55
3	Phoenix Program	9.64	8.50	9.09	9.56	9.09	54
4	Mandated, Essential and Other Education for Judicial Officers	8.85	9.56	9.41	9.22	9.29	52
5	Budget-focused Training and Meetings	8.73	9.36	8.73	9.22	9.04	48
6	California Language Access Plan	8.29	6.71	6.89	9.20	7.43	35
7	Litigation Management Program	9.58	9.00	9.27	9.00	9.02	48
8	Court Interpreter Program (Testing, Development, Recruitment, and Education)	8.50	8.75	9.09	9.00	8.85	41
9	Regional Office Assistance Group	7.38	7.78	7.91	9.00	7.85	48
10	CFCC Educational Programs	8.09	9.00	8.92	8.89	8.76	49
11	Audit Services	8.20	7.89	8.42	8.89	8.27	49
12	Essential and other Education for Court Personnel	9.00	8.50	8.50	8.63	8.64	50
13	Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)	6.92	8.50	8.10	8.63	8.04	51
14	Trial Courts Transaction Assistance Program	7.20	8.33	8.00	8.63	8.18	44
15	California Courts Protective Order Registry (ROM)	7.83	7.75	8.50	8.60	8.02	47
16	Jury System Improvement Projects	7.08	8.06	8.00	8.60	7.77	44
17	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	8.73	8.88	9.08	8.38	8.81	48
18	Essential and other Education for Court Management	7.80	8.62	8.50	8.33	8.38	50
19	Telecommunication Support	9.54	8.50	9.75	8.25	8.92	51
20	Judicial Council’s Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6.00	7.07	6.29	8.25	6.67	39
21	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	8.55	7.79	8.25	8.22	8.51	51
22	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	8.08	9.00	8.50	8.17	8.67	43
23	Workers’ Compensation Reserve	8.71	7.77	8.50	8.17	8.22	36
24	Trial Court Security Grants	9.44	9.56	8.45	8.17	9.05	42
25	JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)	3.25	1.60	3.14	8.17	4.18	22
26	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	8.33	8.40	8.55	8.00	8.35	40
27	Jury Management System	8.00	8.63	8.00	7.50	8.20	44
28	Other Post-employment Benefits Valuation Report	8.33	7.76	8.88	7.38	8.00	39
29	Treasury Services- Case Management	8.70	8.53	8.25	7.38	8.29	45
30	Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program	7.13	7.65	8.08	7.13	7.58	48
31	Subscription Costs— <i>Judicial Conduct Reporter</i>	6.45	5.87	6.50	7.13	6.45	44
32	Faculty and Curriculum Development	8.40	8.63	8.46	7.11	8.22	41
33	Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms	8.13	8.47	9.42	7.00	8.34	38
34	Trial Court Procurement	8.18	6.67	7.91	7.00	7.44	41
35	Adobe Lifecycle Reader Services Extension	7.55	7.28	7.80	6.57	7.34	44
36	Enterprise Policy and Planning (Statewide Development)	6.83	7.14	6.25	6.50	6.75	36
37	CFCC Publications	7.43	7.18	7.75	6.29	7.18	39
38	2015 Language Needs Study	7.33	6.60	6.60	6.14	6.64	33
39	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	2.67	2.67	4.60	6.00	3.86	22
40	Distance Learning	8.46	7.95	7.67	5.78	7.61	54
41	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.72	7.73	6.92	5.78	7.41	51
42	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	6.13	3.71	5.50	5.75	5.08	26
43	Data Integration	7.00	6.67	4.00	5.67	6.07	28
44	Human Resources- Court Investigation	9.14	7.84	7.73	5.40	7.74	42
45	Justice Partner Outreach and e-Services	6.86	3.89	2.50	5.25	4.58	26
46	Testing Tools—Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)	6.22	4.83	6.20	5.00	5.35	31
47	Complex Civil Litigation Program	7.85	4.00	5.40	5.00	5.47	23
48	Audit Contract	7.29	6.14	5.50	3.80	5.86	36
49	Interim Case Management Systems	6.67	5.42	2.80	3.50	5.04	25

#1: CFCC EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.25	13	18	11	9	51	11	18	12	9	50	8.76

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	10.9%	6
No	85.5%	47
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	3.6%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house
 Local Training for FCS staff. Free seminars through the County Health and Human Services Agency.
 We provide significant amounts of local training for both judges and staff.
 In reality "no", though some educational programs could be developed and delivered locally or regionally.
 internal court resources or reach out to other courts for peer-education and collaboration
 National Center for State Courts, National Assn. for Court Managers, Reaching out to other courts

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Many of the trainings offered for our Family Court Mediators and Probate Investigators are on point for the continued education requirements that are needed. If the program will be eliminated, we will find it difficult to meet these requirements.
 During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.
 Judicial training that includes other law and justice partners is rare but extremely beneficial for both the court and the justice partners.
 It would be a particular challenge to provide mandatory training court family court investigators and mediators. May be able to partner with larger courts for delivery of other educational programs.
 We need these sponsored programs in order to receive needed and/or required education.
 Provides mandated training. Substantially equivalent cost-effective training is not available in this actively evolving area of law.
 Some items are mandatory.
 While this program has merit, it is not clear why this ongoing, established program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.
 Loss of the educational programs would create a hardship for all who work in the area of Family Court Services. Providing these services locally would be a financial hardship and difficult process for the local court.
 This is a core function of a state AOC and as such is not appropriately supported through the IMF. It should be funded out of the Judicial Council appropriation. Additionally, courts can share resources to accomplish training themselves.
 We are a remote, geographically distant court. CFCC helps provide us education and speakers we would not be able to have without their assistance. Ret. Judge Len Edwards just came to Imperial last week to provide a lecture on Reasonable Efforts. 90 people attended.
 Our Commissioner finds it valuable
 Educational programs are a vital, ongoing need that seems part of the Judicial Council staff's function of supporting all of the courts. Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Instead, as a core JC staff function consider funding as part of core JC budget.
 Program provides required education to court staff, judicial officers and justice partners.
 Do any of the outside agencies who benefit from training and training resources contribute to any portion of the costs?
 CFCC staff and programs are excellent, but if we need to cut, we can survive or develop alternative modes of service and educational delivery.
 CFCC staff is responsive, but the turn over in staff and budget cuts in recent years have made their program lose momentum. No longer are Regional Trainings as beneficial as they used to be, when they were longer than one day, and access to excellent presenters

#2: INTERACTIVE SOFTWARE – SELF-REP ELECTRONIC FORMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.52	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.34
	7	13	8	5	33	7	14	8	5	34	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	26.4%	14
No	50.9%	27
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	22.6%	12

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Use other services available that provides forms
San Bernardino is in the process of creating additional forms to use in the document assembly for Self-Represented Litigants that are more focused on our specific court's needs.
Direct personal assistance by family law facilitator's and self-help center
We have used other alternatives in the past, but there was a substantial cost involved; something we cannot afford today
Self-Represented litigants would be required to fill out forms by hand.
We could develop an alternative program or procure one, but it would not be as cost effective.
Utilize CA Court forms in their fillable format. Litigants handwrite documents in clinics.
HotDocs; Smart Forms
Off the shelf vendors or in house applications.
Currently working on software through our Self-Help office as well as with Tyler's Odyssey product, which we will be implementing this Fall.
The alternative would require that staff spend additional time sitting down with each litigant to fill out each form, line by line, with repetitive information (e.g. name, address, case name, case number, etc.) rather than allowing the litigants to use the Interactive Software computer program to enter the information once for all forms.
The Court could purchase forms from the vendor Essential Forms. However, there is a lag time in the vendor providing updated forms to the court.
We could create our own online forms
Virtual Self Help Law Center website

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

I am not familiar with this service.
Eliminating this service would mean more self-represented litigants are in need of assistance. This would create longer waits at our Self-Help Center and Family Law offices.
If this program were implemented on a more uniform statewide basis then I believe it would be of more benefit.
This is an example of the benefit of not recreating the wheel 58 times.
Elimination of electronic forms severely hampers the already limited number of customers and level of services that can be provided
We have not been able to utilize this resource but feel it would benefit SRL's.
This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel.

Due to limited funding, staffing and space Kings does not currently offer this service. It would be a benefit to the litigants if we did.

This sounds like a one-time expense. We presume it will not be repeated.

A major need that should be addressed. A great example of a project that seems appropriately funded by the IMF.

Our self-help center uses the on line Judicial Council forms which can be completed, but are not interactive.

Program is a benefit to self represented litigants, attorneys, self-help centers and court staff.

The program creates efficiencies and cost-effectiveness all-around by increasing the number of legible, correct and complete forms filed by self-represented litigants which thereby results in a substantial reduction of allocated time spent by Self-Help staff, clerks offices and judicial officers addressing errors and mistakes.

In a small court with almost no self-help services this program is of great assistance to self-represented litigants and court staff.

The information is indirectly beneficial to our court users, but if we have to reduce it at the JC level, we will come up with different modes of providing that info to SRL's

#3: CFCC PUBLICATIONS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
6.61	8	12	9	7	36	7	9	6	6	28	7.18

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	24.5%	12
No	63.3%	31
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	12.2%	6

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Training via private agencies, State Bar of California, etc.
 General legal research which would not be cost efficient or effective
 But not in one collective website - would have to access a variety of sources to get same information.
 Lexis /West
 List Serve exchange of information with other Facilitators, FCS and Self-Help Coordinators.
 Rely more on peers or regional resources as well as self-guided research on CFCC-related issues
 Provide materials as necessary directly from the vendors.
 We provide legislative analysis to our judicial officers and staff.
 Alternative would be research online.
 Would make use of other publications. However, this would require additional judicial time.
 Judicial officers could use legal materials currently available.
 Reaching out to fellow courts, NACM, NCSC

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Not sure if our Court uses. only put a rating in #1 and answered #2 because there was not an option to say 'not sure'
 The online search inquiry is very helpful and the topical index is used frequently by our judges.
 It is not clear why these ongoing publications are funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.
 The Court does would not be able to support continuing education materials or training within its existing budget.
 CFCC publications are relied upon by Administration and the Bench- and are utilized Daily. Judges and Administrators rely on these to summarize the new laws and to keep current on the publication topics.
 Website maintained by the program provides a valuable service. Upgrades and enhancements to the website would seem to be appropriately funded by the IMF. There needs to be discussion on whether ongoing maintenance - non upgrades - should be funded by the IMF.
 Judicial officers and dependency attorneys subscribe and find this program to be a benefit.
 Has there been an analysis of whether subscribers outside the Judicial Branch should contribute to any costs of this program?

#4: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE – FAMILY LAW INTERPRETER PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.61	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.58
	8	20	12	7	47	3	17	12	7	39	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	23.6%	13
No	65.5%	36
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	10.9%	6

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Funding through Program 45.45 has been expanded and is now covering costs associated with this program.

At judicial request, we use bilingual staff noncertified interpreter staff as pro tem interpreters

Court Interpreter funding from Judicial Council Program 45.45

Live translation

Funding through court interpreters program only. If it is no longer available then there would be no alternative.

Use court employee interpreters to translate

Use existing resources (employee and contract interpreters) to provide interpreters for all DV matters.

This program has been terminated and combined with interpreter services.

Hire translator to translate forms locally or use interpreter to translate forms.

Services now funded directly by Trial Court Trust Funds for interpreter services.

Court staff who receive bilingual pay would assist in this effort.

E would try to coordinate coverage.

There are local trainings that offset travel costs

Reaching out to fellow courts

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Not providing this service would place many of our non-English speaking DV clients at risk.

if we chose to continue this service we would have to use allocation and reduce costs/services elsewhere

This is an important access issue to non-English speaking litigants, but I am not sure how frequently the forms are used in this court.

It would be difficult to adjudicate cases without it.

We would have to hire translators for any OTS language

This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel.

In light of the laws expanding interpreter services and JC LAP, administrative functions for the DV grant are unnecessary. There is no direct benefit or added-value to trial courts for just pass-through program 45.45 money. Long-term solution (value-added) would be for JC to assume administration and management of Program 45.45, similar to how the assigned judges program is coordinated. The current regional interpreters program is inefficient and fraught with unnecessary labor strife.

This program has been terminated and combined with interpreter services.

It is imperative that all litigants regardless of language barriers be represented in cases of domestic violence.

#4: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE – FAMILY LAW INTERPRETER PROGRAM

This program only provides for translation of forms. It should be funded from the 45.45 fund.

This is a very valuable resource and without it our court would find it very difficult to assist the non-English speaking individuals.

A nice benefit for the DV litigants but not a high priority for our court.

The translation of forms used for Domestic Violence Restraining Orders is vital to ensure that non-English speaking or LEP litigants understand the forms and procedures related to requesting or responding to a restraining order. Because restraining orders seek to prevent further harm and violence to protected parties and can detrimentally affect a restrained party's fundamental rights and liberties, it is imperative that all information and forms published by the Court be interpreted and translated on an ongoing basis as laws change.

As a small court with very few needs for interpreters we have never used this program. Given the updated funding model for interpreters is this still a program that should function on a stand-alone basis or should it be a part of interpreter funding?

Should be funded from TCTF

The DV trainings are helpful to have available at the FRD Institute

Although we very infrequently forms in other languages, having this resource available is becoming more important statewide.

Could this be funded with interpreter funding?

Thought this was moved to the Interpreter Fund and was no longer a part of the IMF. If there is any part remaining in IMF, a review should be conducted to determine if this can move to the Interpreter Fund.

#5: SELF-HELP CENTER

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit	Used in Last Year	Value to Court																				
9.48	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">14</td> <td style="text-align: center;">21</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">56</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	14	21	12	9	56	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">14</td> <td style="text-align: center;">21</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">56</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	14	21	12	9	56	9.65
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
14	21	12	9	56																			
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
14	21	12	9	56																			

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	7.1%	4
No	92.9%	52
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house

Pay for program out of other court revenues

leverage on technology for providing web-based information, use more volunteers, and engage the local community to enhance ADR as means to avoid litigation costs and expedite resolution of legal disputes in civil and family.

If the funding is cut, the Court does not have the funds to continue the program at its current level and litigants would be forced to navigate the system without assistance, reducing access to the court and delaying adjudication.

We partner with local CBOs for similar services.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

\$1.00 saved for every \$0.23 spent

This area is critically underfunded. We could quadruple our resources and still not meet the public demand.

Without the Self-help funding from Judicial Council, our court would not be able to keep an entire Self-Help Center up and running. This fund enables our court to assist \$40,000 self represented litigants per year.

We do not have the funding to cover the services provided by the program.

It would be extremely difficult for Pro Per litigants to even get their cases/documents filed and their cases heard.

Our court would not be able to fund without cutting services/costs in other areas. This would be an extreme hardship on our court.

Loss of funding would result in closure of one or more centers and severely limit access for self-represented litigants

Use funds for items all courts could use rather than just support operations everywhere?

The staffing costs for the Self Help Center are dependent on this funding. Without the funding the Center would not be able to operate. Currently due to limited funding and court furlough days the Center has reduced hours and turns away as many as 20 people a day.

We rely heavily on the self-help program grant funding - not only for our Court, but we have a collaborative program with two other counties - Tehama and Lake. Without this funding, we would be able to provide these critical services.

In rural California, and in California Counties on the Mexican Border, self-help services and centers are vital. The community is already underserved with the self-help services we can offer- to take them away will deny access to justice for many Californians and court users.

This program is extremely important and our hope would be to someday expand the services we provide to the litigants.

Program funds vital services. However, as core services, may be more appropriately funded by Trial Court Trust Funds and not the IMF.

Without the self help centers our court calendars and clerk's office would have significant backlogs.

#5: SELF-HELP CENTER

Over the past five years the Self-Help Center has served an average of approximately 9000 people per year. Without the Self-Help Center, self-represented persons, especially those who do not have the financial means to hire an attorney, would have no other place to go for free, neutral legal information and assistance, with no restrictions as to income or party designation. By increasing access to justice through the Courts, the Self-Help Center helps to ease public anxiety and conflict by educating them about their rights, remedies, and options related to Domestic Violence, Family Law and Rental Housing issues. As mentioned previously, the Self-Help Center also creates efficiencies and cost-savings court-wide in reduced staff time spent by the Clerks Office and Judicial Officers addressing litigant errors and mistakes.

Plumas County has no pro bono or non-profit self-help services. The COurt contracts with a local vendor to provide the only self-help services available in the County.

Our self help program does not have an attorney. Judicial Council is aware of our problem, in our remote area, and has been looking into alternatives, such as appearing via Skype, etc.

We refer parties to this often throughout each day.

If these funds were eliminated, we would have to lay off staff. Solano believes this one should be given priority and directly benefits the courts.

#6: SELF-REP LITIGANTS STATEWIDE SUPPORT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.57	13	18	11	8	50	10	16	10	7	43	8.81

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	18.2%	10
No	76.4%	42
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	5.5%	3

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino is currently in the process of updating our website to provide similar resources consistent with the California Courts website. San Bernardino's resources will be less than those offered on the California Courts website.

our own court website

Assuming we would still have funding for our Self-Help Center generally, our staff would have to do more direct legal research if the statewide online self-help resources were no longer funded.

Individual Court Websites

Would have to rely on websites developed by other courts. Our court does not have the resources to self-develop the materials provided through this website.

other court staff

collaboration with local and regional sources and develop local strategies for information, training, and assistance.

We cannot tell what the benefit is to our court of having these online resources. We provide similar resources locally.

The court's self help center resources could be directed to this activity. Doing so would, however, reduce direct services provided by these staff to the public.

We would use in-house resources (bilingual staff) to cover these services.

We would expand our website to provide this information.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

clerks use this tool as well. Very valuable.

No funding available at the local level to fill the void that would be left by eliminating this program. Also, it make sense to approach this collectively from both an efficiency and access point of view.

We could recreate at court level, but this would take a significant amount of time to implement. We do not have staff to take on such a project.

This provides courts with updated information and handles overflow capacity for those customers who are unable to access self-help services in person

This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel.

This is more of an indirect benefit. Any assistance provided to self represented litigants benefits the court by providing assistance that would otherwise require court staff/resources.

The statewide support system is a valuable resource for both litigants and court staff.

The court does not have the funds to continue the program at its current level.

Courts can pool their efforts in creating, sharing and providing such resources.

#6: SELF-REP LITIGANTS STATEWIDE SUPPORT

The Self-Help Website is an excellent resource that we often direct pro pers to when we cannot assist them in the self help center. There is no where else to turn if this general information goes away for them. They cannot afford attorneys or representation.

Centralized maintenance of the Self Help website is helpful. However, if this is intended as a state level site that is a core function of the JC staff, the IMF may not be the appropriate funding source.

Without the service our court calendars and clerk's office would have significant backlogs.

Without a statewide Court-based central clearinghouse for online Self-Help resources, local courts would lack any ability to refer a person for additional assistance in a particular area of law that the local court Self-Help Center might not help with due to budget constraints or staffing capacity.

As stated previously these self-help resources are critical in a county that has few attorneys, no pro bono services and no self-help services other than those funded by the Court.

#7: DISTANCE LEARNING

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.45	12	19	10	7	48	11	19	9	7	46	7.61

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	32.1%	18
No	60.7%	34
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	7.1%	4

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

if funding available would rely on outside training

San Bernardino could create an alternative to this program.

Santa Clara County Learn - e-learning programs open to all court employees.

other on-line courses via NCSC, CTCC and/or other professional organizations, in person courses

Except for Sexual Harassment training, we can use the DVD's vs. live broadcasts. But we still need the DVD's/training materials.

Fund in house

Court's own training staff

This could be brought in house but currently there are no resources to support this alternative. Additionally, the quality and subject matter of in house training may not be at the current standard offered by the JCC.

Court identified other content or curriculum-based education materials from other states or national sources.

Non-satellite distance learning is a more cost-effective alternative.

other vendors

We would travel to JCC site, but this is easy for us, as we are in the same county.

County provided training

Training would have to be conducted in house or employees would have to travel to locations for training and the court would incur additional expenses.

We have a training manager who would teach the various subjects.

Other (more expensive) online training

More expensive, less convenient training options would have to be explored.

NCSC

NACM

Reaching out to fellow courts

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Distance learning provides unique opportunities to learn from and collaborate with other courts or like issues. These classes are geared toward court issues specifically. SCCLearn is not, it is more generic.

this is valuable supplemental training for a court with limited means to provide training opportunities

These services are critical to courts, especially rural courts that cannot afford to send staff to in person training.

#7: DISTANCE LEARNING

Due to our lack of funding for a training coordinator, we find this program valuable.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.

Distance learning is certainly one program that can reach many, many people with little resources.

A collective approach is more cost efficient.

Would have to collaborate with other courts to develop similar curriculum and technology. Absent funding, this is unlikely to occur.

If eliminated this would significantly increase the cost of required training for the judiciary and court staff.

We do not usually watch live broadcasts; but utilize the tapes.

Delivery has not met expectations for concept or benefit

While we can do without this program, it is perhaps a best practice model to reduce overall costs and increase productivity.

This resource is extremely valuable to Kings. As a remote court with a very limited budget for travel to San Francisco/Sacramento it is sometimes our only means of education and training.

The Court does not have the funds to continue the program at it current level.

Statewide communications can now be web-based, eliminating the need for more-expensive satellite communication.

Rural courts cannot get to San Francisco with ease, so distance learning, including AOC broadcasts, are sometimes the only way in which court employees can obtain educational opportunities and stay on top of new changes in laws and administrative areas.

We find this program very valuable as our court does not have staff to provide training

Educational programs are a vital, ongoing need that seems part of the Judicial Council staff's function of supporting all of the courts. Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Instead, as a core JC staff function consider funding as part of core JC budget.

Our court relies on receiving a CD of the broadcast due to difficulty in attending live broadcasts during the workday.

A court with a current staff of 10 persons has no ability to prepare and provide the level of training that this program provides. It enables smaller courts to have training opportunities and keep up to date on current law and procedure.

The distant learning recently attended was regarding communication. The presenter is well known nationally, and content was exceptional, but ironically his own poor non verbal communication on the webinar distracted from the whole point of the topic. Perhaps screen presenters better in the future.

Given the reductions in staff due to budget cuts and space limitations, our court is not able to use these services.

These have not been fully taken advantage of but will be utilized much more going forward.

#8: ESSENTIAL & OTHER EDUCATION FOR COURT MANAGEMENT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.11	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.38
	12	20	12	9	53	6	16	11	9	42	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	23.2%	13
No	75.0%	42
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	1.8%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino could apply for, and has received, grants for our own offerings of ICM classes.

Santa Clara County Learn - We have limited local trainings available. Private training agencies.

Potentially the court could receive this through other professional organizations and/or NCSC however not economically and/or court specific.

Fund in house

Would have to find alternative training programs provided by other courts or private sector. May not be court specific and may require funding to implement.

Develop and provide training using local resources.

local funding

We will reach out to other regional courts, state and national associations

We can provide our own training. We can partner with other courts for training.

in house training

The court could teach the Core 40 Program in house but not the ICM Program. The court would incur additional costs by teaching the Core 40 Program in house.

Teach it in house.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Although we have SCCLearn, court management courses are geared toward court operations and are more beneficial to management.

small/medium courts rely on this for a training program as we have limited training resources in-house

In addition to utilizing CORE 40 training, I am certified faculty for ICM courses.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.

Could not be replaced due to lack of funding. If we had the funding, local alternatives would be less cost efficient.

The only reason we have not used this service in the last year is because of your lack of money budgeted for travel expenses.

Use IMF money to develop program materials and provide instructors; let courts pay for staff to attend

Only one manager has taken more than one of the ICM classes. Two others have taken a class. We haven't sent anyone to Core 40 in a long time.

Management training is very beneficial given the trial courts' restoration of programs and need for succession planning

Due to budgetary and staffing constraints, Kings has not been able to participate in Core 40 or ICM.

#8: ESSENTIAL & OTHER EDUCATION FOR COURT MANAGEMENT

These services would have to be procured from external entities or by hiring a trainer. Local training, although available, is costly and does not provide our managers with valuable networking opportunities or ability to find best practices. The program provides consistent tools throughout the state.

Training and education expenses should be funded from the council's appropriation.

This is important for succession planning, employee development and to fulfill the mandated educational hours

Educational programs are a vital, ongoing need that seems part of the Judicial Council staff's function of supporting all of the courts. Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Instead, as a core JC staff function consider funding as part of core JC budget.

All managers/supervisors attend the CORE 40 program. Managers/supervisors are encouraged to attend ICM courses. The programs provide valuable educational instructions to our management.

It needs to be current information. Should consider updating to other types of classes such as Situational Leadership.

Will be taking advantage of this service this year and in the future

#9: ESSENTIAL & OTHER EDUCATION FOR COURT PERSONNEL

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.14	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.64
	13	20	10	8	51	10	17	10	8	45	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	23.6%	13
No	72.7%	40
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	3.6%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino could apply for grants for our own offerings of classes.

Santa Clara County Learn - We have limited local training opportunities available. Collaboration with local colleges offering Administration of Justice courses to employees.

Potentially through othe professional training programs although not court specific and likely not cost efficient

Fund in house

One-on-One training with leads and supervisors.

Develop and provide this education locally

local staff; private providers; national providers

Rely more on internal, regional, and national resources

We can provide training, and can partner with other courts to do so.

in house training and other vendors

The program could be taught in house, however at greater cost to the court.

We would teach in house

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

These courses are specifically geared towards court issues.

See Distance Learning Section. Our court has also utilized internal SME's to assist.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.

Our court does not have the personnel or the resources to conduct this training.

We would lose the benefits of classroom style training. Also lose the opportunity to exchange ideas and processes with other courts.

If court had to absorb costs, it would significantly reduce the number of employees we send to training each year.

Use IMF money to develop program materials and provide instructors; let courts pay for staff to attend

Due to limited staffing we haven't been able to send anyone to CCTI in the last few years.

CCTI plays an important training role for smaller courts like Kings. We would not be able to provide the same level of training locally.

These services would have to be procured from external entities or by hiring a trainer. Local training, although available, is costly and does not provide our managers with valuable networking opportunities or ability to find best practices. The program provides consistent tools throughout the state.

Training and education should be funded from the council's appropriation.

**#9: ESSENTIAL & OTHER EDUCATION
FOR COURT PERSONNEL**

Educational programs are a vital, ongoing need that seems part of the Judicial Council staff's function of supporting all of the courts. Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Instead, as a core JC staff function consider funding as part of core JC budget.

Our staff utilize these training programs which provide valuable education to staff, provide for development to leadership roles which assist with succession planning.

The training provided through this program are thorough and complete and provide excellent written references for court staff.

It is a great program to get employees together to learn from one another and away from work.

Limited staffing as a result of budget cuts does not allow our court to send employees to these trainings.

Will be taking advantage of this service this year and in the future

#10: FACULTY & CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.55	6	18	10	7	41	5	15	9	7	36	8.22

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	20.4%	11
No	64.8%	35
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	14.8%	8

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Potentially other formal training programs however not likely court specific or cost effective

Possibly. We would need to look to internal expertise as an alternative.

Fund in house

Provide more self-learning materials and remote learning opportunities. In the alternative do less development events with more participants.

Courts can work together to provide standard approaches to training.

Would use National Judicial College. However, this program is no where as advanced as this program.

The program could be taught in house, however at greater cost to the court.

We would develop in house.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

possible area that could be revamped with webinars

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.

Providing curriculum development is essential to help all courts stay current with changing laws, responsibilities & roles.

We are a two judge court with both appointed this year so have and will continue to use the training provided by CJER.

Court judicial officers, executives and managers provide excellent training and expertise at a cost far below what it would be to hire professionals.

Providing skilled facilitators ensures education is delivered consistently and in a manner where participants learn effectively. Otherwise money is wasted on training.

Training and education should be funded from the council's appropriation.

Educational programs are a vital, ongoing need that seems part of the Judicial Council staff's function of supporting all of the courts. Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Instead, as a core JC staff function consider funding as part of core JC budget.

Judicial Officers and staff have volunteered as faculty and the development of these volunteers is needed to provide these important educational programs.

#11: MANDATED, ESSENTIAL & OTHER EDUCATION FOR JUDICIAL OFFICERS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
9.14	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	9.29
	14	21	12	8	55	13	21	12	8	54	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	9.4%	5
No	90.6%	48
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house

We would rely more on peer-to-peer education and reach out the regional and national partners for judicial education and also rely on distance learning

We provide extensive judicial education programs locally.

The program could be taught in house, however at greater cost to the court.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Expenses could be reduced by different venues, selection of meal offerings, and eliminated other unnecessary elaborate expenses.

These training opportunities are essential for new bench officers and meeting ongoing training requirements set forth in the Rules of Court.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.

Training off/for judicial officers is unique. We can not think of an alternative to these courses that could deliver as much value as is received by the participants.

While training may be available through private vendors and other organizations they are expensive and often require significant travel. So, there are no reasonably accessible alternatives.

The Judicial Council has an obligation to provide the necessary training and ongoing education for all Judicial Officers.

Statewide training allows for consistent training by experts, networking, and less errors as newer judges take the bench.

Training and education should be funded from the council's appropriation.

CJER is an essential component to our Judicial Branch. It doesn't make any sense to take away or reduce Judicial Education support when we are considered the State with the best education for Judges nationwide. Let's keep it that way. We should be looking at adding more education, not eliminating it.

Educational programs are a vital, ongoing need that seems part of the Judicial Council staff's function of supporting all of the courts. Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Instead, as a core JC staff function consider funding as part of core JC budget.

The various educational programs covered in this section are essential for our judicial officers.

Have there been financial comparisons, in using NJC in Reno as an alternative?

Our court is unable to fund sending judicial officers to out-of-state trainings.

#12: LANGUAGE NEEDS STUDY

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
6.11	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	6.64
	4	9	7	3	23	0	6	5	3	14	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	11.1%	6
No	61.1%	33
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	27.8%	15

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino could track our own language needs for our court.

We could access the language needs in our own county.

The court would conduct it's own assessment as to the needs of its non-english speaking population. This would likely not be as thorough as the statewide study but would address the local needs.

We will continue to track our usage of interpreters, although I suspect the legislature would still require a statewide report.

develop our own standards

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

The law should be changed so each court can report their own.

reduce/eliminate? Courts would indicate local language needs in LEP not statewide info

Statue requires every 5 years.

This is a one-time expense necessary (legislation) every five years. It is a benefit to the branch so we can keep current on language interpretation needs.

JC should explore ways to streamline and automated as many of the administrative and reporting requirements imposed by the legislature.

This study is mandated by the legislature. It is not clear why this would be funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Program.

Consider deferring study

This is a statutory mandate of the council. Such mandates should be funded from the council appropriation, not from trial court funds.

Assessing language needs statewide if important for the Branch, but it is unclear why this is funded by the IMF rather than core JC budget or the interpreter funds.

Given that the Language Access Plan has been adopted by Judicial Council, should expenses for this program decrease?

Should not be prioritized at this time.

Isn't this statutorily mandated. If so, it has to be funded from somewhere, not that it has to be from the IMF.

#13: CALIFORNIA LANGUAGE ACCESS PLAN

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
6.96	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.43
	5	11	9	5	30	3	9	6	5	23	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	9.1%	5
No	70.9%	39
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	20.0%	11

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We would develop our own local plan.
 Optimize use of existing resources and leverage on technology
 Our comments are directed, not at the Plan itself, but the consultant expenses.
 develop our own standards
 The court is already providing interpretive services to non-mandated areas to the extent possible.
 We would develop our own local plan.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

not sure - placed ratings as there wasn't an option to indicate not sure and required a response to move forward
 This is a one-time expense. I expect, however, there may be additional expenses to implement the plan branch wide.
 We are in need of Language Access for our Litigants.
 We have a plan, don't spend money on more studying
 While the LAP is aimed at enhancing access to justice for the LEP community, several objectives and strategies for achieving the long-term goals may overlook effectiveness and efficiency components. For example some of the strategies simply adds more of the same, instead of leveraging on technology or re-engineering the entire process (its strong labor-focused seems to be paving over the cows' path)
 While this program has merit, it is not clear why this would be funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.
 Our comments are directed, not at the Plan itself, but the consultant expenses. We presume that these are one-time expenses that will not be repeated.
 As a one-time study to assess needs and modernize language access, seems to be an example of appropriate use of IMF funds.
 The plan recommendations impose workload on the court without funding, particularly for coordinators and data collection. Plan benefits LEP court users and interpreters.

#14: COURT INTERPRETER PROGRAM – TESTING, DEVELOPMENT, RECRUITMENT, & EDUCATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.46	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.85
	7	19	10	8	44	4	13	9	7	33	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	5.5%	3
No	83.6%	46
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	10.9%	6

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would look at courses offered by other providers.

We do our recruitment and obtain training from local interpreter schools. Testing however, is an important statewide function that should be centralized for purposes of consistency.

develop our own standards

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

need more testing and training

Testing is required. Has the video remote technology saved interpreter costs? Can those savings be used to cover the costs?

This is a necessary expense for the branch to ensure that qualified interpreters are available for all court proceedings.

LAP should include this component and explore ways to reduce cost and improve the outcomes. Our whole interpreters program, from certification to management is not working as well as it should. We continue to band aid it.

While this program has merit, it is not clear why this program (that is legislatively mandated and is an ongoing program) would be funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

The Court benefits from this program to the extent we get additional, qualified interpreters who are available to the Court.

While our Court does rely upon the testing/certification of interpreters through this program, there are several areas that could/should be reassessed and modified.

Interpreter-related expenses should be funded by the interpreter appropriation (45.45).

This helps ensure that the interpreters are current in their certification

Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Should be evaluated for potential to fund using interpreter funding source and/or core JC budget as a core JC staff responsibility.

Perhaps testing performed by other States can be reviewed to improve our process at lower cost.

Can this be paid for from TCTF funding?

I was not aware this program provides outreach and recruits, we have not benefited from these services and have been recruiting for an interpreter for years.

A review should be undertaken to determine if this is properly funded by the IMF; however, this program needs to be funded.

#15: JUSTICE CORP (COURT ACCESS & EDUCATION)

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit	Used in Last Year	Value to Court																				
4.57	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	0	0	1	5	6	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	0	0	1	5	6	4.18
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
0	0	1	5	6																			
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
0	0	1	5	6																			

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	7.7%	4
No	26.9%	14
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	65.4%	34

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house

Not available to court

Use unpaid volunteers and interns

While we have various local agencies providing similar services, none replicate all of the benefits of JusticeCorps.

Without JusticeCorps the Self-Help Center would be forced to substantially limit the number of persons assisted each day. In turn, more time would be spent at the Clerks Office and in the courtroom addressing errors and mistakes preventing a case from moving forward thereby increasing docket backlogs. The JusticeCorps volunteers make up more than half of the Self-Help Center total staff capacity available to serve the public for 10 months out of the year.

Self Help Grant funds

We would develop and implement our own public outreach according to the need

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Each court could work with Justice Court individually, no need for Justice Council involvement.

Training lawyers for future public service diversity pipeline

would like to benefit from this program. We will never have enough resources to meet the demands in self-help centers he JusticeCorps members are a vital component of our Self-Help Center. Without them, we would have to radically scale back on our model of offering service to self-represented litigants.

This is a program that only benefits seven courts yet branch wide IMF funds are being used. Program should no longer be supported using IMF funds just as IMF funds are no longer going to be used to support interim case management systems for a handful of courts.

The program would be too difficult for our mid-size court to effectively manage versus our ongoing in-house self-help programs.

This is a subsidy to a few courts. Not aware of anything that has come from these programs that other courts can use

I personally see the tremendous value of development capacity within our community and supporting Justice Corp programs, but if we have revenue shortfalls, this would be a luxury in comparison to core operations

Is it worth the money spent when only three courts are benefiting.

Good Program, if funding provided by Legislature

#15: JUSTICE CORP (COURT ACCESS & EDUCATION)

If the funding is cut, the Court does not have the funds to continue the program. This program provides consistently trained and motivated young adults to assist in tasks needed to help SRL through a court proceeding. SRL's benefit, but also a benefit to employees who train and work with JCC and a benefit to JCC students who learn more about the court. Many go on to pursue law degrees or work in the justice system.

This program benefits users in a small number of courts. Our smaller court participated previously but was ultimately found it would be more cost effective to run a similar program locally without state and federal funding support.

We had Justice Corp staff in prior year. Work of the staff was a benefit to our self help program, staff and judicial officers.

Every year, the Self-Help Center benefits from over 5000 volunteer hours served by JusticeCorps members in assisting self-represented litigants, the vast majority of whom are very low income, with legal forms assistance. The program has become an indispensable component of our Self-Help Center and without it, our ability to serve the citizens of San Mateo County would be severely hampered.

Appears this program benefits a small group of large courts.

This is a valuable beneficial program; however, a discussion needs to occur as to whether or not the IMF should fund programs that only benefit a few courts or whether or not the IMF should have a more global application to all courts.

#16: TRIAL COURT PERFORMANCE MEASURES STUDY

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.70	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.35
	5	13	10	6	34	4	12	7	5	28	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	5.8%	3
No	71.2%	37
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	23.1%	12

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Use the NCSC materials and administer ourselves.

We have the staff expertise in house to conduct such surveys and analyses.

Continue to rely on internal resources to compile statistics and analyze data from CMS and other sources.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

I am really unsure of the value this may provide to our court of the JC. Potentially it may provide valuable data to the JC and potentially to courts if the data supports and ultimately acquires judgeships and a method for stable funding.

This expense should continue as it is part of WAFM and directly benefits all courts.

The benefits of this program both to the branch and individual trial courts would be enhanced if it was incorporated into a state-wide court performance measurement program.

This needs to be a budget item in JC budget - funds to update one or two elements of the case weights each year. If the Legislature and Governor really want use of measures, they need to provide adequate funding to do it right.

This is very important to advocate for resources and provide tools to trial courts for monitoring and improve court performance.

The RAS model hurt our court because we are a small court.

The work of the WAAC is crucial the Branch.

This program is more accurately described as support for the WAAC. Support for council advisory committees is appropriately funded by the council's appropriation, not the IMF.

One of our judicial officers is on this committee. This program provides information for workload studies that assists in the resource allocation model.

Funding is used to support a JC Advisory Committee, would seem such funding should be part of core JC budget and not funded by IMF.

Important program for identification of judgeship needs and funding.

#17: TRIAL COURT SECURITY GRANTS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.52	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	9.05
	10	17	10	6	43	9	15	10	5	39	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	13.5%	7
No	75.0%	39
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	11.5%	6

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would fund security enhancements using other funding sources.

Fund thru JCC Operations

Our will not replace the weapons screening equipment until it breaks down

Local operations funds would have to be appropriated for this purpose.

Local funding.

develop our own standards

Contingent upon additional funding.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Each court should be responsible for their own security enhancements.

Although this county received a new facility in 2012 there were still vital security elements missing noted by the JC's security team that these funds assisted in eliminating. Additionally, the new facility requires security expertise and equipment where as historical facility had virtually none.

it would not be cost effective for the branch to have courts individually take this on

This court has benefitted from security enhancements that we never could have funded on our own.

All Screening Equipment could be owned and managed by JCC Security Office. Perhaps a BCP could be submitted for additional funding for that department.

While this court is not currently benefiting from this program, it has in the past received funds to improve security in our facilities.

Of the nearly \$1.2 M spent, there is no specific mention about how much was spent on the LA Superior Court project. It would appear however, that future funding of this program will benefit other courts.

Court would have to reduce operations to fund replacement equipment.

The Court has minimal funding available for increasing security needs without cutting access or programs.

Grants like the Trial Court Security Grant, that positively affect trial court systems are an example of how the Improvement and Modernization Fund should be expended.

Kings has benefited from this program and would not have been able to provide the Judicial Officers a secure parking lot without it. Surveillance and duress alarm systems have played in important role in court security. Kings also utilizes this program for continuity of operation plan.

IMF seems appropriately used for modernization of security equipment.

Program has provided for video surveillance systems in four of our court facilities.

This program has been the only way in which the Ct could install security measures in its historic county-owned building.

#17: TRIAL COURT SECURITY GRANTS

A priority program for Solano

#18: BUDGET FOCUSED TRAINING & MEETINGS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.66	11	17	11	9	48	9	17	10	9	45	9.04

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	13.0%	7
No	79.6%	43
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	7.4%	4

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would do our own budget training internally.
Fund in house
The court would do their own research on budget issues, rely on Judicial Council meetings, and would use Judicial Council budget staff for information and explanations of budget-related items.
Would rely on organizations such as California Trial Court Consortium to sponsor these forums or would pay from local travel budgets costs of transportation for these meetings.
We would have to absorb local costs for training staff and for any TCBAC members
I don't know what exactly is being provided, but assuming these are training and educational programs, we could do our own self-guided study and do peer-to-peer sharing of information
Our Court would have to absorb the travel costs.
Local funding for our share of travel expenses.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.
Very important as it supports branch wide budget issues.
Attending these meetings allow courts to make plan ahead for possible outcomes. We find these very informative and extremely helpful.
While trainings and meetings are valuable, it is unclear why it is funded out of the Improvement and Modernization Fund.
Kings has been an active participant on the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee. During these troubling budgetary times this committee is critical to all courts in California. The training and education for court staff is valuable.
This program is more accurately described as support for the TCBAC. Support for council advisory committees is appropriately funded by the council's appropriation, not the IMF.
Statewide governance and budgeting activities by a JC Advisory Committee seem to be more appropriately funded by core JC budget and not IMF.
Recommendations of the TCBAC needed for funding allocations, WAFM development, etc.
This program is extremely helpful. Especially for someone new to the judicial branch.
Given the rapidly changing and complex budgeting for the trail courts, this is an essential service for a small court.

#19: OTHER POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS VALUATION REPORT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.46	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.00
	7	18	8	8	41	4	2	1	2	9	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	32.7%	17
No	46.2%	24
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	21.2%	11

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would hire an actuarial firm ourselves.
 obtain valuation from list of CalPERS approved actuaries
 The alternative would be for courts to use separate firms for the required actuarials, which would place greater burdens on the court when many are least able to afford it.
 Fund in house
 The court would engage an actuarial firm on its own to comply with GASB requirements concerning PERB benefits reporting.
 We would contact with the county's service provider. Funding for such services would be an issue, however.
 Could reach out to private actuary to prepare reports, however, this would require funding.
 hire a consultant with local funding
 We would absorb the costs from funding earmarked for future OPEB contributions
 Since the valuation report is a legal requirement, the Court would have to reduce funding in another area to pay for valuation reports.
 Our Court has, in the past, paid for actuarial services from our own general fund, so if necessary, we could/would do so in the event this program is eliminated.
 We could hire auditors using local funds.
 Court could issue an RFP and pay for its valuation report, at the expense of other activities.
 use another vendor
 We could buy these services from our OPEB Trustee.
 We could contract directly for this service but do not have the funds to pay for it
 Would increase local costs but could be done locally.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Initial valuation/actuarial received from this program was compiled differently from independent actuarial obtained from approved CalPERS in that the JC had set specific criteria for all courts, our court's criteria and/or data varied somewhat from the JC's data set and therefore the outcome of the studies differed.
 dramatic cost impact; cost prohibitive to hire actuary
 Required by GASB
 This program supports all courts and should therefore be continued. It appears the expense is every other year.
 Without this consultant, each court would have to hire consultants to do this highly technical report.

**#19: OTHER POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS
VALUATION REPORT**

This is a required program, this is a report that must be completed every two years. It is not an improvement or modernization. It is unclear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

Kings has precipitated in the surveys, but does not currently offer post employment benefits.

This is an example of a program that should be managed centrally to achieve efficiencies. Whether IMF is the appropriate source of funding is a question to be answered.

Question whether this is appropriate for the IMF. If this is an ongoing requirement of state financial reports, may be more appropriately funded by core JC budget.

Established OPEB trust based on valuations.

Without further information as to what this report could/would provide, we are unable to assess the value to our court further.

Another priority program for Solano. Courts do not have the expertise to undertake this reporting and would be required to contract. I would expect economy of scale for this service to all courts.

#20: TREASURY SERVICES – CASH MANAGEMENT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.11	11	19	12	7	49	10	15	12	8	45	8.29

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	14.0%	7
No	78.0%	39
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	8.0%	4

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino could distribute directly.

County if agreed or process locally, however, would be very costly and likely unreliable and untimely as we have experienced untimely county services in the past.

I'm not sure we have any option - leave civil fees with the local courts and eliminate this process?

Would reinstate local bank accounts.

We would contact with our county for this service.

The Court would have to absorb the workload and complete the distribution internally.

The court would have to perform this service in house, likely at a higher cost.

Direct payment to the SCO and county (retained revenue) by the Court as was the norm prior to the TC145 methodology in place today

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Each court could distribute directly.

All courts could upload the TC-145 to an SAP GL Acct #, and use the Assignment field for the UCF line #. Then all the data would not need to be input anywhere for calculations, it could be pulled from SAP.

All courts benefit from this program and funding should therefore continue.

From a statewide cash management perspective it makes sense that treasury would be managed at the state level, however, it is no essential to the functioning of the local trial court.

This would most likely be one of the easier items for our court to absorb with current staff levels.

The cash flow function should be that of the branch not of the individual court.

Yolo Superior Court does benefit from this program however; it is not a new or innovative program nor is it aimed at the continued improvement of court systems. The question is not whether it is beneficial but rather is it appropriate to use the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to fund the program.

Kings has limited staffing resources and relies on the Judicial Council staff to perform its functions.

The accounting staff supported by this expense should be paid for out of the council's appropriation.

They do a great job assisting our court.

Does not appear appropriate for IMF. Appears to be a core JC function to account for State funds and, therefore, should be part of the JC core budget.

Perhaps look at ways to streamline process so that revenue generated for court stays with court and is not sent to JC and returned to court.

#20: TREASURY SERVICES – CASH MANAGEMENT

If the UCF treasury services were to cease, a major re-engineering reversing years of progress toward accurate distribution, timely payment and consistent handling of civil fees held in trust would take place. This is one of the most efficient of vital of branchwide services provided by the JCC and IMF funding.

This program's importance has shrunk with the level of reserves that it manages. I likely can be scaled back.

Could some of the JCC staff costs shift to the JCC budget instead of the IMF?

#21: TRIAL COURT PROCUREMENT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
6.68	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.44
	12	13	9	4	38	8	10	9	4	31	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	40.0%	20
No	44.0%	22
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	16.0%	8

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

- Complete procurements locally or through another court procurement office.
- San Bernardino will do and will continue to do our own procurement.
- Duty would be added on to existing court staff
- Handle in house or partner with another court, however would be cost prohibitive we would have to do locally;
- We handle all of our own procurement services.
- Fund in house
- We have a business services analyst and contract specialist on staff.
- In-house.
- We currently use the Riverside/LA procurement services.
- We have an internal procurement unit and would continue to rely on it and also reach out to larger courts and local governmental agencies if needed
- We use the shared procurement service that has been hosted by Riverside, and will now (starting in July 2015) be hosted by Los Angeles.
- The Court would have to absorb the additional workload.
- We have staff who perform JBCM procurement services in house and rely heavily on them for our procurement functions.
- Los Angeles Procurement Program
- Court is part of the Shared Procurement Services operated by the Riverside Superior Court.
- Their support is valuable, but could be replaced locally.
- Court participates in the Riverside procurement contract; however, the master contracts program benefits all courts.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

- The branch should beef this area up as there is a need and overall cost savings to have branchwide master agreements with vendors all courts use. (Riverside program...not LA program is trying to meet need)
- Staff reductions have not provided the opportunity to engage in the solicitations. Having the state procure master contracts for the courts has helped.
- We find this program extremely valuable.
- This is a subsidy to those courts using it, the other courts are paying out of their base.
- The cost of \$25,812 seems high for phone and rent for one person. It's hard to believe that office space for one person could not be found which would eliminate the rent cost.

#21: TRIAL COURT PROCUREMENT

A streamlined statewide procurement services that provides more statewide pricing would increase the value of this service.

We do have several employees trained on purchasing under the JBCM and could reach out to other courts who offer services if/when needed.

I do think there is a benefit to the trial courts to have some at TCAS who can assist with procurement related questions.

We did utilize the procurement office for our new facility project under SB 1407, and there are several concerns as to how those construction projects are handled with regard to procurement.

This is a local function. If provided by council staff, those staff should be completely funded by the courts who use these services.

Shared purchasing power is helpful and often results in cost effective contracts. This would, however, seem to be a core function of the JC staff and therefore more appropriately funded by core JC budget and not the IMF.

Our court may need these services if we are unable to continue with a Shared Procurement services offered by a large court.

The Court has entered into a procurement agreement with another court. That has been more useful for the Court's needs to date.

Could some of the JCC staff costs be shifted to the JCC budget instead of the IMF?

#22: HUMAN RESOURCES - COURT INVESTIGATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.07	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.74
	7	18	9	3	37	2	13	6	1	22	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	28.3%	15
No	56.6%	30
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	15.1%	8

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

If funding were available, Court would rely on independent agencies to conduct investigations.

Each local court should be responsible for their own investigations.

In-house and obtain investigators, if necessary or appropriate.

in house investigation, hire outside firm which would likely be extremely costly

Use private contractors for investigations.

We would need to contact an outside agency or investigator.

The court would consider using the county HR department. The drawback is that there would be a cost involved.

In-house investigations.

Conduct investigations internally or contract for these services. These would be costs that may serve to reduce court operations.

We would have to pay it out of operating budget

Court could contract for investigations from a third-party as needed.

Hire private counsel

Sierra County personnel provides most of our HR services and has counsel on retainer to investigate personnel claims.

Good program, but replaceable.

Internal Investigation

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

fortunately this court has had few if any investigations in its history which were easily handled in house; however, if necessary this would be a valuable services to have through the JC

we would have to hire for this and it would be expensive on a limited budget

This court used these services 3 years ago and it was invaluable at the time.

Important when an independent third party is needed.

This service may be more valuable to smaller courts without internal resources.

This is a subsidy to those courts using it; other courts pay out of their base. Moreover, having someone else pay for investigation of a court's alleged HR mistakes creates a disincentive to operate a strong HR program.

Although this program is not used frequently, it is beneficial and available to any court in the branch.

The investigation services offered take too long to complete.

Hiring our own attorney would be very expensive and would come at a price to staff level, or other programs and services.

#22: HUMAN RESOURCES - COURT INVESTIGATION

The benefit would be that local courts would have greater control on the quality and timeliness of the investigations. On the down side, trial courts would experience a direct expense.

It is not clear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund.

This is a local function. If provided by council staff, those staff should be completely funded by the courts who use these services.

We are too small to have an employee dedicated to Investigations. The AOC HR department has been instrumental in our success in investigating several matters. We would be lost without these services.

Our court has our Judicial Council attorneys number on speed dial. They provide an invaluable service to our court.

Unclear why this program is funded by the IMF. Having access to investigators is very helpful for the court and possible the JC/JC staff leadership may wish to consider funding as part of core JC budget.

We have used program in prior years. Try to keep investigations internal through HR/Administration. If outside investigator required and service not available would look to contract out or obtain service from County.

Tehama does not have sufficient funding to have this service contracted out or in-house.

Valuable program for the small courts or when there is a high profile investigation that needs to occur.

#23: TRIAL COURT LABOR RELATIONS ACADEMIES AND FORUMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.16	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.51
	11	21	11	8	51	8	19	11	8	46	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	25.5%	14
No	70.9%	39
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	3.6%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

If funding was available, Court would attend employment forums hosted by outside agencies.

San Bernardino would seek out information from law firms ourselves.

professional labor organizations yet the cost would not be affordable

Fund in House

However, using another agency (CALPELRA) is costly. These forms are free and offer excellent training and networking opportunities.

We would seek outside provider, e.g., CalPELRA or NPELRA. It would be more costly however, and not as tailored to the court environment.

Information sharing through list serves, the California Trial Court Consortium and dialogue with other courts.

We will attend less of these training and identify other local or regional sources for the information and training opportunities

These services would have to be procured from external entities or by hiring a trainer.

in house training and other vendors

The court would have to conduct the academies in house, likely at a higher cost.

Hire private counsel to teach related issues.

Sierra County personnel provides the Court with HR services through an MOU for same.

Can be replaced, but this is valuable.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

the labor programs are very helpful in educating our local staff giving them the ability to network with other court staff, act out and discuss real life court specific scenarios and MOUs, etc.

This training is always appreciated. The JCC staff do a wonderful job and I suspect there is some cost avoidance in the trial courts because court employees were better informed as a result of the forums or academies.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately. Fund lodging, etc in house.

Kings relies on these academies and forums. The education and experience provided is important to the court. Kings has also provided leadership and instruction.

This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel.

This program is a great resource to all of us. Not only are new staff provided training, it's an opportunity to share emerging trends and best practices in labor relations.

We have no other means for training.

#23: TRIAL COURT LABOR RELATIONS ACADEMIES AND FORUMS

We may need to budget for these additional local costs.

Provide the information via webinar.

There are benefits to this program, however, it is not a new or innovative program nor is it aimed at the continued improvement of court systems. It is unclear why funds would be expended for this program from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

To the extent this program has a statewide training component, it should be managed centrally and funded from the council's own appropriation. To the extent that courts use these services on an ad hoc basis, they should fund the program as a consortium.

The Labor Relations Academies- particularly II- are essential for HR professionals. Labor Relations Academy II looks at current changes and issues that courts face- small and mid-size courts would never be able to keep on top of all the changes without this program.

These sessions are valuable to the courts especially because we are required to participate in Labor Negotiations with our unions.

Educational programs are a vital, ongoing need that seems part of the Judicial Council staff's function of supporting all of the courts. Does not seem appropriate for IMF. Instead, as a core JC staff function consider funding as part of core JC budget.

Academies & Forums can be streamlined to reduce # of days.

Other programs through SHERM or the Wiley Firm are too costly.

The Plumas Court has no designated HR staff. The CEO is responsible for all labor relations issues, The formal training provided by JC staff and the ability to ask questions is vital. JC staff's ability to gather information from trial courts around the state is also critical in making good decisions about labor relations and avoiding problems between the Court and its employees,

Will be taking advantage of this service this year and in the future

#24: WORKERS' COMPENSATION RESERVE

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.02	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.22
	7	13	8	5	33	4	11	7	3	25	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	13.2%	7
No	60.4%	32
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	26.4%	14

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would contract for services directly with a vendor.

Santa Clara would be required to obtain its own WC reserve.

CSAC would likely be an alternative

Individual court using private insurance carrier

Fund in house

County contract, but higher cost.

The program is very beneficial and has proven to be more cost-effective than the previous county-administered programs. If we had to do without, perhaps participating courts could develop a consortium and distribute the administrative cost incurred by IMF/JC among all participating courts.

Courts would have to fund from local funds.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

without this a claim could blow our budget with only a 1% reserve

I don't believe this court has any tail claims that are still active. I could be wrong since these cases take forever to resolve.

Required

The court has not utilized this program in recent years, but when it needed to it was valuable asset.

Is this something that should be paid out of IMF? I would recommend it be moved to a separate funding source.

Based on the explanation on page 21 of the report, it is unclear if there continue to be unpaid tail claims. If no tail claims remain, perhaps the reserve is no longer needed..??.....

One of the most important programs supported by the fund.

Acquiring coverage at the individual court level would be cost prohibitive.

This program is neither an improvement, innovation nor a modernization. It is not clear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund.

Unclear why funded by the IMF.

We are no longer a beneficiary, but we did benefit several years ago.

#25: AUDIT CONTRACT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
5.48	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	5.86
	7	10	7	1	25	1	6	4	1	12	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	16.3%	8
No	57.1%	28
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	26.5%	13

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

potentially contract with independent audit firm

Internal audit staff would need to assume duty

The legislature should pay for the audit they require.

Outside contractor, but at added expense.

Assume each court would have to negotiate contract individually with BSA.

State Controller's Office; JC Audit Services

Could hire out but may be expensive

Hire private accounting firm to conduct the audit.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

not sure what this is and had to place a rating in a box to move forward; ignore ratings

Need additional information defining "audit contract."

Not clear what this is. If it is the audit of compliance with new contract law, it is a waste of money.

Not sure exactly what this expense is for and what this means. There is a reference to Audit Services on page 29 of the report with a footnote but no explanation of exactly what administrative support services were provided and to whom. Responses to questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 were required but since there is no information about this expense in the report, these responses should not be taken into consideration.

We responded to this question under the assumption it refers to the BSA Audit.

There is no information about an audit contract in any of the provided documentation.

I am not sure what this question is referring to so I may not have provided a good answer. If this is regarding the internal audit division at JCC then I believe it is valuable to the trial courts to have that resource.

The survey description is inadequate. If this is the contract for the audit of the judicial council staff organization, then it should be funded out of the council appropriation. Under no circumstances should any trial-court-related funds be used to support this program.

This group provides the court with valuable assistance when we administer our contracts to ensure compliance.

Unable to evaluate without further information.

Audits are necessary and expensive.

It is not clear that this is needed.

#26: INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.93	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.27
	12	20	11	9	52	5	12	8	6	31	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	21.2%	11
No	76.9%	40
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	1.9%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

contract with independent CPA or audit firm; potentially cost prohibitive

Our court has an Internal Audit unit that could supplement the services provided by the IAU except for the financial audits performed every 5 or so years.

Outside contact at added expense.

Court would contract for audit services. Absent funding for this purpose, this could serve to reduce funding available for court operations.

Could hire out but could be expensive and historical knowledge and/or consistency would be lost

The Court would have to procure the services on an as needed basis.

All courts are able to use the services of regular auditors.

This service could be brought in house, however at a likely higher cost.

Again, we would have to hire a private accounting firm.

Local auditing firm

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Kings respects and relies on the JC Internal Audit Services for advice in all areas of compliance; operations and financial. The staff is always accessible and ready to assist the court.

Not seeing a connection to the "improvement/modernization" category - again, an area that may need to be moved to a different funding source.

This goes to the trust and confidence in the branch by the Governor, Legislature, and the public. Nobody likes audits, but we need them.

This program is very important to the branch. Not sure however, that funding these positions out of IMF is appropriate. These positions should be funded out of the Judicial Council budget and touted as another important service provided to the trial courts by the Judicial Council staff.

This unit provides valuable services to the Trial Courts. We often seek advice from this group.

: It is not clear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund.

Regular audits are a crucial element of trial court accountability. However, if the council staff are going to provide this service it should be funded by the council appropriation. Otherwise, courts should have the opportunity to use other auditing agencies.

This division has assisted our court with various audit issues as they occur. Our court uses them frequently to ensure we are in compliance with all Trial Court Policies and Procedures.

Unclear why funded by the IMF. If a portion of the JC staff's responsibility is to evaluate and review compliance by the courts, this would appear to be a core JC function and more appropriately funded by core JC budget.

#26: INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES

Other areas within the JC need to be audited - for example do courts count JBSIS correctly.

Since this service is necessary and required by code., should this program be included in the IMF?

The expertise and experience of the internal auditors is very valuable and economical. Their understanding of the branch and rules is not easily replicated by private auditors.

It would be helpful to have more training and other advisory services beyond just audits.

#27: CLETS SERVICES & INTEGRATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
6.80	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.18
	4	6	8	3	21	3	7	6	3	19	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	26.4%	14
No	37.7%	20
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	35.8%	19

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would get direct access via Sheriff switch.
 would have to seek/restore CLETS access through the County and incur additional costs
 Our Security staff has CLETS access and the court pays for associated costs.
 CLETS via county system
 Local Law Enforcement
 Build our own interfaces with local funds
 Access to CLETS through Ventura County Sheriff's Department
 Maintain status quo and develop interfaces when time and funds are available
 Sheriff
 We maintain CLETS access through the County's MOU with DOJ. We pay the County approximately \$10,000 per year for some miscellaneous services and CLETS is part of this charge. There are advantages to working through the County for CLETS access.
 Courts can pursue their own data exchanges with state and county agencies, using statewide standards.
 Court has connections through the County.
 Hard copy, hand written disposition of arrest updates mailed to DOJ
 Thru the Sheriff's Office

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Our court does not use CLETS directly, all our CLETS entries are done by our local Sheriff's office
 Reduced delay in law enforcement input, also allows for timely access to RAP sheet information.
 At this point in time the court has not had the ability to use this service, but will be in the coming year as we move into the new court facility.
 This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel.
 The explanation in the report indicates eight courts participate with two more courts joining. Not sure what all of the other courts are doing. There apparently are other solutions. Perhaps those solutions are less costly or more efficient???
 This depends on if CCPOR requires this infrastructure to function. At Ventura Court, all other CLETS access is through Ventura County Sheriff. With regard to #3 above, only if CCPOR is dependent upon it.
 Current program is not cost effective given the number of participating courts. Need to find a more cost effective alternative.
 Development and deployment of this solution seems appropriate for the IMF. There should be discussion on whether ongoing maintenance of such programs are appropriate for the IMF.

#27: CLETS SERVICES & INTEGRATION

Each court should obtain direct access to CLETS and fund the access. Lack of fairness when some courts receive CLETS access and other must obtain direct access and pay with their budget allocation.

CLETS is used only to check for prior criminal activity in determining whether a judicial officer will grant a TRO in DV, elder abuse. Is this program cost effective for the number of courts that participate? Is it possible to have local justice partners do these checks on a more cost-effective basis?

#28: DATA INTEGRATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
5.96	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	6.07
	4	5	2	3	14	2	3	0	1	6	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	18.0%	9
No	36.0%	18
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	46.0%	23

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We have our own direct connection to DMV.
 build interfaces locally with local funding
 We are already in the process of working with OTech and DMV on a direct connect solution.
 We would have to provide such services with our internal IT staff
 Locally hosted criminal/traffic case management system.
 Maintain status-quo and develop integration strategies/interfaces to existing systems when time and money becomes available.
 We intend to use CMS vendor for our Data Exchanges.
 Courts can pursue data exchanges on their own.
 We'd have to do any data integration needs in house, at an expense and burden to our IT department.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Extremely expensive for minimal service.
 If this program were eventually available statewide as a data exchange and integration between DOJ and courts, it would have the potential to be valuable to all courts and law enforcement
 Should provide future benefits.
 Kings will utilize this service through the Tyler/Odyssey agreement.
 Not knowing what they developed, we cannot answer these questions fairly.
 This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel. Interfaces to state agencies should be built once at state level, and each trial court uses them
 A statewide approach to data integration is important and could be less costly in the long term. However, many courts today are already in the process of implementing their own connections to DMV & DOJ. The explanation in the report indicates \$3.3 M has already been spent (not including grant funds for the DOJ project with Santa Clara Superior Court) yet the project is not complete. Is there an estimate of costs and time to complete this project?
 This program is now more critical as court migrate to new CMSs/
 We currently interface with DOJ via FTP and/or CD.
 The court's Information Systems staff report they are not aware of a data integration and it appears as if this program was primarily through Santa Clara.
 Our Court isn't able to participate at this time due to CMS implementation and will assist in 4-5 years.
 Current program is not cost effective given the number of participating courts. Need to find a more cost effective alternative.

#28: DATA INTEGRATION

Improved data integration seems appropriate for the IMF. The relative priority of this project should be evaluated by the Technology-related committees.

Our court has our own direct access to DOJ & DMV. We may benefit from this program in the future as we move to a new CMS.

San Mateo sees the value in data integration. Given that Tyler Technologies has been chosen as the CMS vendor for nearly 50% of the Superior Courts, this court sees value in having consistent methods for exchanging data to/from Tyler's CMS.

The Court cannot accurately comment on this program as it has no IT staff of its own and does not completely know what services the program provides to the Court.

We need additional information as to what Data Integration entails.

#29: JUSTICE PARTNER OUTREACH/E-SERVICES

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
5.36	2	2	0	2	6	1	1	0	2	4	4.58

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	18.0%	9
No	32.0%	16
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	50.0%	25

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Local justice partner outreach
Local outreach
Internal IT staff.
develop/maintain locally.
Same as previous answer
San Diego is far behind on technology advances due to CMS delays. Benefits will be seen in years to come (4-5 years out).
Courts can pursue on their own. Consortia of courts could collaborate.
Contract Vendors

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

High price, high overhead for ineffective service
not sure what this program is;
Kings is utilizing e-filing services through Tyler/Odyssey contract.
Interfaces with local agencies should be built and paid for with local funds
Similar to the Data Integration project, this program will be beneficial to the branch. However, as courts are in different stages of new CMS deployments, statewide benefits remains to be seen.
The court's Information Systems staff report they are not aware of an outreach program for e-services. Programs like this need to be communicated more clearly to trial courts.
The model is ineffective. Trial courts must implement most/all solutions therefore they should have the driving role in statewide discussions.
This is essential and necessary in view of courts becoming paperless.
As written, difficult to differentiate from the "Data Exchange" and "CLETS" programs. Does not appear appropriately funded by IMF. JC staff representation on state level committees seems to be a core JC staff function and more appropriate as core JC budget item.
We may benefit from this program as we move to a new CMS and e-filing.
The Court cannot accurately respond to the questions about this program as the description provided does not give enough information for informed answers.

#30: ADOBE LIFECYCLE READER SERVICE EXTENSION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit	Used in Last Year	Value to Court																				
6.75	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">14</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">34</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8	14	8	4	34	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">29</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	5	13	7	4	29	7.34
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
8	14	8	4	34																			
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
5	13	7	4	29																			

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	15.4%	8
No	57.7%	30
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	26.9%	14

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Cancel service

The Court's IT Division would have to take on the tasks associated with creating fillable forms.

Moving to implement Tyler's Odyssey program, which will have a forms component.

pay for local license

Would require additional court funding.

We do have our own Adobe licensing, so could prepare fillable forms if absolutely necessary.

Host locally.

We could perform this in-house, however, i would likely cost more to do so and would not be uniform statewide

Direct purchase

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

No longer of use to court.

Very expensive service requiring expensive infrastructure to support

We may indirectly benefit from this service and I am not aware or do not fully appreciate the benefit.

The Court often has to do a lot of rework when using the Judicial Council-created "fillable" forms to create form packets. Naming conventions are not standardized across forms which causes the court to have to do a lot of "reprogramming" in order to use two or more forms in a packet.

We don't currently use the interactive software, but it is something we're going to look into.

One statewide license benefits all courts equally;

The court's Information Systems staff report they are not aware of an outreach program for e-services. Programs like this need to be communicated more clearly to trial courts.

With Increasing SRL filing volumes, SRLs need the ability to save work done in forms as they move through the process.

Development and deployment of this solution seems appropriate for the IMF. There should be discussion on whether ongoing maintenance of such programs are appropriate for the IMF.

Benefit to self represented litigants, attorneys and court staff.

It makes sense to have the Judicial Council forms created as fillable PDFs by the JCC, instead of having each Court create them.

#31: CALIFORNIA COURTS TECHNOLOGY CENTER

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.27	13	19	11	9	52	13	19	11	9	52	7.41

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	22.2%	12
No	75.9%	41
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	1.9%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Local hosting. External commercial services.
locally hosted, cost prohibitive inefficient services would be the alternative
VPN or web-portal.
Internal staff and IT resources.
hosted locally or regionally at lower costs, while minimizing risk. Or in the alternative, allocate costs to participating courts and offices of the JC
Cloud hosting services such as Microsoft, Amazon, ...
We would be forced to move services in house and local.
other vendors
The court would have to perform this service in house, likely at a higher cost.
In part only - re shared CMS (Plumas/Sierra - Sustain JE) we would seek a collaborative, regional hosting contract with a larger Sustain court.
Other state, public, and private data center alternatives need to be examined for hosting statewide judicial branch applications.
We would have to hire court IT staff to handle these services.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Alternative hosting providers or services may be available at a lower cost and higher value to the Branch.
Cost to branch extremely high for service provided.
Extremely expensive inflexible service.
valuable but the service levels are not up to par and costs are expensive; Our court uses the financial system and CLETS system hosted by CCTC
A withdrawal from CCTC without an adequate transition time period would require significant increase in revenue and/or reduction in expenditures, including staff.
Support use for Phoenix only.
We use this in a limited way.
CCTC is the backbone for the court's Phoenix program.
This service/program is only valuable to our court because of the SAP and CCPOR support. SAP is a mandated system. We don't use CCTC for any other support. Response to question 4 is strictly in response to SAP and CCPOR support
Court currently accesses Phoenix through VPN. This is not reliant on CCTC.
The one-time costs to implement in-house services of same would require substantial technology funding.

#31: CALIFORNIA COURTS TECHNOLOGY CENTER

Not if funding is not provided. If funding were provided, court could host systems/services locally.

Phoenix is all we use from CCTC and CFAM but that isn't critical.

Although the court benefits through this program (for CAFM, CLETS), more outreach is needed for trial courts as to what programs are offered and how CCTC can assist.

Very expensive

Concerns of TCTF used for select courts.

We are a Sustain Justice Edition court, and one of the original courts to be hosted at the tech center. One of the issues that was not addressed when CCMS ended was what should the road map be for these courts. As a smaller court we do not have the internal resources (at least at this time) to host the system on our own. Nor do we have the money in our current allocation to even consider such a project.

Our Court would have to implement replacement for Phoenix. Don't rely on CCTC for their services.

Program does not appear to be cost effective any longer. Need to revisit strategy with numerous cost effective cloud hosting options now available.

Appropriate hosting model is currently being evaluated by the Technology Committee and CTAC. Depending on that project, funding by IMF may be appropriate.

Tehama does not have sufficient funding or expertise to handle this in-house.

Hosting for many of the programs could be transitioned to courts. Courts not on Sustain or V2/V3 must host their own CMS and pay these costs. Lack of fairness with some courts receiving hosting/maintenance while other provide for their own from budget allocation.

All of the technology needs for the Plumas Court are handled by the CTCC - we are a managed court and the CMS, Sustain Justice Edition, is hosted at the Tech Center. The Court has not IT staff of its own but is willing to investigate other options which would be more cost-effective.

No replacement would be available for Phoenix/SAP

We are hosted and receive full IT services from the CTCC. Should significant changes to the cost structure for these services change, our court would need time to analyze our options and make any changes. It would most certainly take more than the 4 months between now and the beginning of the 15/16 fiscal year.

We are a "managed" court. Some of the services provided by this program could be performed at the court level for far less expense if JCC would invest in court IT staff rather than contract all of these services out to a vendor.

#32: CALIFORNIA COURTS PROTECTIVE ORDER REGISTRY (ROM)

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.57	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.02
	11	18	8	5	42	12	19	6	4	41	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	18.2%	10
No	72.7%	40
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	9.1%	5

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Sheriff has access to protective orders through local portal.
 JPAW (A local application/portal that was built for a similar purpose.)
 We have a local registry, not shared with statewide CCPOR, not benefitting from statewide CCPOR either
 Use only CLETS access through Ventura County Sheriff's Dept.
 Maintain status quo
 Local inquiry access available through SO
 We would revert back to an older, in-house system.
 The court would have to perform direct entry into CLETS, which would be a more manual process and there would be the possibility of data entry errors.
 fax machine
 We use CLETS for this information.
 Go back to doing this the way we did it for years prior to this program.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Use of CCPOR would require additional staff labor under our current CMS. Once we implement the Odyssey system we will need to access the labor
 Capabilities to move existing CLETS users do not exist.
 Monterey is scheduled to 'go-live' with CCPOR by 6/30/2015; this will eliminate the need to maintain/upgrade local application and the COunty will have better access to protective orders
 This court is moving to CCPOR now and the impact on staff and local law enforcement was underestimated. The process has not been easy.
 Not all courts are in the program, but some info is better than none.
 If eliminated would not have access to restraining order information from other courts.
 Our Law Enforcement Agencies do not enter data.
 Do tribal courts make a financial contribution to the program?
 We think CCFOR is extremely valuable statewide even though it does take more resources at the local level in terms of data entry.
 Our Court has not had staff, time, or technology to implement CCPOR.
 Program adds costs to Court operations. Need incremental funding.
 Access via Sheriff's department

**#32: CALIFORNIA COURTS PROTECTIVE
ORDER REGISTRY (ROM)**

Development and deployment of this solution seems appropriate for the IMF. There should be discussion on whether ongoing maintenance of such programs are appropriate for the IMF.

Benefit to judicial officers, law enforcement and victims.

At the current time this program should be expanded only as there are grant funds available.

This program is a substantial benefit to law enforcement and justice partners, maybe even more so than the court.

#33: CIVIL, SMALL CLAIMS, PROBATE, AND MENTAL HEALTH (V3) CMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
3.34	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	3.86
	0	0	2	3	5	0	0	2	3	5	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	13.7%	7
No	11.8%	6
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	74.5%	38

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We have a private vendor CMS.

Odyssey

No alternative without funding for purchase and implementation of a replacement CMS

We are in the process now of replacing V3 with a single CMS for all case types.

We manage our own CMS internally.

Implement Tyler Odyssey. Planned to begin in 2017

other CMS systems

Sustain, Justice Edition

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Courts subsidized the branch in the development of this CMS, need to be protected, not punished, for supporting the branch

The JC has directed that these costs be paid by the courts using these systems as there is no statewide benefit. This same policy should be in place for other program costs that are supported with IMF funds that do not have a statewide benefit.

If funding were provided, the Ventura Court could purchase, host and maintain

Due to the demise of CCMS, and for fairness issues, the costs should be absorbed by the participating courts. This will create an incentive to migrate to a different CMS and provide justification for additional funding from the state

It is unclear why this program is funded through the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund for what is limited to only a few trial courts.

Need further detail on V3 courts and costs

Was a good idea when it was built. Not needed once migration to local Tyler system.

Pooling of upgrade and enhancement efforts for CMS' used by multiple courts may be a cost effective use of IMF. Annual maintenance expenses for CMS should be a court level cost unless paid for all courts uniformly.

CMS should be hosted and maintained by individual courts. Lack of fairness in hosting for some courts and not others and lack of fairness in IMF paying for new or upgrades to CMS for some courts while others have to manage out of their regular allocation.

The courts that currently use the V3 product should have significant input into any plan to transition from V3 to another CMS.

#34: ENTERPRISE POLICY & PLANNING (STATEWIDE DEVELOPMENT)

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
5.68	5	11	5	8	29	2	10	3	8	23	6.75

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	17.3%	9
No	48.1%	25
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	34.6%	18

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Microsoft SQL server, local negotiated pricing.
Invoices
The Court would pursue procurement of the needed software through local procurement processes.
We are a Microsoft sequel shop, not Oracle.
Would do so internally, but at increased costs.
The Court would have to to purchase local licensing versus the benefits received from Branch-wide licensing.
Court would have to procure services directly with Oracle.
Court already uses an alternative approach at its own cost.
other vendors and consultants
Court would have to pay and manage our Oracle license at the local level. This would be costly and taxing on our current resources.
The court would have to perform this service in house, likely at a higher cost.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Extremely expensive service with some benefit but not essential given the price.
not sure what this is or the local benefit; only marked the values above to move on in the survey
I am not sure of the extent this court uses this service.
The Oracle license seems to let you know when a CCTC software renewal is due - generally an invoice accomplishes the same thing. See #31 above.
We don't know what this is.
Any alternative program would be cost prohibitive for the court.
Securing, funding, and achieving economies of scale with software licensing (e.g. Oracle) across the judicial branch can benefit all courts. Funds for an enterprise architect (EA) for the branch is important to the degree the JCC is to act as a data integration and interface hub for CA Courts.
This program may have been important a few years ago, however as courts move onto third party deployment and using best of breed solutions architecture design becomes less important.
If court had to fund, we would reduce staff to balance budget.
Only if additional funding provided
Instead of use Oracle if the service and server was provided in Microsoft we could benefit from it.

#34: ENTERPRISE POLICY & PLANNING (STATEWIDE DEVELOPMENT)

Yolo does not use this program. More outreach is needed for trial courts regarding what programs are offered to the trial courts.

Which courts are being served? Costs?

There has been some concern expressed by CITMF that this contract might be renegotiated for cost savings and efficiencies.

Branch-wide licensing reduces costs.

Program should be revisited given shifting statewide priorities.

This type of program appears appropriate for the IMF. The technology related committees should evaluate the relative priority for this program.

Without this program the Court would be required to purchase and maintain application.

It is difficult to rate this program as it is unclear based on the description provided what an individual court is provided by the program.

#35: INTERIM CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
4.13	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	5.04
	4	5	1	0	10	4	6	1	0	11	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	5.7%	3
No	26.4%	14
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	67.9%	36

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house
 We recently went onto the Tyler case management system as of 11/3/14.
 Court could contract for legislative updates directly with the CMS vendor.
 other vendors/CMS systems

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Being replaced by modern systems.
 This is extremely valuable for the courts that need it. Fortunately we are not one of those courts
 Similar to V3, the IMF should no longer support programs that do not provide statewide branch benefits.
 This program is extremely critical to the operations of the 15 impacted courts and needs to be maintained unless a suitable alternative and funding is available.
 Same response as elimination of IMF funding for V3
 It is unclear why this program is funded through the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund for what is limited to only a few trial courts.
 Concerns of TCTF used for select courts
 The SJE program was outdated and too labor intensive.
 Pooling of upgrade and enhancement efforts for CMS' used by multiple courts may be a cost effective use of IMF. Annual maintenance expenses for CMS should be a court level cost unless paid for all courts uniformly.
 Each court should host and pay for own CMS maintenance & support and interfaces. Non Sustain & V2/V3 courts are required to pay their own costs for CMS maintenance and support without subsidy from IMF which is a lack of fairness.
 All IT needs including the hosting of the SJE product are provided by the Tech Center. The Court is willing to look at other cost-effective options for a CMS. However, the Court has no IT staff and has not been able to recruit staff with the qualifications necessary.
 We are unable to plan for alternatives with 1% reserves.
 SJE is our only case management system and is used for all case types. We are charged annually for the services related to SJE and until recently did not realize these costs were subsidized by the IMF. If the cost structure changes significantly, we would be forced to move to a new CMS. That type of procurement and transition would take at least 2-3 years to complete. Additionally, without the ability to save fund balance beyond 1% we have no way to fund a new CMS. The SJE courts need an initial investment to move them away from the current model, in order to save both the IMF and the local courts money in the long term.
 Understand plan is in the works to transition away from Interim Case Management Systems.

#36: JURY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.61	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.20
	10	19	11	7	47	6	14	9	5	34	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	17.3%	9
No	73.1%	38
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	9.6%	5

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Other local funding sources.
Fund in house
Court would fund further upgrade and development of jury management systems based on cost benefit of upgrade.
Funding diverted from other functions and services.
We would allocate local funds to either upgrade or replace existing systems
Private jury management program.
Seek funding via BCP.
other vendors
Court fund jury projects locally.
The court would have to perform this service in house, likely at a higher cost.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

we do not have enough money in our allocation/budgets to make needed enhancements
Kings benefited from this program in 2009 when it was granted funding for the new jury system, JSI.
We would continue with existing setup until obsolete.
2. Jury Technology Grant
5. Not without additional funding.
The Jury Management System grant is the type of program that should be funded by the Improvement and Modernization fund. This grant is available to all courts who apply, and it is oriented to specific improvement and at the trial court level (in this case, improved jury systems)
We received a grant (\$21,000) from this program in 2014 to expand the functionality of our existing jury system.
Jury management systems should be funded locally.
We were one of the recipients of the jury grant and it assisted in upgrading our jury services in our court.
This program seems appropriate for the IMF and consideration should be given for expansion once the fund is balanced.
We benefited from program in prior year. Nice to have grant funding but can be eliminated. Courts can pay for jury management system projects directly.

#37: TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.73	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.92
	12	20	11	9	52	9	16	10	9	44	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	17.0%	9
No	77.4%	41
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	5.7%	3

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

any alternative would be local, unreliable and likely cost prohibitive

Fund in House

Would use internal funding diverted from other functions and services. Lack of statewide contracts however, would be more expensive.

We would delay re-refresh programs and allocate local funds to maintain or upgrade equipment as needed.

Contract with vendor(s) directly. County. Local funding.

In house telecommunications support.

other vendors

The court would have to perform this service in house, likely at a higher cost.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

No local funding is available to maintain technology currency or fund the service provided under this program.

Valuable way to access scarce technical skills.

Extremely valuable and important infrastructure service that keeps the core networks running.

Court would not be able to fund or manage the planning, implementation and funding of upgrading this critical infrastructure component.

To this service benefits all courts equally across the state, it should be funding here, rather than each court reinventing the wheel.

The cost for this program/service is nearly \$15.8 M. The report explanation is not clear as to how much of the expense, if any, is one-time vs. ongoing.

This type of support is helpful, however, it is not communicated well. More information should be made available to trial courts regarding this type of support.

Continued support is appropriate; continued development should be reviewed.

This program funds much needed replacement infrastructure. With lack/reduction of funding, our Court would not stay current on network requirements.

Good program. Needs checks and balances of when/how new services get added and how to sunset services that are not universally adopted.

This is a great example for an appropriate use of the IMF -- modernization of court IT equipment.

The alternative of contracting independently for these services would be catastrophically expensive.

Our budget would not accommodate the loss of this program.

#38: TESTING TOOLS – ENTERPRISE TEST MANAGEMENT SUITE

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit	Used in Last Year	Value to Court																				
5.04	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">23</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8	7	5	3	23	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	4	4	4	3	15	5.35
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
8	7	5	3	23																			
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
4	4	4	3	15																			

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	2.1%	1
No	52.1%	25
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	45.8%	22

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

No responses received.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Support use for CCPOR only.

We don't know what this is.

Part of this expense appears to be ongoing. Report is unclear as to how much is one-time vs. ongoing. CCPOR costs should remain funded through IMF as this is a branchwide program/cost.

2. V3/CCPOR

It is unclear why this program is funded through the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund for what is limited to only a few trial courts.

Expenditures of TCTF on V3 only benefit select courts.

Don't know what this is. If it is used to provide cleaner updates to CCMS V3 patches or upgrades, then we benefit.

Program should be stopped concurrent with shutdown of CCMS V3.

Our court used the CCPOR portion only

The type of program may be appropriately funded by the IMF. The relative priority of this program should be evaluated by the technology-related committees.

Analysis should be made to determine if the most current and cost-effective tools are in place. As courts move away from the V3 system is there an estimate of cost reduction?

We do not benefit from V3 testing, but are the beneficiaries of CCPOR testing.

Is there a most cost effective way to do this task?

#39: UNIFORM CIVIL FEES

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.61	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.04
	12	20	11	8	51	10	9	9	6	44	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	21.6%	11
No	76.5%	39
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	2.0%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino could distribute directly.
 process locally or via county services which would likely be untimely and costly proving to be unreliable to the state
 Eliminate the requirement that civil fees have to go up and come back to the trial courts.
 Excel
 Court would use staff to develop any required reports and/or distribution calculations required.
 Internal fiscal staff, but less efficient than the state-wide effort.
 We would go back to tracking the legislative changes and updating our fee schedule
 The Court would have to perform manually.
 We performed this function in-house previously and could again

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Each court could distribute directly.
 Cheaper alternative - see #20 above. The reports I have seen were created in Excel and seemed adequate.
 While this is a valuable program, it may be another one that should be moved out of the IMF fund and supported through an alternative funding mechanism.
 By definition does not seem suitable for performance at local trial court level. That being said, question whether this is an appropriate program to be funded by IMF.
 Not clear what this provides now that fees are uniform
 It is not clear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. This should be funded as part of the JC core operations.
 Seems to be a state administrative cost, not TCTF
 Even though we responded no to alternatives, we also believe the UCF process can be streamlined.
 Unclear why funded by the IMF. Appears to be a core JC staff function and perhaps more appropriately funded by core JC budget.
 Returning to indirect payment by the County would be costly and fraught with distribution errors.
 Again, could some of the JCC staff costs move to the JCC budget instead of the IMF?

#40: ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTERS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
5.07	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	5.08
	5	4	5	2	16	2	1	2	1	6	
5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?											
Yes						10.0%			5		
No						34.0%			17		
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.						56.0%			28		
6. If yes, please explain the alternative.											
Straus Institute & Fresno State both have programs.											
We handle mediator training internally.											
Continue to use volunteers and internal resources											
create our own programs											
Local Bar Association											
7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.											
We haven't used this in recent years, but we plan to start using it again soon.											
Funding should move out from the IMF fund.											
Not clear we can afford this at this time											
This appears to be a one-time expense that could be eliminated next fiscal year.											
Mediators obtain educational training from other sources at own expense.											

#41: COMPLEX CIVIL LITIGATION PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
5.39	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	5.48
	3	0	3	5	11	0	0	2	5	7	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	6.1%	3
No	24.5%	12
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	69.4%	34

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Have the litigant's pay.
Continue to use the current assignment system that assigns cases to any one of our available civil departments.
Local funding of required staff.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

To the extent this funding supports 2 LRA positions, we do not have general funds available to keep those positions should 1 MF funding be cut. Funding supports two courtrooms specifically assigned to complex litigation. The pending caseload for these departments totals 592 verified complex cases. Without funding, the legal research attorneys and staff needed for complex litigation would not be able to support an exclusive complex caseload.

Another program that has been in place for a long time and should be moved out of IMF - potentially paid for by Complex Civil fees or a separate funding source.

This program develops expertise and products that all courts can use, and hears cases from other courts; not benefiting only those courts who have programs

The \$4.0 M spent on this program only benefit six courts. IMF funds should be used for programs/services that support or benefit all courts. This "policy" is already moving forward with CMS costs being shifted to those courts that use these systems.

This program, limited to only a few larger courts, has limited potential for improving the systems of all of the trial courts, and it is now an established, ongoing program. Alternative funding should be used for this program.

Pilot programs may be appropriately funded by the IMF. Once pilot is complete, however, seems appropriate to move funding out of the IMF to other funding sources.

This is a large sum to support a limited number of courts and courtrooms. Perhaps these expenses can be reduced as the program has been in place for several years.

Provides critical support needed to address complex cases.

Although a beneficial program to the courts that receive this funding, this should not be funded from the IMF. Pilot programs generally don't last more than a decade. Per the cost, this program should be eliminated.

#42: JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE DEFENSE INSURANCE

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.68	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.67
	7	17	12	7	43	3	9	9	4	25	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	7.5%	4
No	88.7%	47
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	3.8%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

contract with independent attorneys which would be cost prohibitive
 Local funding appropriated from operating budget.
 Local funding.
 The court / judges would be required to retain counsel independently and at a higher cost.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

no funds to pay for this; should be a statewide program for judges and not a liability for a local court
 Again, while valuable, it does not fit under the "improvement/mod" category.
 This program is neither an improvement, an innovation nor is it a modernization. While it is a valuable program, it is not clear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund.
 This is an example of a useful and efficient centrally funded and managed program.
 Unclear why funded by the IMF. Vital program that is a core part of JC function. Consideration should be given to funding via core JC budget.
 Important service that has been used by our judges.

#43: JURY SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit	Used in Last Year	Value to Court																				
7.36	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	10	17	10	6	43	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	9	13	8	5	35	7.77
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
10	17	10	6	43																			
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
9	13	8	5	35																			

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	7.4%	4
No	77.8%	42
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	14.8%	8

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would do these improvements ourselves.
 maintain status quo or delay replacement.
 other vendors
 Resort to a manual process that would be very labor intense.
 Work with vendor

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Although regular updates of jury instructions for both civil and criminal does benefit the court, it is unclear how “jury system improvement projects” is an ongoing improvement or modernization.
 While the products of the work of the advisory committees is valuable, support for their meetings is a core responsibility of the council and should be funded out of the council's own appropriation.
 Unclear why funded by the IMF. If royalties are deposited in the IMF, then this program appears appropriately funded by IMF. If not, however, appears to be funding to support a JC Advisory Committee and consideration should be given to funding as part of JC core budget.

#44: LITIGATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.82	11	17	12	9	49	4	13	11	9	37	9.02

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	20.4%	11
No	77.8%	42
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	1.9%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We would hire local attorneys without the requisite experience at greater expense.

If funding was available to trial courts, could hire outside counsel.

San Bernardino would contract for these services ourselves.

contract with cost prohibitive private attorneys

The court would engage private counsel for any issues that require such litigation requirements.

Hire our own lawyers

We will need to absorb all legal costs associated with litigation.

Self-funding of counsel.

The court would need to retain counsel independently and likely at a higher cost.

We would contract with private counsel.

Contracting with private attorneys at significant expense.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

There is only one judicial branch and developing expertise in court litigation is unique to the AOC

This is an essential service to the trial courts.

Required by Statute

Our court does not have a dedicated general fund budget available for litigation defense/settlements

Without this program, representation and settlement costs would be prohibitive for the local court.

Although we have not utilized this program, it is available to all courts, and it is an area that is valuable. However, not sure that it is appropriate for the IMF fund.

well run; invaluable

Court does not currently retain counsel for these services.

Court would not be able to afford quality counsel to defend a variety of legal claims.

This program is neither an improvement, an innovation nor is it a modernization. While it is a valuable program, it is not clear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization fund.

Our court makes extensive use of this program due to high volumes of litigation involving the Court, judicial officers and employees.

As a responsibility of the council, expenses should be supported by the council's appropriation.

Unclear why funded by the IMF. Vital program that is a core part of JC function. Consideration should be given to funding via core JC budget.

Without this program the courts would be required to hire & pay outside counsel for defense.

#44: LITIGATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Is this a program that should be funded from the IMF?

This program needs to be funded, but not certain it should be funded from the IMF.

#45: REGIONAL OFFICE ASSISTANCE GROUP

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit	Used in Last Year	Value to Court																				
6.89	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">42</td> </tr> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	13	18	8	3	42	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th>C1</th> <th>C2</th> <th>C3</th> <th>C4</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">36</td> </tr> </table>	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	9	17	7	3	36	7.85
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
13	18	8	3	42																			
C1	C2	C3	C4	Total																			
9	17	7	3	36																			

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	24.5%	13
No	62.3%	33
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	13.2%	7

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Could hire outside counsel if funding was available.

potentially contract with cost prohibitive attorneys and other service providers however this method of service delivery would not be efficient

A statewide assistance office would have to be created within the judicial Council

he assistance of the opinion and contract attorneys funded through ROAG is valuable. If they were eliminated, that legal work would have to be brought in-house.

Engage a private firm for necessary consultation, as needed.

Simply do without

Local funds for services, like legal services, would have to be appropriated from our operational budget.

We already employ the alternative: our own staff to handled these matters.

Use assistance of the Judicial Council wherever they are located. It doesn't matter since we are so remote-- we conduct most business by phone.

The court would contact the main office in San Francisco.

Contracting with private legal counsel at considerable expense.

San Francisco office

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Legal Opinion unit is excellent

Kings relies on this assistance in all areas of expertise. With our limited resources and budget we would not be able to procure the legal services and opinions provided by this office.

It is unclear how these services differ from the services provided by LSO, JCC HR, etc. Are these programs alternatives to the Regional Office Assistance Group? Is this appropriately funded through IMF?

A subsidy to those courts who use it.

Value of having attorneys that are familiar with the local courts and in tune with their needs

It is not clear why this program is funded by the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund program. This should be funded as part of the JC staff core operation

Courts who prefer to use council staff, or whose needs do not warrant hiring local staff to perform these duties, should pay for them. This is not an appropriate use of IMF funds.

Things were much better when we had Regions- LA, Sacramento, and San Francisco with staff dedicated to the courts in that region. But times have changed. Now it makes sense to have one Judicial Council staff and have all available to any court in the state.

This program is extremely helpful to the courts

#45: REGIONAL OFFICE ASSISTANCE GROUP

Unclear why funded by the IMF. Services provided are a core part of JC staff functions. Consideration should be given to funding via core JC budget.

We utilize the attorney and secretarial support for contracts, programs ad assistance.

The Court uses these services on an as-needed basis for legal opinions on operational and administrative issues - with an emphasis on HR issues. The Court has used this program every year at least one time. The legal opinion library that has been and continues to be compiled is a very useful tool.

Our ratings are reflective of the legal services provided by Michael Giden, Linda Nquyen and their respective staff.

#46: SUBSCRIPTION COSTS – JUDICIAL CONDUCT REPORTER

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
6.02	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	6.45
	5	18	10	6	39	5	16	8	6	35	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	12.2%	6
No	71.4%	35
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	16.3%	8

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

San Bernardino would seek subscriptions ourselves.
 CJA hotline
 self-guided research or remote distance learning and provide information at business meetings or statewide educational programs
 Local funding would have to be reallocated for this purpose.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

reduce and send to PJs/APJs - do most just read or 'delete' email?
 Utilized regularly by the bench.
 Another area not appropriate for IMF
 Judicial Officers need constant information.
 As an ongoing training-related expense, this subscription is appropriately funded out of the council's own appropriation.
 Unclear why funded by the IMF. Vital program that is a core part of JC function. Consideration should be given to funding via core JC budget.
 We feel that this subscription can be eliminated.

#47: TRIAL COURTS TRANSACTIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.41	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.18
	7	17	11	5	40	4	11	9	5	29	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	13.5%	7
No	69.2%	36
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	17.3%	9

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

- Hire local transaction attorneys at greater expense.
- San Bernardino would contract for these services ourselves.
- Engage a private firm for necessary consultations, as needed.
- We would have to allocate funding from our operational budget.
- directly contract with appropriate vendors and incur that cost.
- This court makes use of the Shared Procurement Services program operated by the Riverside Superior Court.
- The court would need to obtain outside guidance, likely at greater cost.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

- John Prestiani has been exceptional to work with.
- We don't know what this is.
- Kings relies heavily on the OGC for council and assistance in all legal matters pertaining to contracts, labor and finance matters.
- It is unclear how this differs from the Regional Office Assistance Programs and services provided through other JCC programs.
- A subsidy to those courts who use it, not everyone does
- Allows court to have quality legal assistance
- Courts who prefer to use council staff, or whose needs do not warrant hiring local staff to perform these duties, should pay for them. This is not an appropriate use of IMF funds.
- The attorneys provide exceptional service to the court.
- Presents a policy question. If a core function of the JC staff is to support courts in complying with statutory and other mandates, this would appear to be a core function of the JC staff and consideration should be given to funding as part of the core JC budget and not via the IMF.
- This is an important program for our small court in providing business transaction and labor & employment negotiations.

#48: COURT ORDERED DEBT TASK FORCE

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
6.32	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	6.67
	8	13	7	2	30	7	10	6	2	25	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	5.9%	3
No	68.6%	35
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	25.5%	13

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Internal staff resources.
Share information among trial courts and continue to seek best practices

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

At this time our court is unsure as to the effectiveness of this task force, we do receive information that seem to be beneficial, however, beyond that the benefit is unclear at this time.

This should be left in place until such time as revenue distribution is simplified for the trial courts.

Value all depends on the outcome.

Distribution training is critical.

The biannual, statewide revenue distribution training has been beneficial to Kings and other courts. Courts had been asking for this training for a very long time.

While this program has great potential to improve workload for trial courts, counties and the state, it does not seem appropriate for funding through IMF.

Don't see any value in work done so far. This is a political problem, not a management or funding problem

Not sure if the task force has completed it's work. It appears, however, the expense was a one-time cost.

Costs should be paid by Judicial Council

Costs of meetings of task forces should be funded from the council's own appropriation.

Our CFO participates in this committee.

Education is a necessary and ongoing function. Unclear, however, why funded this is funded by the IMF.

Given the increased interest by the DOF, Governor and Legislature in the collection of fines, it is important the this program remain in place.

#49: PHOENIX PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
9.00	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	9.09
	14	21	12	8	55	14	20	12	9	55	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	18.5%	10
No	81.5%	44
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

local, cost prohibitive

Fund in House

ADP, court purchased automated financial system.

Hire full time HR staff, and contract with private vendor for payroll, both options are cost prohibitive.

County service contract.

incur costs for direct contracting or staffing to produce same product.

We maintain our own financial management systems.

Go back to the County.

Services would need to be performed in house, likely at greater cost.

We could provide this program locally without statewide uniformity

Could be locally and regionally provided, though with implementation and ongoing costs which are unknown at this time.

7. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

it's good to be on a common platform; we could benefit more if we could utilize payroll and HR; although costs are coming down it is still more expensive than ADP;

n the future if court can receive additional modules made available. Budget Development and Grants.

Kings relies on the resources and expertise of the Phoenix staff and SAP system. Statewide accounting and support has give the court's transparency and provided uniform and accurate financial data statewide.

The branch needs one accounting system every court uses to demonstrate financial accountability for the funds provided.

While our court could establish it's own financial accounting system, it would not be able to replicate the statewide benefits of a single state-wide system.

We would have to purchase software, or contract through the County of Ventura.

This question is a little misleading because all trial courts have to be on Phoenix Financial. We have no issues being on this system, or the requirement to be on this system, but to my knowledge this is not optional.

There are benefits to this program, however, it is not a new or innovative program nor is it aimed at the continued improvement of court systems. It is unclear why funds would be expended for this program from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

Participation required by Judicial Council; therefore, costs should be apportioned between the Trial Courts and the Judicial Council.

As all trial courts are currently using the financial component of Phoenix, the ratings above seem less than useful. Has an analysis been done lately to see if the courts are suing the most cost-effective centralized accounting technology? Is this a program that should be included in the IMF?

#49: PHOENIX PROGRAM

Sierra benefits from the direct fiscal reporting and fund management of the financial component of the Phoenix Program. We do not use the human resources component.

Table 1: IMF -- Reduction Options by Program/Project

#	Project/Program Title	Office	2014-2015 JC Allocation (or 2013-14 Allocation)						15% Reduction Options				25% Reduction Options				
			2011-12 Exp Final	2012-13 Exp/Enc Year-to-Date	2013-14 Exp/Enc Year-to-Date	JC Staff FTE	JC Staff Costs (State Operations)	Other Costs (Local Assistance)	Total	1A	2015-16 Allocation	1B / 1C	2015-16 Allocation	2A	2015-16 Allocation	2B / 2C	2015-16 Allocation
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1	CFCC Educational Programs	CFCC	90,400	76,495	85,990	n/a	-	90,000	90,000	(13,500)	76,500	-	90,000	(22,500)	67,500	-	90,000
2	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	300	36,305	60,009	n/a	-	60,000	60,000	(9,000)	51,000	-	60,000	(15,000)	45,000	-	60,000
3	CFCC Publications	CFCC	20,208	19,904	20,000	n/a	-	20,000	20,000	(3,000)	17,000	-	20,000	(5,000)	15,000	-	20,000
4	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	CFCC	1,686,446	1,750,000	20,167	n/a	-	20,000	20,000	(3,000)	17,000	-	20,000	(5,000)	15,000	-	20,000
5	Self-Help Center	CFCC	4,962,016	4,999,815	4,999,825	n/a	-	5,000,000	5,000,000	(750,000)	4,250,000	-	5,000,000	(1,250,000)	3,750,000	-	5,000,000
6	Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	CFCC	150,204	99,876	100,019	n/a	-	100,000	100,000	(15,000)	85,000	-	100,000	(25,000)	75,000	-	100,000
7	Distance Learning	CJER	104,808	117,584	144,876	n/a	-	147,000	147,000	(22,050)	124,950	-	147,000	(36,750)	110,250	-	147,000
8	Essential/Other Education for Court Management	CJER	48,583	18,975	26,165	n/a	-	46,000	46,000	(6,900)	39,100	(25,000)	21,000	(11,500)	34,500	(25,000)	21,000
9	Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	CJER	111,574	59,142	128,524	n/a	-	92,000	92,000	(13,800)	78,200	43,000	135,000	(23,000)	69,000	(12,000)	80,000
10	Faculty and Curriculum Development	CJER	203,111	193,802	249,966	n/a	-	288,000	288,000	(43,200)	244,800	(28,000)	260,000	(72,000)	216,000	(41,000)	247,000
11	Mandated, Essential & Other Education for JOs	CJER	462,044	505,947	590,125	n/a	-	841,000	841,000	(126,150)	714,850	(202,000)	639,000	(210,250)	630,750	(275,000)	566,000
12	2015 Language Needs Study	COSSO			293,347	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	California Language Access Plan	COSSO			65,000	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	CIP - Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education	COSSO	118,435	129,111	128,137	n/a	-	168,000	168,000	(28,000)	140,000	(25,200)	142,800	(28,000)	140,000	(42,000)	126,000
15	JusticeCorp (Court Access and Education)	COSSO	217,568	277,000	331,000	n/a	-	347,600	347,600	-	347,600	(52,140)	295,460	-	347,600	(86,900)	260,700
16	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	COSSO	13,264	6,946	9,124	n/a	-	13,000	13,000	(13,000)	-	(1,950)	11,050	(13,000)	-	(3,250)	9,750
17	Trial Court Security Grants	COSSO	1,417,042	1,192,137	1,196,873	n/a	-	1,200,000	1,200,000	(218,290)	981,710	(180,000)	1,020,000	(391,150)	808,850	(300,000)	900,000
18	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	Finance	14,968	32,072	44,805	n/a	-	50,000	50,000	-	50,000	-	50,000	(11,250)	38,750	-	50,000
19	Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuation Report (every 2 years)	Finance	553,715	14,827	600,079	n/a	-	600,000	600,000	50,000	650,000	(600,000)	-	50,000	650,000	(600,000)	-
20	Treasury Services - Cash Management	Finance	224,449	235,807	160,268	2	238,000	-	238,000	-	238,000	-	238,000	-	238,000	-	238,000
21	Trial Court Procurement	Finance	154,173	128,298	25,812	2	244,000	-	244,000	(244,000)	-	-	244,000	(244,000)	-	-	244,000
22	Human Resources - Court Investigation	HR	19,841	90,099	88,228	n/a	-	94,500	94,500	(6,460)	88,040	(9,690)	84,810	(6,460)	88,040	-	94,500
23	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	19,012	23,585	27,929	n/a	-	34,700	34,700	(12,920)	21,780	(9,690)	25,010	(25,840)	8,860	(32,300)	2,400
24	Workers' Compensation Reserve	HR	923,510	-	719,749	n/a	-	1,231,000	1,231,000	(1,231,000)	-	(1,231,000)	-	(1,231,000)	-	(1,231,000)	-
25	Audit Contract	AS	-	95,499	-	n/a	-	150,000	150,000	(150,000)	-	-	150,000	(150,000)	-	-	150,000
26	Audit Services	AS	602,483	628,069	666,861	4	660,000	-	660,000	-	660,000	-	660,000	(52,500)	607,500	-	660,000
27	CLET'S Services/Integration	IT	257,353	472,411	473,272	1	114,000	319,400	433,400	23,682	457,082	23,682	457,082	23,682	457,082	23,682	457,082
28	Data Integration	IT	2,764,241	3,900,610	3,311,735	3	577,100	3,326,500	3,903,600	(53,387)	3,850,213	(53,387)	3,850,213	(53,387)	3,850,213	(53,387)	3,850,213
29	Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services	IT	301,124	424,392	234,707	1	200,700	-	200,700	12,613	213,313	12,613	213,313	12,613	213,313	12,613	213,313
30	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	IT			129,780	n/a	-	133,700	133,700	(133,700)	-	(133,700)	-	(133,700)	-	(133,700)	-
31	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	IT	3,826,866	8,629,067	9,382,315	11	1,892,200	8,595,000	10,487,200	95,837	10,583,037	95,837	10,583,037	95,837	10,583,037	95,837	10,583,037
32	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	598,400	654,498	445,027	2	116,300	469,300	585,600	10,354	595,954	(585,600)	-	10,354	595,954	(585,600)	-
33	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	IT	6,553,876	5,442,760	4,590,072	n/a	-	5,658,137	5,658,137	601,449	6,259,586	601,449	6,259,586	601,449	6,259,586	(5,658,137)	-
34	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	IT	5,403,334	5,102,258	5,109,422	n/a	-	5,268,500	5,268,500	(48,198)	5,220,302	(48,198)	5,220,302	(48,198)	5,220,302	(48,198)	5,220,302
35	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	1,176,350	1,038,334	1,048,587	n/a	-	1,246,800	1,246,800	649,234	1,896,034	(1,246,800)	-	649,234	1,896,034	649,234	1,896,034
36	Jury Management System	IT	-	598,013	600,000	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	Telecommunications Support	IT	5,748,922	8,706,488	15,554,175	n/a	-	11,705,000	11,705,000	(7,580,834)	4,124,166	(3,555,834)	8,149,166	(11,453,288)	251,712	(3,555,834)	8,149,166
38	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	IT	482,258	576,748	428,176	n/a	-	624,300	624,300	(4,601)	619,699	(624,300)	-	(4,601)	619,699	(624,300)	-
39	Uniform Civil Fees	IT	368,045	385,602	347,490	2	343,000	-	343,000	23,544	366,544	23,544	366,544	23,544	366,544	23,544	366,544
40	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	LSO	381,362	74,808	59,478	n/a	-	75,000	75,000	-	75,000	-	75,000	(75,000)	-	-	75,000
41	Complex Civil Litigation Program	LSO	3,670,583	3,874,153	4,001,074	n/a	-	4,001,000	4,001,000	(1,123,455)	2,877,545	(1,723,455)	2,277,545	(2,180,324)	1,820,676	(2,872,424)	1,128,576
42	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	794,247	875,966	919,892	n/a	-	966,600	966,600	-	966,600	-	966,600	-	966,600	-	966,600
43	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	13,831	14,481	13,900	n/a	-	19,000	19,000	-	19,000	-	19,000	-	19,000	-	19,000
44	Litigation Management Program	LSO	3,595,119	3,425,909	3,364,240	n/a	-	4,500,000	4,500,000	(400,000)	4,100,000	-	4,500,000	(400,000)	4,100,000	-	4,500,000
45	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	1,777,381	1,346,780	1,212,326	7	1,460,000	-	1,460,000	-	1,460,000	-	1,460,000	-	1,460,000	-	1,460,000
46	Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	LSO	17,080	15,535	15,535	n/a	-	17,100	17,100	-	17,100	-	17,100	(17,100)	-	-	17,100
47	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	LSO	471,627	450,682	445,416	n/a	-	451,000	451,000	(200,000)	251,000	-	451,000	(200,000)	251,000	-	451,000
48	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	TCAS			1,440	n/a	-	25,000	25,000	(3,750)	21,250	-	25,000	(6,250)	18,750	-	25,000
49	Phoenix Program	TCAS	6,419,132	11,835,976	10,778,122	58.88	7,310,000	6,575,300	13,885,300	(2,082,795)	11,802,505	(2,086,545)	11,798,755	(3,471,325)	10,413,975	(3,477,575)	10,407,725
50	Total					93.88	13,155,300	64,569,437	77,724,737	(13,073,277)	64,651,460	(11,622,364)	66,102,373	(20,405,660)	57,319,077	(18,852,695)	58,872,042

Table 2: IMF Reduction Targets and Amounts -- Summary by Office and Option

#	Division	Office	15% Reduction Options					25% Reduction Options				
			Reduction Target	Option 1A	Option 1B	Option 1C	Largest Reduction	Reduction Target	Option 2A	Option 2B	Option 2C	Largest Reduction
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Administrative	Finance	(169,800)	(194,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(283,000)	(205,250)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)
2	Administrative	HR	(1,250,380)	(1,250,380)	(1,250,380)		(1,250,380)	(1,263,300)	(1,263,300)	(1,263,300)		(1,263,300)
3	Administrative	IT	(6,088,491)	(6,404,007)	(5,490,694)		(6,404,007)	(10,147,484)	(10,276,461)	(9,854,246)		(10,276,461)
4	Administrative	TCAS	(2,086,545)	(2,086,545)	(2,086,545)		(2,086,545)	(3,477,575)	(3,477,575)	(3,477,575)		(3,477,575)
5	Operations and Programs	CFCC	(793,500)	(793,500)	-		(793,500)	(1,322,500)	(1,322,500)	-		(1,322,500)
6	Operations and Programs	CJER	(212,100)	(212,100)	(212,000)		(212,100)	(353,500)	(353,500)	(353,000)		(353,500)
7	Operations and Programs	COSSO	(259,290)	(259,290)	(259,290)		(259,290)	(432,150)	(432,150)	(432,150)		(432,150)
8	Leadership Services	AS	(121,500)	(150,000)	-		(150,000)	(202,500)	(202,500)	-		(202,500)
9	Leadership Services	LSO	(1,723,455)	(1,723,455)	(1,723,455)		(1,723,455)	(2,872,425)	(2,872,424)	(2,872,424)		(2,872,424)
10	Total		(12,705,061)	(13,073,277)	(11,622,364)	(600,000)	(13,479,277)	(20,354,434)	(20,405,660)	(18,852,695)	(600,000)	(20,800,410)

Table 3: IT Reduction Options Based on Planned 2015-16 Allocation Need

#	Project/Program Title	2014-15 Allocation	Planned 2015-16 Allocation Levels	15% Reduction Options from Planned Level				25% Reduction Options from Planned Level			
		A	B	Option 1A	2015-16 Allocation	Option 1B	2015-16 Allocation	Option 2A	2015-16 Allocation	Option 2B	2015-16 Allocation
				C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
33	CLETS Services/Integration	433,400	513,620	(56,538)	457,082	(56,538)	457,082	(56,538)	457,082	(56,538)	457,082
34	Data Integration	3,903,600	3,850,213	-	3,850,213	-	3,850,213	-	3,850,213	-	3,850,213
35	Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services	200,700	442,957	(229,644)	213,313	(229,644)	213,313	(229,644)	213,313	(229,644)	213,313
36	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	133,700	141,000	(141,000)	-	(141,000)	-	(141,000)	-	(141,000)	-
37	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	10,487,200	10,583,037	-	10,583,037	-	10,583,037	-	10,583,037	-	10,583,037
38	CCPOR (ROM)	585,600	1,047,954	(452,000)	595,954	(1,047,954)	-	(452,000)	595,954	(1,047,954)	-
39	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	6,463,000	6,259,586	-	6,259,586	-	6,259,586	-	6,259,586	(6,259,586)	-
40	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	5,268,500	5,220,302	-	5,220,302	-	5,220,302	-	5,220,302	-	5,220,302
41	Interim Case Management Systems	1,246,800	1,996,034	(100,000)	1,896,034	(1,996,034)	-	(100,000)	1,896,034	(100,000)	1,896,034
42	Jury Management System	-	600,000	(600,000)	-	(600,000)	-	(600,000)	-	(600,000)	-
43	Telecommunications Support	11,705,000	10,649,166	(6,525,000)	4,124,166	(2,500,000)	8,149,166	(10,397,454)	251,712	(2,500,000)	8,149,166
44	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	624,300	619,699	-	619,699	(619,699)	-	-	619,699	(619,699)	-
45	Uniform Civil Fees	343,000	366,544	-	366,544	-	366,544	-	366,544	-	366,544
59	Total	41,394,800	42,290,112	(8,104,182)	34,185,930	(7,190,869)	35,099,243	(11,976,636)	30,313,476	(11,554,421)	30,735,691

IMF Allocation Reduction Options

Contents

Administrative Division.....	114
Finance.....	114
1. 15% Reduction Option(s)	114
1A.....	114
1B.....	116
1C.....	117
Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options	117
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	117
2A.....	117
2B.....	118
2C.....	118
Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options	118
Human Resources	119
1. 15% Reduction Option(s)	119
1A.....	119
1B.....	121
Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options	123
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	123
2A.....	123
2B.....	124
Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options	124
Information Technology	125
1. 15% Reduction Option(s)	125
1A.....	125
1B.....	129
Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options	133
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	133
2A.....	133
2B.....	137

Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options	139
Trial Court Administrative Services	140
1. 15% Reduction Option(s)	140
1A.....	140
1B.....	144
Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options	145
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	145
2A.....	145
2B.....	150
Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options	150
Operations & Programs Division.....	151
Center for Families, Children & the Courts.....	151
1. 15% Reduction Option(s)	151
1A.....	151
Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options	155
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	158
2A.....	158
Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options	163
CJER (Center for Judiciary Education and Research).....	164
1. 15% Reduction Option(s).....	165
1A. Pro-Rata Reduction Across All Programs	165
1B. 15% Reduction to CJER’s Aggregate Total IMF Allocation (Reduction Target \$212,000).	166
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	170
2A. Pro-Rata Reduction Across All Programs	170
2B. 25% Reduction to CJER’s Aggregate Total IMF Allocation (Reduction Amount \$353,000)	171
Court Operations Services	173
1. 15% Reduction Option(s).....	173
1A. A strategic office approach to meet the proposed 15% reduction	173
1B. A 15% reduction across each program.....	176
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	179
2A. A strategic office approach to the meet the proposed 25% reduction	179

2B. A 25% reduction across each program.....	181
Leadership Services Division	184
Audit Services.....	184
1. 15% Reduction Option(s)	184
1A.....	184
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	185
2A.....	185
Legal Services.....	186
1. 15% Reduction Option(s)	186
1A.....	186
1B.....	187
2. 25% Reduction Option(s)	187
2A.....	187
2B.....	188

Administrative Division

Finance

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A.

1. Trial Court Procurement (Table 1, row 21)

a. Program/Project Description

There are two authorized position funded by IMF in Business Services. One is a Senior Procurement Specialist (currently filled) and one is a Contract Specialist (currently vacant).

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The IMF funded Senior Procurement Specialist position is currently filled and is working on trial court related transactions. Requests for assistance in the procurement area have been more prevalent with the adoption of the Judicial Branch Contract Manual. Trial courts call for advice in bidding approaches on all kinds of goods regularly. This position has handled several major projects for court construction and has been instrumental in getting several goods Leveraged Pricing Agreements (LPAs) current and available for trial courts to utilize. These LPAs have mainly been in the area of furniture and seating. The position has also provided support and purchase order processing for security related purchase orders for Siemens, RapidsScan and StopTech for all of the trial courts as needed. The position has also provided Procurement support for the trial court processing of the CAL NET II contract for various projects. The position has taken the lead role in the court construction projects on furniture and seating procurement (overseeing the selection committee from the trial courts and Capitol projects and accompanying the team during the selection process). The position is responsible for setting up the furniture showroom tours for the trial courts and reviewing the selection criteria prior to the tours. The position is instrumental in reviewing the bill of materials, which can vary from project to project with hundreds of pages of product. The position verifies LPA pricing submitted for the Court Construction projects and actually processes and issues the purchase orders to the vendors. A large part of the position's workload is for the capitol projects and court construction.

The impact of losing the current IMF funded Procurement Specialist position would reduce the number of available LPA's for goods available for use by the trial courts.. Eliminating this position would force the trial courts and Judicial Council staff to seek other government based contracts to purchase goods. The loss of the position would further impact the existing Judicial Council Procurement staff as they would have to

process the purchase orders for security related statewide requests and CalNet II (telecommunications) purchase orders for trial courts or new court construction projects related to CALNET. Currently, JC Procurement staff support purchasing furniture and seating for capital projects with under 4 million dollars in that area's budget and the projects over 4 million are procured through the contractor. The impact on the court construction projects would be to defer all furniture and seating projects to the contractor and would increase costs and budget for these projects. Contractors are not authorized to use Judicial Branch LPAs and Master Agreements. Many of the courts also depend on these very favorably priced LPA agreements to buy furniture for their existing courts and have been successful in saving funds by having these LPAs and contracts available.

The Senior Procurement Specialist performs needed procurement functions that trial courts benefit from. As an alternative, perhaps funding can be sought from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund to fund this position to mitigate the effect on service levels to the courts.

The IMF funded Contract Specialist position was created to work on state-wide master contracts advantageous to the trial courts. This is an area in which the Trial Courts have requested assistance in having these types of agreements and contracts in one centralized database in which they could review and use as needed. Unfortunately, due to enforced capped hiring limits for Judicial Council staff, this position has been vacant for two years. During this time, Business Services has only exercised option terms to extend existing master agreements but has not been staffed to work with trial courts to develop and facilitate solicitations for awards of any new master agreements for services. Processing master agreements (or, typically, leveraged procurement agreements) which the trial courts could use was helpful to trial courts: (1) which were not staffed with contracting staff possessing the expertise to process these awards in accordance with required policies and procedures; (2) by allowing for pricing economies of scale which could not be achieved without a leveraged procurement, and (3) in providing access to services by contractors that may not have submitted proposals in response to smaller or remote courts. Presumably, trial courts have either gone without contracting for the services that would have been awarded by the IMF Contract Specialist or have found other ways of meeting their needs (e.g., perhaps through their own collaborations with other trial courts, or if available, using appropriate LPAs established through Western States Contracting Alliance or California Multiple Award Schedules). If the IMF-funded Contract Specialist position is eliminated as part of the IMF reductions, Business Services will not be adequately staffed to provide new leveraged procurement agreements for services that trial courts could use. At that point, I would think we would remove master contracts from the state-wide website as they expire.

2. Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuation Report (Table 1, row 19)
 - a. Program/Project Description

This funding supports the every other year, federally and state mandated reporting requirement for government entities to report on other post-employment benefits (OPEB) liabilities, such as retiree health benefit obligations. The Judicial Council has centrally managed this effort on behalf of trial courts for the past three reporting cycles. In the last OPEB reporting cycle, a total of \$640,000 was expended for actuarial consultant services, which included data gathering and development of actuarial reports for each of the 58 trial courts as well as limited consultative services provided by the actuary to courts seeking professional assistance regarding OPEB reporting and trusts. In addition to baseline reporting, secondary reviews and subsequent revisions of completed valuations were required due to the establishment of OPEB trusts by nearly half the courts statewide.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option would fund the program at \$650,000, by increasing the 2013–2014 allocation level by \$50,000. Going forward, the large amount of OPEB trusts that now exist coupled with new actuarial reporting requirements--which will require the preparation of valuations for zero-liability and certain group-pool courts previously exempted from comprehensive analysis--will likely mean a funding need of approximately \$650,000 every other year to support this federally and state mandated reporting requirement. Due to the limited number of actuarial consultants in the marketplace and who have responded to past RFPs, it is unlikely that this line item can accept reductions without consequences (see additional options below). Note: This funding does not include any JCC staffing component

1B.

1. Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuation Report (Table 1, row 19)

a. Program/Project Description

See 1A.2a above.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option is to eliminate funding from the IMF for centralized OPEB reporting. Because reporting is required by GASB, this would result in courts having to individually contract and fund the required reporting going forward. This would mitigate all economies of scale resulting from the current practice of centrally managing this effort and likely cause a significant increase to the overall cost of OPEB reporting for the 58 trial courts statewide. Current economies come from standardizing the process: data requests, health claim analysis, actuarial assumptions, programming and report format. Another, possibly bigger, cost would be on the courts and JCC end. Each court would need to issue and evaluate RFPs. The JCC would need to track progress and manage different actuaries, summarize results for the SCO and respond to their questions. Also, few vendors have been willing to bid on previous contracts.

1C.

1. Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuation Report (Table 1, row 19)

a. Program/Project Description

See 1A.2a above.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option is to shift the funding of the costs from the IMF to the TCTF and have courts pay through a reduction in their allocation. Although courts would be paying for this service, a centrally managed contract would, however, when compared to Option 1B, still provide significant savings statewide and for any given court versus a “go it alone” approach where each court would need to issue request for proposals and secure a qualified actuary to perform these services.

Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options

None of the 3 options reduces funding for the treasury services program, which receives Uniform Civil Fee (“UCF”) cash deposits and monthly collection reporting for all 58 trial courts and distributes the fees according to statute to local programs and state funds. The monthly processing of UCF includes, entering fee and assessment remittances into a web-based application that calculates the statutory distributions, executing the monthly cash distributions when due to state and local agency recipients, and completing the financial accounting for the function. In general, Option 1A, which exceeds the reduction target by \$24,200, retains the subsidy of the OPEB valuation report in the IMF but at the \$650,000 level and eliminates the trial court procurement program. Options 1B and 1C both remove the subsidy from the IMF, require courts to pay for OPEB valuation report services from their TCTF funding, and exceed the reduction target by \$430,200.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)**2A.**

1. Trial Court Procurement (Table 1, row 19)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Same as 1A.1b above.

2. Budget Focused Training and Meetings (Table 1, row 18)

a. Program/Project Description

This funding primarily supports the activities of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and its advisory bodies, including associated travel, catering, and

teleconference costs. A small amount also supports statewide budget training and information sharing (such as conference calls following the release of the Governor's budget, May Revision, and so on).

- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce funding by \$11,250, from \$50,000 to \$38,750. The TCBAC maintains ten advisory bodies, including four standing subcommittees, some of which meet in person throughout the year. The reduction would result in fewer TCBAC in-person meetings and/or increased use of meeting by teleconference. At the current rate of currently scheduled in-person meetings in calendar year 2015, approximately one third of a 2015–16 budget (reduced by 15%) would be expended less than three months into the year. The committee would likely be limited to six in-person committee meetings and three in-person subcommittee meetings. Because funding to support trial court budget training (generally web-based) and statewide conference calls is nominal, it's unlikely to be severely affected.

2B.

- 1. Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuation Report (Table 1, row 19)
 - a. Program/Project Description:
See 1A.2a above.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Same as 1B.1b above.

2C.

- 2. Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuation Report (Table 1, row 19)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See 1A.2a above.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Same as 1C.1b above.

Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options

None of the 3 options reduces funding for the treasury services program, which receives Uniform Civil Fee (“UCF”) cash deposits and monthly collection reporting for all 58 trial courts and distributes the fees according to statute to local programs and state funds. The monthly processing of UCF includes, entering fee and assessment remittances into a web-based application that calculates the statutory distributions, executing the monthly cash distributions

when due to state and local agency recipients, and completing the financial accounting for the function. In general, Option 2A, which misses the reduction of \$268,800 by \$77,750, retains the subsidy of the OPEB valuation report but at the \$650,000 level in the IMF, reduces in-person meetings of the TCBAC, and eliminates the trial court procurement program. Options 2B and 2C both remove the subsidy from the IMF, require courts to pay for OPEB valuation report services from their TCTF funding, and exceed the reduction target by \$317,000.

Human Resources

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A.

3. Human Resources – Court Investigation (Table 1, row 22)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The Judicial Council assisted the following courts in prior fiscal years:

	Fiscal Year 2012-13	Fiscal Year 2013-2014	Fiscal Year 2014-2015 (to date)	
1	Riverside	San Mateo	Santa Cruz	
2	Amador	Santa Clara	San Mateo	
3	Santa Clara	San Francisco	Sonoma	
4	Glenn	San Diego	Madera	
5	Mono	Contra Costa		
6	Alameda	Sutter		
7	Madera	Santa Clara		
8	San Francisco	Alameda		
9	Santa Cruz	Butte		
10		San Bernardino		
	\$90,098.88	\$66,760.98	\$52,455.84	Total Cost
	\$10,010.99	\$6,676.01	\$13,113.96	Average Cost

Under Option 1A, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would absorb a 6.8 percent (1/3 of the total target) reduction of approximately \$6,460. Human Resources would continue to provide support and services to a court upon request, with minimal impact.

Human Resources has minimized the level of reduction applied to this fund because any major reductions would diminish the level of services provided to the court. A third party independent investigator is utilized when a trial court has a highly sensitive investigation and, for appearance sake, is better handled by an outside law firm, or an investigation involves a member of court management and it is decided – based on court preference or Judicial Council resource concerns -- that someone from outside HR handle the investigation.

If this program were reduced even further, it would result in the Judicial Council having to advise a court that it cannot afford to retain outside counsel to investigate, and then the trial court would be forced to independently contract with an investigator. A number of courts would have to address employment-related investigations through procurement of their own outside counsel. Small courts would be at a significant disadvantage if they were to bear the costs. Please keep in mind that courts have often requested that Judicial Council staff not be used for these investigations due to the sensitivity and political nature of these matters.

4. Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums (Table 1, row 23)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The following table reflects trial courts that attended the Labor Relations Academies and Forums and associated costs.

	Fiscal Year 2012-13		Fiscal Year 2013-2014		Fiscal Year 2014-2015 (to date)	
	Academies	Forums	Academies	Forums	Academies	Forums
# of Courts Represented	20	26	38	40	TBD	37
# of Attendees	75	87	119	90	TBD	75
Total Expenditures	\$21,870.52	\$2,054.27	\$27,283.34	\$1,997.59	TBD	\$4,363.45

Under Option 1A, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would absorb a 37.2 percent (2/3 of the total target) reduction of approximately \$12,920. This reduction would result in a major impact to the program. One of three possible areas would result due to lack of funding:

- i. **Cancellation of the Labor Relations Academy I.** The Labor Academy I is a vital resource for individuals who are new to labor relations and provides them a

foundation in labor relations in the courts. The target audience consists of new court executive officers, trial court managers and supervisors, individuals serving for the first time on a bargaining team, and HR representatives new to labor relations. Elimination of this program will result in less informed, untrained individuals serving on bargaining teams and court leadership relying on instinct as opposed to labor relations best practices.

- ii. **Elimination of the Labor Forums.** The Labor Forums are currently held in Sacramento and Rancho Cucamonga. This forum is a mid-year update on the state of labor relations in the trial courts. The target audience consists of court leadership and HR leadership. In addition to labor relations updates and topics there is a status update on legal, legislative, and finance issues--all from a labor relations perspective. Without consistent updates on labor relations, it is likely that courts will be operating under “stale” information and may not be aware of labor issues or labor decisions that have been made statewide, which could have implications on each court. Maintaining the network of information is essential for positive labor relations and informed court leadership.
- iii. **Cancellation of the southern or northern Labor Relations Academy.** If the budget were reduced, it would severely reduce the ability to provide Labor Academies in both Northern and Southern California. The academies, which were also formerly held in San Francisco, have already been eliminated by past cuts with Bay Area courts now attending the Sacramento venue. The allocation for this program has consistently been reduced in the past and an additional reduction would result in the need to eliminate the Labor Relations Academy in either Northern or Southern California, or both.

5. Workers’ Compensation Reserve (Table 1, row 24)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The Judicial Council’s Legal Services office does not currently expect any payments to occur going forward. Human Resources recommends that the Judicial Council eliminate program funding. As a contingency, if payments materialize, Human Resources is exploring the possibility of funding such payments through the Judicial Branch Workers’ Compensation Fund.

1B.

1. Human Resources – Court Investigation (Table 1, row 22)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Under Option 1B, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would absorb a 10.3 percent (1/2 of the total target) reduction of approximately \$9,690. Human Resources would continue to provide support and services to a court upon request, with minimal impact.

2. Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums (Table 1, row 23)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Under Option 1A, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would absorb a 27.9 percent (1/2 of the total target) reduction of approximately \$9,690. This reduction would result in a major impact to the program. One of two possible areas would result due to lack of funding:

- i. **Cancellation of the Labor Relations Academy I.** The Labor Academy I is a vital resource for individuals who are new to labor relations and provides them a foundation in labor relations in the courts. The target audience consists of new court executive officers, trial court managers and supervisors, individuals serving for the first time on a bargaining team, and HR representatives new to labor relations. Elimination of this program will result in less informed, untrained individuals serving on bargaining teams and court leadership relying on instinct as opposed to best labor relations practices.
- ii. **Cancellation of the southern or northern Labor Relations Academy.** If the budget were reduced, it would severely reduce the ability to provide labor academies in both Northern and Southern California. The academies, which were also formerly held in San Francisco, have already been eliminated by past cuts with bay area courts now attending the Sacramento venue. The allocation for this program has consistently been reduced in the past and an additional reduction would result in the need to eliminate the Labor Relations Academy in either Northern or Southern California.

3. Workers' Compensation Reserve (Table 1, row 24)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The Judicial Council's Legal Services office does not currently expect any payments to occur going forward. Human Resources recommends that the Judicial Council eliminate program funding. As a contingency, if payments materialize, Human Resources is

exploring the possibility of funding such payments through the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund.

Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options

Option 1A minimizes reduction to the Court Investigation program at the expense of significant reductions to the Labor Relations Academies and Forums, while Option 1B evenly applies the target reduction between both programs. In both options, the Court Investigation program is not significantly impacted by either level of reduction, while the Labor Academies and Forums tend to fare slightly better under Option 1B. Human Resources might be able to research alternative methods to fund the Labor Academies and Forums, but due to funding restrictions, it must rely on the sustained support of the Improvement and Modernization Fund in order to continue providing investigative services to the trial courts.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)

2A.

2. Human Resources – Court Investigation (Table 1, row 22)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Under Option 2A, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would absorb a 6.8 percent (1/5 of the total target) reduction of approximately \$6,460. Human Resources would continue to provide support and services to a court upon request, with minimal impact.

3. Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums (Table 1, row 23)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Under Option 2A, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would absorb a 74.5 percent (4/5 of the total target) reduction of approximately \$25,840. Under this scenario, the Labor Academies would be discontinued and Human Resources would only hold the Labor Forums (Sacramento and Rancho Cucamonga) to keep courts current on legal issues, legislative issues and finance issues, all from a labor relations perspective.

4. Workers' Compensation Reserve (Table 1, row 24)

a. Program/Project Description

The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.

- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
The Judicial Council's Legal Services office does not currently expect any payments to occur going forward. Human Resources recommends that the Judicial Council eliminate program funding. As a contingency, if payments materialize, Human Resources is exploring the possibility of funding such payments through the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund.

2B.

- 2. Human Resources – Court Investigation (Table 1, row 22)
 - a. Program/Project Description
The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Under Option 2B, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would not absorb any reductions to the Court Investigation program.
- 3. Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums (Table 1, row 23)
 - a. Program/Project Description
The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Under Option 2B, the Judicial Council's Human Resources office would absorb a 93.1 percent (100 percent of the total target) reduction of approximately \$32,300. Under this scenario, the Labor Academies would be discontinued and Human Resources would only hold one Labor Forum to keep courts current on legal issues, legislative issues and finance issues, all from a labor relations perspective.
- 4. Workers' Compensation Reserve (Table 1, row 24)
 - a. Program/Project Description
The program/project description in the 2013-14 report to the Legislature is still accurate.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
The Judicial Council's Legal Services office does not currently expect any payments to occur going forward. Human Resources recommends that the Judicial Council eliminate program funding. As a contingency, if payments materialize, Human Resources is exploring the possibility of funding such payments through the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund.

Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options

In Options 2A and 2B, the Labor Academies will be discontinued in favor of holding one or two smaller Labor Forums per year. A significant reduction to this program will be damaging to the

trial courts' labor negotiations preparation. Courts have come to expect and depend on these services – this is evident through the continually high number of participants every year. Courts have come to rely upon the resources made available through the Academies and Forums; with budget considerations being a substantial topic every year, it is expected that the need for these types of training will continue to increase.

Information Technology

In September 2014, the Trial Court Budget Working Group asked that an IMF IT Work Group review Information Technology's proposed expenditures for FY 2015-16 and identify areas for reduction. The IMF IT Work Group reviewed all of Information Technology's FY 2015-16 line-item expenditures by program and worked with Information Technology to develop their recommendations for short-term (FY 2015-16), medium-term (12-24 months), and long-term (24-36 months) actions. The Work Group recommended a total of \$1,032,000 in reductions for FY 2015-16. These reductions are included in our scenario options. Table 3: IT Reduction Options Based on Planned 2015-16 Allocation Need displays the proposed expenditures for 2015-16 and the reduction amounts from the proposed 2015-16 expenditure levels. The reduction amounts referenced in the discussions below are from Table 3. The reduction amounts in Table 1 are adjusted to achieve the same 2015-16 allocation levels as those in Table 3. A final report of the recommendations was presented to the Judicial Council at their February 19, 2015 meeting, where it was accepted as proposed.

As part of the IMF IT Work Group's review of Information Technology's FY 2015-16 budget, Information Technology proposed various other reductions, deferrals, and recommended items that courts could pay for as a means of further reducing the Information Technology budget. These items were not recommended by the IMF IT Work Group or in the final report to the Judicial Council, but are being offered as options for this exercise in order to meet the 15% and 25% goals as instructed.

Finally, the Information Technology reduction scenario options do not include straight 15% or 25% reductions for each program. That exercise does not work for IT programs since most programs are currently at baseline levels of funding. We believe it is necessary to reduce or defer components of programs or reduce entire programs if large reductions are necessary and on-going. The scenarios presented are largely incremental. Descriptions are not repeated, but referenced if they are the same in a previous scenario option.

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A.

1. CLETS Services/Integration (Table 1, row 27)

a. Program/Project Description

The CLETS Program supports access to the statewide law enforcement network provided by the California Department of Justice (CA DOJ). This access provides trial courts with criminal justice information from California and various national databases to support complete and timely adjudication. CLETS access is also used by CCPOR as its sole method to provide and update restraining and protective orders to the CA DOJ and the NCIC (FBI) databases.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the CLETS program would charge back the trial courts for the cost of the Datamaxx software (\$56,538). The trial courts that would be impacted are Fresno, Madera, Merced, Monterey, Plumas, San Francisco Tulare, and Yuba. Any new courts that would be coming onto the CLETS program would also be affected (Placer, San Joaquin, and Trinity).

2. Justice Partner Outreach/e-Services (JPO&E) (Table 1, row 29)

a. Program/Project Description

The JPO&E program purpose is to implement the Judicial Council's objectives for court e-services and e-filing initiatives by supporting the planning and implementation of electronic filing of court documents, as well as electronic service of court documents, to all 58 California Superior Courts and local and state justice/integration partners. In addition, the program provides ongoing communication and support for the courts as it relates to exchanges and information sharing with local and state justice/integration partners.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the JPO&E program would defer the hiring of a consultant (\$229,644) which would support ongoing activities that are assigned to this program. Under the direction of the JCTC and CTAC, this consultant would support the planning and development of several initiatives and work on addressing justice and integration partner issues and outreach (CMS Data Exchanges, E-Filing, Remote Courtroom Video, and SRL E-Services Portal). Without this resource, JCTC and CTAC support would be limited to existing resources and the response to integration partner issues and outreach may be delayed.

3. Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension (Table 1, row 30)

a. Program/Project Description

The Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension program provides the ongoing software maintenance for Adobe Forms. These forms are used throughout the trial courts. There are nearly one thousand state-wide forms and over 2,000 local forms in use in the trial courts today. A PDF form, by default, can be "fillable", but it can also be made "savable" for later updates with licenses for Adobe LiveCycle Reader Extended Forms.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the entire cost for maintenance and support for the Adobe Reader Extensions branch wide licenses (\$141,000) could be charged back to those courts using the product.

4. CCPOR (ROM) (Table 1, row 32)

a. Program/Project Description

CCPOR creates a statewide repository for restraining and protective orders that contains both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers. CCPOR was developed by the trial courts and the Judicial Council, based on a recommendation submitted by the Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force to provide a statewide protective order registry.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the delaying of deployment of new trial courts onto the CCPOR program (\$332,000) and a one-year delay of hardware refresh at the data center (\$120,000) would result in a total of \$452,000 in deferred costs. The postponement of the hardware refresh at the data center increases the risk of hardware failure. The \$332,000 reduction to delay the deployment of new trial courts for CCPOR was approved by the Judicial Council at the February 19, 2015 meeting.

5. Interim Case Management Systems (Table 1, row 35)

a. Program/Project Description

The Sustain Program budget provides technical project management and expertise for the trial courts using Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system and the 40+ interfaces with statewide and local justice partners which are hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). This support includes resources to implement legislative updates, integrate software upgrade/software patches, production support, disaster recovery services, CCTC infrastructure upgrades as well as cover costs for CCTC server/infrastructure hosting. The SJE CCTC hosted courts include: Humboldt, Imperial, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas/Sierra (note: the Sierra Court uses the Plumas SJE application to process traffic cases), San Benito and Trinity.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the ICMS program can defer the cost of upgrading the Sustain operating system (\$100,000). This upgrade of the Sustain operating system would apply to the servers running the SJE application. The risk of not upgrading this software is that the SJE courts would be running on an unsupported operating system. This reduction was approved by the Judicial Council at the February 19, 2015 meeting.

6. Jury Management System (Table 1, row 36)

a. Program/Project Description

This Jury program provides grant funding to the trial courts to use on projects which improve their jury management systems. The number of courts receiving grants varies according to the number and size of grant requests received from the trial courts as well as grant funding available.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the Jury program can suspend issuing jury grants (\$600,000) to trial courts that would need to upgrade or enhance their jury management systems. This reduction was approved by the Judicial Council at the February 19, 2015 meeting.

7. Telecommunications Support (Table 1, row 37)

a. Program/Project Description

This program develops and supports a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local systems (email, jury, CMS, VOIP, etc.) and enterprise system applications such as Phoenix, via shared services at the CCTC provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources.

The network technology refresh program is offered to all 58 courts. The core objective of the program is to maintain the investment made in the original telecommunications project by updating local network equipment that is no longer supported due to aging technology. The project forecasts the refresh cycle by working with our service integrators and hardware vendors to create an annual technology roadmap identifying the technology requiring replacement while reviewing both existing and new technologies available to the branch.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) Chargeback:

In FY 2015-16, the Telecommunication program could chargeback the Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) (\$2,500,000) to all of the trial courts. Today, the Telecommunications LAN/WAN program manages and administers the Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement benefitting all 58 trial courts. The agreement ensures a minimum level of maintenance coverage for all core court network equipment and services. A branch-wide approach provides the branch a savings of 30% or \$5M over five years; the current agreement expires May 31, 2015. The program is actively working to renew another 3 or 5 year agreement to save the branch at least the same amount in maintenance. The maintenance agreements provide critical operational and security

updates to the network services and greatly reduce potential courts outages from up to ten business days down to hours in some cases.

The JCC may continue to administer the agreement by charging back the courts their specific portion of the MMA based on inventory and maintenance costs per court. The program maintains a detailed inventory of all network equipment per court as of the MMA. Optionally, should the courts directly procure their own maintenance contracts, they may not be able to lock into a multi-year branch-wide discount and benefit from additional services. The courts would decide on the level of maintenance for their individual court networks and would be responsible to administer and ensure all eligible equipment is covered under the agreement. If a court chooses not to procure maintenance, the court runs the risks of experiencing longer outages as a result of a device failure due to long procurement processes.

Managed Network Security Services Chargeback:

In FY 2015-16, the Telecommunication program could chargeback the Managed Network Security Services (\$4,025,000) to all of the trial courts excluding Los Angeles. Today, all trial courts except Los Angeles benefit from managed network security services funded by the Telecommunications LAN/WAN program. Los Angeles is still determining their need for these services via the LAN/WAN program. The services maintain network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention, vulnerability scanning, and web browser security. These network security tools mitigate the risk of court data being purposely breached or erroneously exposed without proper authority and ensure continuous court operations to the public.

The JCC may continue to administer the managed services by charging back the courts their specific portion of the subscribed services per court. The program maintains a detailed inventory of all managed network security services per court as of the program. Optionally, should the courts procure their own services, they may not benefit from bulk pricing. They may choose from a multitude of security services available. There would be no branch view on the overall security posture including vulnerabilities, concerted cyber-attacks, breaches and mitigation efforts.

1B.

1. CLETS Services/Integration (Table 1, row 27)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.1.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the CLETS program would charge back the trial courts \$56,538. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.1.b.

2. Justice Partner Outreach/e-Services (Table 1, row 29)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.2.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the JPO&E program would defer \$229,644. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.2.b.

3. Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension (Table 1, row 30)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.3.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension program would charge back the trial courts \$141,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.3.b.

4. CCPOR (ROM) (Table 1, row 32)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.4.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the delaying of deployment of new trial courts onto the CCPOR program (\$332,000), delaying of hardware refresh at the data center (\$120,000), and charge back of remaining CCPOR program expenses (\$595,954) to the trial courts would result in a total reduction of \$1,047,954. The postponement of the hardware refresh at the data center increases the risk of hardware failure. The \$332,000 reduction to delay the deployment of new trial courts for CCPOR was approved by the Judicial Council at the February 19, 2015 meeting. The existing 43 courts that would be deployed by June 2015 could be charged back the \$595,954 remaining cost for CCPOR on a per court or per user basis.

5. Interim Case Management Systems (Table 1, row 35)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.5.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the ICMS program can defer the cost of upgrading the Sustain operating system (\$100,000) and charge back trial courts for the remaining program costs (\$1,896,034). The \$100,000 reduction was approved by the Judicial Council at the February 19, 2015 meeting. The SJE CCTC hosted courts have all expressed concern about the impact to their budgets and court operations if the full cost of the program is charged back to them. Specifically, several courts have indicated that they would be required to lay off staff, estimated to range from 9% to 15% of their staff. All eight of the SJE CCTC hosted courts (Humboldt, Imperial, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas/Sierra, San Benito, and Trinity) would be impacted.

6. Jury Management System (Table 1, row 36)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.6.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the Jury program would defer \$600,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.6.b.

7. Telecommunications Support (Table 1, row 37)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.7.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) Chargeback:

In FY 2015-16, the Telecommunication program would chargeback the Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) (\$2,500,000) to all of the trial courts. Today, the Telecommunications LAN/WAN program funds and administers the Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) benefitting all 58 trial courts. The agreement ensures a minimum level of maintenance coverage for all core court network equipment and services. A branch-wide approach provides the branch a savings of 30% or \$5M over five years; the current agreement expires May 31, 2015. The program is actively working to renew another 3 or 5 year agreement to save the branch at least the same amount in maintenance. The maintenance agreements provide critical operational and security updates to the network services and greatly reduce potential courts outages from up to ten business days down to hours in some cases.

The JCC may continue to administer the agreement by charging back the courts their specific portion of the MMA based on inventory and maintenance costs per court. The program maintains a detailed inventory of all network equipment per court as of the

MMA. Optionally, should the courts directly procure their own maintenance contracts, they may not be able to lock into a multi-year branch-wide discount and benefit from additional services. The courts would decide on the level of maintenance for their individual court networks and would be responsible to administer and ensure all eligible equipment is covered under the agreement. If a court chooses not to procure maintenance, the court runs the risks of experiencing longer outages as a result of a device failure due to long procurement processes.

8. Testing Tools – Enterprise Test Management Suite (Table 1, row 38)

a. Program/Project Description

The Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS) program helps the courts receive more reliable JCC-developed software. Its value is in identifying priorities for fixing defects and identifying enhancements; documenting steps taken to remedy the defect or develop the enhancement; and measuring the resolution of defects or deployment of enhancements. ETMS is specifically beneficial to custom-developed software under JCC oversight, such as the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR); Civil, Probate and Mental Case Management System (V3), and the Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2).

ETMS provides a centralized repository for detailed descriptions of defects, service requests and requested enhancements. This facilitates prioritization, provides a repository for documenting actions, and allows the team to record the steps to test and ensure that defects have been fixed and enhancements are working properly. From this repository, release notes are generated for every major release of software and reviewed with court staff before installation and court testing. Reports from the repository are used to track the numbers of defects, service requests and enhancements over time, look for trends, and help the JCC proactively identify areas which need further improvement.

Included in the testing suite are tools to help automate the testing process, enabling quality assurance staff to run a greater number of tests. This helps to ensure a higher standard of reliability and fewer defects in software delivered to the courts, with fewer resources. Also included are tools to track testing plans, store the steps needed to carry out the myriad of tests and record anticipated and actual test results to ensure the software is performing as designed. Finally, ETMS includes performance testing tools which allow developers to mimic hundreds of users accessing the system at the same time, each carrying out a typical task – without enlisting the aid of hundreds of users. This type of testing helps ensure the system won't be overloaded when released to its customers. A prime example of inadequate testing was the initial rollout of Healthcare.gov. Performance testing of the system with the anticipated number of people accessing the system would have helped developers identify deficiencies before the launch.

The tools that comprise ETMS are part of the larger quality assurance program, which develops and uses continuously improving processes to improve the quality and reliability of software.

- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the ETMS program could be eliminated (\$619,699). If the program was no longer funded, development would be slower and application and enhancement quality would suffer. Performance testing would be performed on a significantly lower level which could produce less than dependable applications for the trial courts.

Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options

Beyond the agreed upon reductions totaling \$1,032,000 approved by the Judicial Council at the February 19, 2015 meeting, Information Technology is not recommending either of the two 15% options because they include new and large charge backs to the trial courts for critical programs such as Telecommunications (LAN/WAN), Interim Case Management System, and CCPOR. We do not believe courts have the ability to pay these levels of charge backs without significantly impacting current court operations.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)

2A.

1. CLETS Services/Integration (Table 1, row 27)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.1.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the CLETS program would charge back the trial courts \$56,538. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.1.b.
2. Justice Partner Outreach/e-Services (Table 1, row 29)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.2.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the JPO&E program would defer \$229,644. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.2.b.
3. Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension (Table 1, row 30)

- a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.3.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension program would charge back the trial courts \$141,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.3.b.
4. CCPOR (ROM) (Table 1, row 32)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.4.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the CCPOR program would defer \$452,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.4.b.
5. Interim Case Management Systems (Table 1, row 35)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.5.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the ICMS program would defer \$100,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.5.b.
6. Jury Management System (Table 1, row 36)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.6.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the Jury program would defer \$600,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.6.b.
7. Telecommunications Support (Table 1, row 37)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.7.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) Chargeback:

In FY 2015-16, the Telecommunication program could chargeback the Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) (\$2,500,000) to all of the trial courts. Today, the Telecommunications LAN/WAN program funds and administers the Cisco Master Maintenance Agreement (MMA) benefitting all 58 trial courts. The agreement ensures a minimum level of maintenance coverage for all core court network equipment and services. A branch-wide approach provides the branch a savings of 30% or \$5M over five years; the current agreement expires May 31, 2015. The program is actively working to renew another 3 or 5 year agreement to save the branch at least the same amount in maintenance. The maintenance agreements provide critical operational and security updates to the network services and greatly reduce potential courts outages from up to ten business days down to hours in some cases.

The JCC may continue to administer the agreement by charging back the courts their specific portion of the MMA based on inventory and maintenance costs per court. The program maintains a detailed inventory of all network equipment per court as of the MMA. Optionally, should the courts directly procure their own maintenance contracts, they may not be able to lock into a multi-year branch-wide discount and benefit from additional services. The courts would decide on the level of maintenance for their individual court networks and would be responsible to administer and ensure all eligible equipment is covered under the agreement. If a court chooses not to procure maintenance, the court runs the risks of experiencing longer outages as a result of a device failure due to long procurement processes.

Managed Network Security Services Chargeback:

In FY 2015-16, the Telecommunication program would chargeback the Managed Network Security Services (\$4,025,000) to all of the trial courts excluding Los Angeles. Today, all trial courts except Los Angeles benefit from managed network security services funded by the Telecommunications LAN/WAN program. Los Angeles is still determining their need for these services via the LAN/WAN program. The services maintain network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention, vulnerability scanning, and web browser security. These network security tools mitigate the risk of court data being purposely breached or erroneously exposed without proper authority and ensure continuous court operations to the public.

The JCC may continue to administer the managed services by charging back the courts their specific portion of the subscribed services per court. The program maintains a detailed inventory of all managed network security services per court as of the program. Optionally, should the courts procure their own services, they may not benefit from bulk pricing. They may choose from a multitude of security services available. There would be no branch view on the overall security posture including vulnerabilities, concerted cyber-attacks, breaches and mitigation efforts.

Technology Refresh Deferral:

In FY 2015-16, the Telecommunication program could defer the Technology Refresh program (\$3,872,454) for the trial courts. The following courts are scheduled to refresh routers and/or wireless controllers in fiscal year 2015-2016. Routers are the core devices responsible for connectivity to remote court locations, justice partners and the Internet. Wireless controllers manage all wireless connectivity (Wi-Fi) services for internal court use and public court networks as required by the court. These devices will be designated as end-of-support by the manufacturer in 2016; no support will be provided by the vendor at such time. A one-year deferral may subject the courts to operational outages. Should any device fail, it may take up to ten business days to identify and procure the necessary replacements in order to restore court services. The courts would be responsible for the replacement of these core services.

If a court is not listed below, it is due to equipment already being replaced or not requiring refresh due to a recent courthouse construction project.

NETWORK DEVICE	Router 1800	Router 2800	Router 3800	Wireless Controller 4400
Alameda	2	7	0	0
Amador	1			1
Butte	2	8		1
Calaveras	2	1		1
Colusa	1	1		
Contra Costa	2	10		0
El Dorado	1			1
Fresno	3	10	5	2
Glenn	1	6		
Humboldt	1	1		1
Imperial	2	2		1
Inyo	2	3		1
Kern	2	2	1	
Kings	1	1	1	1
Lake	1	2		
Lassen	1			
Madera	1	4		1
Marin	1		2	1
Mendocino	1			1
Merced	2	1		1
Modoc	1	1		
Mono	1			
Monterey	1	2		1
Napa	1	3		1
Nevada	1			1
Placer	1	4	2	

Plumas	1	1		
Riverside	2	10		
Sacramento	1			
San Bernardino	2			
San Francisco	4	2		
San Joaquin	2	6		
San Luis Obispo	2	3	1	1
San Mateo	2	5		
Santa Barbara	2			
Santa Clara	2	5	4	
Santa Cruz	2	1		1
Shasta	1	1		
Sierra	1			1
Siskiyou	1	1		1
Solano	1	2	1	1
Sonoma	1	1	1	1
Stanislaus	2	4		2
Tehama	1			
Trinity	1			
Tulare	1	9		
Tuolumne	2	4		2
Ventura	2	3	2	
Yolo	1	3	1	1
Yuba	1			

2B.

1. CLETS Services/Integration (Table 1, row 27)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.1.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the CLETS program would charge back the trial courts \$56,538. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.1.b.

2. Justice Partner Outreach/e-Services (Table 1, row 29)

a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.2.a.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the JPO&E program would defer \$229,644. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.2.b.

3. Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension (Table 1, row 30)
 - a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.3.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension program would charge back the trial courts \$141,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.3.b.
4. CCPOR (ROM) (Table 1, row 32)
 - a. Program/Project Description

See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.4.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the deferral of \$452,000 and charge back of \$595,954 to the trial courts would result in a total reduction of \$1,047,954. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1B.11.b.
5. Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS (Table 1, row 33)
 - a. Program/Project Description

The civil, small claims, probate and mental health interim case management system (V3) processes twenty-five 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.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

In FY 2015-16, the Case Management System (V3) program would chargeback the entire program to the trial courts using the V3 services (\$6,259,586).

The trial courts in Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura have confirmed that since they are currently absorbing the impact of WAFM, they would not have sufficient funding to cover the costs of V3. If funding is not available, all V3 operations at the data center would need to be shut down. Therefore, Sacramento will need to process all of its civil and probate cases manually. Ventura will need to process all of its small claims, civil, probate, and mental health cases manually. As Orange and San Diego host V3 locally, the impact would be that they would need to hire and train support staff to maintain V3, or they would not be able to incorporate legislative updates and resolve production issues.

The trial court in San Joaquin may not be impacted if they are able to make their target date for conversion and go live with FullCourt Enterprise (JSI) in FY 2014-15.

6. Interim Case Management Systems (Table 1, row 35)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.5.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the ICMS program would defer \$100,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.5.b.
7. Jury Management System (Table 1, row 36)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.6.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the Jury program would defer \$600,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1A.6.b.
8. Telecommunications Support (Table 1, row 37)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1A.7.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the Adobe Telecom program would charge back the trial courts \$2,500,000. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1B.14.b.
9. Testing Tools – Enterprise Test Management Suite (Table 1, row 38)
 - a. Program/Project Description
See the Program/Project Description in Scenario 1B.15.a.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
In FY 2015-16, the ETMS program would defer \$619,699. See the Description of the Reduction in Scenario 1B.15.b.

Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options

Beyond the agreed upon reductions totaling \$1,032,000 approved by the Judicial Council at the February 19, 2015 meeting, Information Technology is not recommending either of the two 25% options because they include new and large charge backs to the courts for critical programs such CCPOR, Testing Tools – Enterprise Test Management Suite, V3 CMS, Telecommunications (LAN/WAN), and the Interim Case Management System. We do not believe courts have the ability to pay these levels of charge backs without significantly impacting current court operations.

Trial Court Administrative Services

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A.

1. Court-Ordered Debt Task Force (Table 1, row 48)

a. Program/Project Description

The Court-Ordered Debt Task Force was established in conjunction with Penal Code section 1463.02 and its composition requires inclusion of state, county, and city representatives. The task force's objective is to evaluate the effectiveness of the criminal and traffic-related fine/fee structure and attempt to simplify the administration of this system for the benefit of the citizens and the criminal justice participants.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The 15 percent allocation reduction totals \$3,750 in Fiscal Year 2015-2016. The reduction may result in less travel associated with the annual statewide Revenue Distribution training. As an alternative to 4 live interactive sessions, this training may have to be delivered to the trial courts via webinar in 2 instances, impacting the overall effectiveness.

2. Phoenix Program (Table 1, row 49)

a. Program/Project Description

The Phoenix Program supports the Judicial Council's goal to establish an effective administrative infrastructure at the state and local levels 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. All 58 trial courts utilize the Phoenix Financial System, and currently, 10 courts depend on the Phoenix Human Resources System for their payroll needs. Additional courts have begun discussions with Phoenix Program staff for their transition onto the JCC's payroll solution after being notified by their counties of service terminations.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

At the 15 percent level, the IMF reduction totals \$2,082,795. This reduction cannot be absorbed in the program's IMF fund. The fiscal year 2015-2016 IMF allocation is fully committed to JCC staffing (58 percent) and system integrator, system maintenance and operations, and user license costs (43 percent).

Ongoing reductions have already significantly eroded the Phoenix Program's overall budget over the course of several years. The program's goals and objectives have been adjusted downward each year to absorb the mandated cuts in funding, but to date, the needs of the courts continue to be met through the creative and resourceful efforts of management and staff. However, the implementation of these newly proposed reductions will seriously affect the Phoenix Program's ability to continue.

Reductions would significantly decrease the amount of maintenance and operations support services contracted from EPI-USE, negatively affecting the processing of trouble tickets in queue, and impacting the service levels provided to each of the 58 trial courts, including the 10 courts on the Phoenix HR System, among other things.

If the Phoenix contracts are to remain in place as dictated by legal obligation, then the only option remaining is a reduction of program staff in the Shared Services Center and Phoenix ERP unit funded by IMF. At a 15 percent reduction, cutting OE&E expenditures to a bare minimum, an estimated 15 to 19 mid-level staff of 58.88 current FTE's would need to be eliminated to remain within budget.

The current staffing levels already present a challenge in the provision of support to all 58 trial courts. Existing deficiencies in most units are apparent and are revealed in the constant redistribution of workload among remaining staff, and also in the use of administrative staff to fill behind vacant positions where tasks must still be performed in support of the courts. The impact of reducing staff even further would compound an already difficult situation.

Shifting IMF costs to other funding sources within the program is also not an option. One alternative to reducing the IMF deficit in FY 2015–2016 is to shift the cost of the Shared Services Center back to the courts in the form of reimbursements, freeing up \$6,500,000 for the fund.

Specific Impact of 15 Percent IMF Reduction

General Ledger:

- Inability to adequately monitor the courts financial records (specifically cash and fund balances) without working a significant amount of overtime.
- Increased court responsibility for reconciliations, monitoring their accounts, posting journal entries, etc. with limited staff.

- Decreased time to assist courts with reporting and preparation of reports (e.g., Schedule 1's, 1% Fund Balance, ICRP, cash projections, as well as the numerous surveys that courts request assistance to complete).
- Decreased time to complete testing for system maintenance and enhancements (often mandated).

Trust Services

- Inadequate time to properly review self-input court entries that may include ACH transactions. If ACH transaction errors are not caught prior to processing then cash could be transferred to the wrong account/3rd party.
- Inadequate time to properly review Federal Wire transfers prior to processing and transferring cash.
- Insufficient time to adequately review Daily Bank activity (i.e., confirm daily deposits posted in Phoenix System agree to bank activity).
- Inability to meet agreed upon timeline to park / post deposits and disbursements on the courts' behalf, post monthly interest allocations, etc.
- Insufficient time to adequately back-up JCC Treasury Services staff as required on a daily basis (i.e., electronic fund transfer processing, bank research, encashment process review, Uniform Civil Fee Processing, banking administration, banking related journal entry posting).
- Insufficient time to complete daily, weekly, monthly reviews of general ledger accounts and activity for proper account coding, abnormal balances, stale dated checks, outstanding items in the cash clearing accounts, etc.
- Inability to respond to ad-hoc court requests in a timely manner (i.e., request for interest amount that has accrued on a specific case; request for legislation to support non-payment of criminal interest; requests to research variances or unreconciled general ledger accounts).
- Insufficient time to update desk procedures and training materials for the courts as needed.
- Inability to adequately address or reconcile fiscal year-end activities and calendar year-end 1099INT training and activities. It would be a challenge to meet all daily and year-end deadlines.
- Inability to spend a significant amount of time assisting the courts on a daily basis. Staff would not have time to continue to assist the courts, as we currently do today, with their daily questions related to deposit activity, trust disbursement activity, on-demand training, reconciliation assistance in the Trust fund, Distribution fund and Uniform Civil Fee fund, requests to research rules, policies or procedures, requests for professional opinion, expertise and advice, etc.

Phoenix Purchasing Support Services

- Inability to maintain updated job and quick reference guides for the Phoenix System.
- Inability to maintain current desktop procedures.
- Inability to review and update procedures, including the JBCM and Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures.

- Inability to develop and maintain job aids for procurement and contracting processes related to the JBCM.
- Inability to analyze relevant contract and procurement policies, rules of court, laws and regulations to ensure the unit is knowledgeable and work is in compliance.
- Eliminate participation in the management of the branch-wide office supply agreement.
- Eliminate all interaction with vendor community.
- Inability to provide Phoenix training as it relates to purchasing and the Material Management Module.
- Inability to provide system trouble shooting and testing.
- Inability to generate custom reports for the courts from the Phoenix System.
- Inability to facilitate the monthly procurement call for the Judicial Branch.

Accounts Payable

- Payments returned as undeliverable due to bad addresses will have to be returned to the corresponding court for address research and follow up.
- Elimination of special check handling tasks requiring that checks be mailed back to the court to mail to 3rd party.
- Require courts to upload own jury files.
- Unavailability to help train court staff.
- Unavailability to maintain training material.

Process Support

The Finance (FI) and Human Resources (HR) documentation and training support to all Phoenix users, court users and TCAS users, would be eliminated.

- Documentation of Phoenix Business processes would cease.
- Phoenix system changes whether court requested, through upgrades, or by deployments would no longer be recorded.
- Existing business process would become obsolete, stale and unusable rendering the library of existing process documentation and training materials unreliable.
- Phoenix HR and FI training materials and training support for court users would no longer be available.
- The development of training materials for new functionality, deployments, or enhancements would cease.
- The interdepartmental support for court training efforts would not be maintained. The HR and FI training materials and support affects all court users.
- The following training materials and support functions would no longer be possible:
 - New user trainings including online tutorials and instructor lead trainings.
 - Phoenix based training curriculum – a vast library of help links integrated with the Phoenix system that allow court users to quickly get online assistance with daily work functions.
 - Phoenix library of managed support documentation which provide additional help, policy guides, forms, and references to court users.

- Development and maintenance of Business Processes, including the written documentation (Solution Process Documents) and the visually (Process Flow Diagram) recording of system process and any subsequent transactional changes.
- Instructor lead Phoenix system trainings for all deployments and new court users

Phoenix ERP - ITSO

The Phoenix ITSO impacts of both the 15 percent and 25 percent proposed cut result in the same conclusion: there will be no possible way to sustain the Phoenix application and will result in the discontinuation of the Phoenix HR and FI program. Operational expenses for this budget are primarily attributed to infrastructure to support the system and people to support that infrastructure.

- *Infrastructure Impacts*

The current hardware, software, infrastructure and environments, are mission critical for basic operations. A cut of 15 percent or 25 percent will result in the elimination of development, testing, training and production environments which support all business operations and this would result in an instable environment unable to support daily court operations.

- *Support Impacts*

Additionally, a 15 percent or 25 percent cut to the staff that support this system would result in staffing below the threshold for baseline system stability. It would mean that at all levels of maintenance and operations there would be a single point of failure and in some cases no support at all.

1B.

1. Court-Ordered Debt Task Force (Table 1, row 48)

a. Program/Project Description

Same as in 1A.1a

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Option 1B.1b elects that no cuts be made to this budget; therefore, there is no impact on the trial courts.

2. Phoenix Program (Table 1, row 49)

a. Program/Project Description

Same as 1A.2a

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

At the 15 percent level, the IMF reduction totals \$2,086,545. Please see 1A.2b above.

Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options

At the 15 percent reduction level, there is no significant difference between option 1A and 1B. However, TCAS is not recommending either of the two 15 percent options because of the greatly diminished service levels imposed on the 58 trial courts utilizing the JCC's financial and payroll administrative infrastructure solution.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)

2A.

1. Court-Ordered Debt Task Force (Table 1, row 48)

a. Program/Project Description

See 1A.1a

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The 25 percent allocation reduction totals \$6,250 in Fiscal Year 2015-2016. The reduction will result in less travel associated with the annual statewide Revenue Distribution training. As an alternative to 4 live interactive sessions, this training may have to be delivered to the trial courts via webinar, impacting the overall effectiveness.

2. Phoenix Program (Table 1, row 49)

a. Program/Project Description

See 1A.2a

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

At the 25 percent level, the IMF reduction totals \$3,471,325. A reduction of this level cannot be absorbed in the program's IMF fund. The fiscal year 2015-2016 IMF allocation is fully committed to JCC staffing (58 percent) and system integrator, system maintenance and operations, and user license costs (43 percent).

Ongoing reductions have already significantly eroded the Phoenix Program's overall budget over the course of several years. The program's goals and objectives have been adjusted downward each year to absorb the mandated cuts in funding, but to date, the needs of the courts continue to be met through the creative and resourceful efforts of management and staff. However, the implementation of these newly proposed reductions will seriously affect the Phoenix Program's ability to continue.

Reductions would significantly and detrimentally decrease the amount of maintenance and operations support services contracted from EPI-USE, negatively affecting the

processing of trouble tickets in queue, and impacting the service levels provided to each of the 58 trial courts, including the 10 courts on the Phoenix HR System, among other things.

If the Phoenix contracts are to remain in place as dictated by legal obligation, then the only option remaining is a reduction of program staff in the Shared Services Center and Phoenix ERP unit funded by IMF. At a 25 percent reduction, cutting OE&E expenditures to a bare minimum, an estimated 30 to 32 mid-level staff of 58.88 current FTE's would need to be eliminated to remain within budget.

The current staffing levels already present a challenge in the provision of support to all 58 trial courts. Existing deficiencies in most units are apparent and are revealed in the constant redistribution of workload among remaining staff, and also in the use of administrative staff to fill behind vacant positions where tasks must still be performed in support of the courts. The impact of drastically reducing staff to the degree necessary to achieve the \$3.5 million reduction would result in catastrophically negative impacts on the administrative infrastructure of the trial courts.

Shifting IMF costs to other funding sources within the program is also not an option. The program's General Fund and Trial Court Trust Fund allocations cannot absorb an added \$3.5 million in expenses. One viable alternative to reducing the IMF deficit in FY 2015–2016 is to shift the cost of the Shared Services Center back to the courts in the form of reimbursements, freeing up \$6,500,000 for the fund.

Specific Impact of 25 Percent IMF Reduction

General Ledger:

- Inability to adequately monitor the courts financial records (specifically cash and fund balances) without working a significant amount of overtime.
- Increased court responsibility for reconciliations, monitoring their accounts, posting journal entries, etc. with limited staff.
- Decreased time to assist courts with reporting and preparation of reports (e.g., Schedule 1's, 1% Fund Balance, ICRP, cash projections, as well as the numerous surveys that courts request assistance to complete).
- Decreased time to complete testing for system maintenance and enhancements (often mandated).
- Inability to make journal entries on courts' behalf. For many courts, this would be quite a hardship as they just do not have the staff to perform this responsibility and there is also the issue of separation of duties.
- Inability to assist the courts with their annual budget preparation.
- Training and on-site visits would not be possible.

Trust Services

- Inadequate time to properly review self-input court entries that may include ACH transactions. If ACH transaction errors are not caught prior to processing then cash could be transferred to the wrong account/3rd party.
- Inadequate time to properly review Federal Wire transfers prior to processing and transferring cash.
- Insufficient time to adequately review Daily Bank activity (i.e., confirm daily deposits posted in Phoenix System agree to bank activity).
- Inability to meet agreed upon timeline to park / post deposits and disbursements on the courts' behalf, post monthly interest allocations, etc.
- Insufficient time to adequately back-up JCC Treasury Services staff as required on a daily basis (i.e., electronic fund transfer processing, bank research, encashment process review, Uniform Civil Fee Processing, banking administration, banking related journal entry posting).
- Insufficient time to complete daily, weekly, monthly reviews of general ledger accounts and activity for proper account coding, abnormal balances, stale dated checks, outstanding items in the cash clearing accounts, etc.
- Inability to respond to ad-hoc court requests in a timely manner (i.e., request for interest amount that has accrued on a specific case; request for legislation to support non-payment of criminal interest; requests to research variances or unreconciled general ledger accounts).
- Insufficient time to update desk procedures and training materials for the courts as needed.
- Inability to adequately address or reconcile fiscal year-end activities and calendar year-end 1099INT training and activities. It would be a challenge to meet all daily and year-end deadlines.
- Inability to spend a significant amount of time assisting the courts on a daily basis. Staff would not have time to continue to assist the courts, as we currently do today, with their daily questions related to deposit activity, trust disbursement activity, on-demand training, reconciliation assistance in the Trust fund, Distribution fund and Uniform Civil Fee fund, requests to research rules, policies or procedures, requests for professional opinion, expertise and advice, etc.

Phoenix Purchasing Support Services

- Inability to maintain updated job and quick reference guides for the Phoenix System.
- Inability to maintain current desktop procedures.
- Inability to review and update procedures, including the JBCM and Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures.
- Inability to develop and maintain job aids for procurement and contracting processes related to the JBCM.
- Inability to analyze relevant contract and procurement policies, rules of court, laws and regulations to ensure the unit is knowledgeable and work is in compliance.

- Elimination of participation in the management of the branch-wide office supply agreement.
- Elimination of all interaction with vendor community.
- Inability to provide Phoenix training as it relates to purchasing and the Material Management Module.
- Inability to provide system trouble shooting and testing.
- Inability to generate custom reports for the courts from the Phoenix System.
- Inability to facilitate the monthly procurement call for the Judicial Branch.
- Inability to provide year end support, including training, reports and review.
- Inability to respond to trial court procurement and contract related questions regarding the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual (JBCM), Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures and general policies and processes.
- Inability to respond to requests for assistance with the Phoenix Material Management Module.
- Elimination of supervisor tasks.
- Elimination of special projects of any type.
- Elimination of the Procurement Network ListServe.

Accounts Payable

- Payments returned as undeliverable due to bad addresses will have to be returned to the corresponding court for address research and follow up.
- Elimination of special check handling tasks requiring that checks be mailed back to the court to mail to 3rd party.
- Require courts to upload own jury files.
- Unavailability to help train court staff.
- Unavailability to maintain training material.
- Delays in the processing of vendor invoices, vendor payment processing, and jury payment processing.
- Reduced hours for Court/Vendor contact with staff.
- Elimination of emergency check runs.
- Inadequate coverage to allow staff to meet mandated training requirements.
- Inadequate staffing to be able to participate in the planning and testing of system maintenance and enhancements.

Payroll Financial Services

- Inability to assist the 58 trial courts in reconciling their benefit liability accounts. For each court, the staff review postings to general ledger accounts that record deductions and payments of employee benefits to multiple benefit providers for each court (i.e., medical, dental, vision, life, long-term disability, short-term disability, employee assistance program, etc.).

Process Support

The Finance (FI) and Human Resources (HR) documentation and training support to all Phoenix users, court users and TCAS users, would be eliminated.

- Documentation of Phoenix Business processes would cease.

- Phoenix system changes whether court requested, through upgrades, or by deployments would no longer be recorded.
- Existing business process would become obsolete, stale and unusable rendering the library of existing process documentation and training materials unreliable.
- Phoenix HR and FI training materials and training support for court users would no longer be available.
- The development of training materials for new functionality, deployments, or enhancements would cease.
- The interdepartmental support for court training efforts would not be maintained. The HR and FI training materials and support affects all court users.
- The following training materials and support functions would no longer be possible:
 - New user trainings including online tutorials and instructor lead trainings.
 - Phoenix based training curriculum – a vast library of help links integrated with the Phoenix system that allow court users to quickly get online assistance with daily work functions.
 - Phoenix library of managed support documentation which provide additional help, policy guides, forms, and references to court users.
 - Development and maintenance of Business Processes, including the written documentation (Solution Process Documents) and the visually (Process Flow Diagram) recording of system process and any subsequent transactional changes.
 - Instructor lead Phoenix system trainings for all deployments and new court users
- Loss of Phoenix System Authorized User Security control.
 - Production issue support for all 58 courts and their FI and HR users and the internal Phoenix users will be compromised with the elimination of this function.
 - Phoenix authorized user security roles are constantly being changed to accommodate court's new hires, transfers, and reorganizations. Security roles would no longer be reviewed and maintained to could result in conflict of issue resulting in auditing findings for courts and Judicial Council. Additionally, security roles could not be created or modified for new functionality, whether court requested, through upgrades, or system required upgrades.
 - Without the Authorized User Security support function the Phoenix system would become static and the court's flexibility to assign staff in various Phoenix user positions would be eliminated.

Phoenix ERP - ITSO

The Phoenix ITSO impacts of both the 15 percent and 25 percent proposed cut result in the same conclusion: there will be no possible way to sustain the Phoenix application and will result in the discontinuation of the Phoenix HR and FI program. Operational

expenses for this budget are primarily attributed to infrastructure to support the system and people to support that infrastructure.

- *Infrastructure Impacts*

The current hardware, software, infrastructure and environments, are mission critical for basic operations. A cut of 15 percent or 25 percent will result in the elimination of development, testing, training and production environments which support all business operations and this would result in an instable environment unable to support daily court operations.

- *Support Impacts*

Additionally, a 15 percent or 25 percent cut to the staff that support this system would result in staffing below the threshold for baseline system stability. It would mean that at all levels of maintenance and operations there would be a single point of failure and in some cases no support at all.

2B.

1. Court-Ordered Debt Task Force (Table 1, row 48)

a. Program/Project Description

See 1A.1a

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Option 2B.1b elects that no cuts be made to this budget; therefore, there is no impact to the trial courts.

2. Phoenix Program (Table 1, row 49)

a. Program/Project Description

See 1A.2a

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

At the 25 percent level, the IMF reduction totals \$3,477,573. Please see 2A.2b above.

Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options

At the 25 percent reduction level, there is no significant difference between option 2A and 2B. However, TCAS is not recommending either of the two 25 percent options because of the greatly diminished service levels imposed on the 58 trial courts utilizing the JCC's financial and payroll administrative infrastructure solution.

Operations & Programs Division

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A.

1. CFCC Educational Programs (Table 1, row 1)

a. Program/Project Description

The FY 2015–2016 allocation will be used to assist judicial officers and court employees to attend the 2015 Beyond the Bench conference and the Youth Court Summit.

Programming is coordinated with CJER and open to all courts.

CFCC Educational Programs provide multidisciplinary and mandatory education for court professionals. These are the only multidisciplinary programs for judicial officers, court professionals, and their partners in child welfare, probation, and family law that also meet mandatory educational requirements.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

A \$13,500 (15 percent) reduction would cut funding for the travel of approximately 32 judicial officers or court staff to Beyond the Bench in 2015 (approximately 16 percent of all judicial officers and court staff who receive travel support). Given that CFCC and CJER now alternate the major juvenile law educational events annually; this means that a significant proportion of judicial officers will not have an opportunity for comprehensive training for nearly two years.

The reduction would also require the Youth Summit to reduce total event size by 15 attendees or approximately one court team consisting of judge, court staff and youth representatives.

2. Interactive Software – Self-Rep Electronic Forms (Table 1, row 2)

a. Program/Project Description

Funding supports the license to allow all courts to use Law Help Interactive Server and middleware to allow courts to use Hotdocs document assembly programs in self-help centers, family court services offices and through their court website or linked to the California Courts self-help center.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The Judicial Council has a license which is available for use by all the courts. The cost is projected to be \$40,000 in FY 15-16 for the same level of usage. The remaining \$20,000 has been used to fund consultants to develop and update the Hotdocs programs used by the courts. Similar to “Turbotax,” these programs ask questions which litigants can answer which then populate Judicial Council and other necessary forms. The program uses logic which either eliminates or asks additional questions based on previous answers. Typed, legible and complete pleadings are produced along with instructions for service and filing.

Currently, more than 70,000 people use these programs each year in California self-help centers. This translates into less than \$1 for every person served. There are only three court licenses available nationally at the deeply discounted rate that has been provided to the Judicial Council. If the license was not negotiated on a statewide basis, courts would have to develop their own server and middle-ware capacity in order to maintain the programs currently in use. It does not seem wise to cut that capacity.

Two alternative options are proposed for achieving a 15% reduction:

Option A. Continue to pay \$40,000 for license for the server and would reduce available funds to \$11,000 per year for consultants who prepare modifications and enhancements as requested by the courts.

Option B. All courts pay for a proportionate share of the cost of the license development costs.

3. CFCC Publications (Table 1, row 3)

a. Program/Project Description

In FY 2015-2016, the allocation will be used to fund the license to use a proprietary web-based knowledge management tool that was developed specifically for juvenile dependency judges, court staff and dependency stakeholders, the *California Dependency Online Guide* (“*CalDOG*”). The system is used by over 90 percent of judicial officers with dependency court assignments.

The *California Dependency Online Guide* (“*CalDOG*”) is available at no cost to all courts statewide. *The California Dependency Online Guide* is a training and information resource used by nearly all of the judicial officers, court staff, and court-appointed attorneys in dependency proceedings across the state and a source of relevant, up-to-date and no-cost information for judicial officers, attorneys, and all professionals working in California’s child welfare system. *CalDOG* provides quality summaries and links to opinions of the most recent state and federal dependency cases, new child welfare and probation regulation and policy guidelines interpreted for the courts, an up-to-date calendar of educational opportunities around the state and new publications and web resources. All

material is categorized and searchable by major topics in dependency law. CalDOG's 4,150 subscribers include 270 judges and other judicial officers, 2,330 attorneys, 700 county child welfare workers, and 850 other child welfare professionals including educators, probation officers, tribal representatives, psychologists and others.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

A reduction of \$3,000 or 15% would require CFCC to renegotiate license terms with the vendor. CFCC would suggest that less used portions of the system be taken down in California, most likely the sample briefs and motions section. Judicial officers, particularly those from small courts, have communicated to CalDOG staff that because of CalDOG they have been able to reduce the cost of their legal subscriptions and books. Cutting sections of CalDOG would require judicial officers to find other ways of accessing publications.

4. Domestic Violence Interpreters Program (Table 1, row 4)

a. Program/Project Description

Since interpretation costs have shifted to project 45-45, these funds are solely used for translation of forms and instructional material related to domestic violence. California Code of Civil Procedure section 185(b) requires the Judicial Council to make available to all courts, translations of domestic violence protective order forms in languages other than English, as the Judicial Council deems appropriate. Since 2000, the Judicial Council has translated those forms into Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese and Korean, based on data regarding requested language interpreters and language needs studies. Since they are statewide forms, it is more cost-efficient to translate once for statewide use rather than have courts go through the expense of translating locally.

The area of domestic violence is one where there are regular statutory changes requiring changes to Judicial Council forms and funds are fully used every year for these translations. Cutting back on translations would not appear to fit within the vision of the Language Access Plan newly adopted by the Judicial Council nor that of the Department of Justice has taken the position that Title VI requires all critical forms to be translated.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

A 15% cut would leave \$17,000 for these translations. It costs approximately \$500 per language per translated form for translation and formatting depending on the length of the form and how significant the change is.

Two alternative options are proposed for achieving a 15% reduction:

Option A: The Judicial Council could translate the forms into fewer languages.

Option B: The Judicial Council could determine not to translate all forms and instructional material. That would potentially pose difficulties for the court by having

fewer language resources as the translated forms save time from interpreters and self-help staff having to sight-translate the forms.

5. Self-Help Centers (Table 1, row 5)

a. Program/Project Description

These funds go directly to trial courts to provide self-help assistance. Over 95% of the funds are used for staffing of the centers. These funds enable self-help centers to serve more than 450,000 persons per year by helping litigants to complete legal forms, explaining the court process and legal issues, and providing referrals for additional assistance.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

With a 15% cut of \$750,000, 30,044 fewer people will be served by self-help centers. It is likely that some courts will have to cut back on staff hours or lay staff off if these funds are reduced. These cuts will have a significant impact on court clerks and other court staff as well as judicial officers. One evaluation found that self-help center workshops save \$1.00 for every \$.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$.36 to \$.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to help them finish their divorce cases, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$.45 spent. In the evaluation of one program that had to cut self-help services, the number of guardianship continuances went from 7 per year to 402 per year. Clerks reported that they had to spend 45 minutes at the counter with guardianship litigants and that the time was often not productive since they needed more help with their paperwork.

Two alternative options are proposed for achieving a 15% reduction:

Option A: Pro rata reduction between the courts based on the current formula which relies on the population in each county. This has the benefit of allowing trial courts an early notification of budget cuts that they would need to address.

Option B: The Judicial Council could develop a new formula for distribution of these funds rather than have them based on population in the county. This would allow for a more nuanced approach, but would take more time to develop and might appear less equitable than pro rata reduction.

6. Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support (Table 1, row 6)

a. Program/Project Description

Funds support the California Courts On-Line Self Help Center which is used by over 5 million people per year including updates based on changes in the law and maintaining the Spanish mirror site, for training for court self-help staff and for translations of forms and instructional materials commonly used by self-represented litigants.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Given the large number of Californians who use the self-help website and rely on it for assistance, it is critical that the site be legally correct and up-to-date. Provision of one statewide self-help website allows the courts to link to those materials rather than developing their own. Training for self-help staff has been dramatically restricted and is now primarily on-line and by co-sponsoring with other organizations. Many courts have asked for additional audio and video resources to be developed for the websites and for use in their self-help centers and courtrooms. These materials can be developed in collaboration with local courts, but require professional services for editing and captioning.

Since unrepresented persons pose special challenges when they do not speak English, this fund has been used to translate Judicial Council forms that are primarily used by self-represented litigants. These include family law forms, fee waivers, small claims and civil harassment. That would potentially pose difficulties for the court by having fewer language resources as the translated forms save time from interpreters and self-help staff having to sight-translate the forms. It costs approximately \$500 per language for translating and formatting a form depending on the length of the form and how significant the change is. Since these are statewide forms, it is more cost-efficient to translate once for statewide use rather than have courts go through the expense of translating locally.

Two alternative options are proposed for achieving a 15% reduction:

Option A - Eliminate translation of approximately 30 forms and instructional handouts.

Option B - Eliminate development of audio-visual materials requested by courts for the self-help website and local courts self-help centers.

Comparison of the 15% Reduction Options

1. CFCC Programs

A pro rata reduction is considered the only remaining option, since cuts in program cycles and scope have been made in response to prior budget reductions. Statewide programs such as Beyond the Bench and Family Law Education Programs are now offered every other fiscal year rather than annually.

2. Interactive Software – Self-Rep Electronic Forms

This project pays for \$40,000 in a license for all California courts and \$20,000 for consultants to update and adapt the software programs. A 15% cut could come from a \$9,000 cut to the consultants, which would increase the backlog of requests from courts for development of programs. Local courts could potentially contract to purchase this

expertise themselves. Since there are only 3 court licenses available nationwide at this reduced cost, it does not seem feasible for local courts to purchase this license on their own, but they could potentially transfer funds to the Judicial Council for a pro rata share of the license. This seems as if would be costly to administer and difficult for courts that are struggling for resources.

3. CFCC Publications

Because all of the allocation is used to support one license, there is no other reduction option but to reduce the funds available for that license.

4. Domestic Violence Interpreters Program

A 15% cut would leave \$17,000 for translations. Each form costs approximately \$500 for translation and formatting per language depending on the length of the form and the amount of change. So, on average, 6 translations would not be completed with this proposed cut. The area of domestic violence is one where there are regular statutory changes requiring changes to Judicial Council forms so these funds have been fully utilized in past years. One option is to translate into fewer languages. As forms are modified, a language might be dropped depending on the costs of translations. This would affect litigants who only spoke the language that was lost. Alternatively, the Judicial Council could determine not to translate all forms and instructional material, and could determine that some materials did not need to be translated. This might be more of a concern in some years than others.

5. Self-Help Centers

$5,000,000 \times .15 = \$750,000$ - 40,192 fewer people served by self help centers

A pro rata cut could be made between the courts based on the current formula which relies on the population in each county. This has the benefit of allowing trial courts an early notification of budget cuts that they would need to address. Or the Judicial Council could develop a new formula for distribution of these funds rather than have them based on population in the county. This would allow for a more nuanced approach, but would take more time to develop and might appear less equitable than pro rata reduction. Table 4 below shows the level of funding per court under the 15% and 25% reduction scenarios.

**2015-16 Self-Help Center Funds by Court
15% and 25% SCIMF Reductions**

Table 4

Court	Full Year of \$3.7M TCTF (Dedicated Baseline)	\$2.5M TCTF Legislature's Augmentation	Total TCTF Allocation	\$5M SCIMF	Total TCTF and SCIMF Allocation for 7/1/14-6/30/15	Proposed 15% Reduction SCIMF (\$750,000)	Total TCTF and SCIMF Allocation	Proposed 25% Reduction SCIMF (\$1,250,000)	Total TCTF and SCIMF Allocation
a	c	d	e = c + d	f	h = e + f	i = .15 of f	j = g - i	k = .25 of f	l = h - k
Alameda	104,209	101,575	205,784	203,151	408,935	30,473	378,462	50,788	358,147
Alpine	34,058	83	34,141	167	34,308	25	34,283	42	34,266
Amador	35,773	2,565	38,337	5,129	43,467	769	42,697	1,282	42,184
Butte	44,097	14,608	58,706	29,217	87,922	4,383	83,540	7,304	80,618
Calaveras	36,125	3,074	39,199	6,149	45,348	922	44,426	1,537	43,811
Colusa	35,000	1,447	36,447	2,894	39,340	434	38,906	723	38,617
Contra Costa	81,852	69,231	151,083	138,461	289,544	20,769	268,775	34,615	254,929
Del Norte	35,357	1,964	37,321	3,927	41,248	589	40,659	982	40,266
El Dorado	42,191	11,851	54,042	23,701	77,743	3,555	74,188	5,925	71,818
Fresno	75,815	60,497	136,312	120,993	257,305	18,149	239,156	30,248	227,057
Glenn	35,332	1,927	37,259	3,854	41,113	578	40,535	963	40,149
Humboldt	40,161	8,913	49,074	17,826	66,900	2,674	64,226	4,457	62,443
Imperial	41,744	11,204	52,948	22,407	75,355	3,361	71,994	5,602	69,753
Inyo	34,861	1,245	36,106	2,490	38,596	374	38,223	623	37,974
Kern	70,253	52,450	122,703	104,900	227,603	15,735	211,868	26,225	201,378
Kings	40,867	9,935	50,803	19,871	70,674	2,981	67,693	4,968	65,706
Lake	36,980	4,311	41,291	8,623	49,914	1,293	48,621	2,156	47,758
Lassen	35,648	2,384	38,032	4,769	42,801	715	42,086	1,192	41,609
Los Angeles	510,282	689,065	1,199,347	1,378,130	2,577,476	206,719	2,370,757	344,532	2,232,944
Madera	40,712	9,711	50,424	19,423	69,846	2,913	66,933	4,856	64,991
Marin	45,777	17,038	62,815	34,077	96,892	5,112	91,781	8,519	88,373
Mariposa	34,847	1,225	36,072	2,450	38,522	368	38,155	613	37,910
Mendocino	38,204	6,083	44,287	12,166	56,453	1,825	54,628	3,041	53,412
Merced	45,471	16,595	62,066	33,190	95,256	4,979	90,278	8,298	86,959
Modoc	34,457	662	35,119	1,323	36,442	198	36,243	331	36,111
Mono	34,632	914	35,547	1,829	37,375	274	37,101	457	36,918
Monterey	53,749	28,573	82,322	57,145	139,468	8,572	130,896	14,286	125,181
Napa	40,250	9,042	49,292	18,084	67,376	2,713	64,663	4,521	62,855
Nevada	38,652	6,730	45,382	13,460	58,842	2,019	56,823	3,365	55,477
Orange	176,822	206,630	383,452	413,259	796,711	61,989	734,722	103,315	693,397
Placer	48,713	21,287	70,000	42,573	112,574	6,386	106,187	10,643	101,930
Plumas	34,997	1,442	36,439	2,884	39,324	433	38,891	721	38,602
Riverside	124,804	131,371	256,175	262,742	518,917	39,411	479,505	65,686	453,231
Sacramento	98,412	93,189	191,601	186,378	377,979	27,957	350,022	46,594	331,384
San Benito	36,679	3,876	40,555	7,751	48,306	1,163	47,143	1,938	46,368
San Bernardino	126,593	133,960	260,554	267,921	528,474	40,188	488,286	66,980	461,494
San Diego	176,566	206,259	382,825	412,517	795,342	61,878	733,464	103,129	692,213
San Francisco	71,128	53,715	124,843	107,430	232,273	16,115	216,159	26,858	205,416
San Joaquin	65,065	44,944	110,009	89,888	199,898	13,483	186,414	22,472	177,426
San Luis Obispo	46,237	17,704	63,942	35,409	99,350	5,311	94,039	8,852	90,498
San Mateo	67,661	48,700	116,361	97,399	213,760	14,610	199,150	24,350	189,410
Santa Barbara	53,600	28,356	81,956	56,713	138,669	8,507	130,162	14,178	124,491
Santa Clara	116,433	119,260	235,693	238,521	474,214	35,778	438,435	59,630	414,583
Santa Cruz	46,196	17,644	63,840	35,289	99,129	5,293	93,836	8,822	90,307
Shasta	42,437	12,206	54,642	24,411	79,053	3,662	75,392	6,103	72,951
Sierra	34,163	235	34,398	471	34,869	71	34,798	118	34,751
Siskiyou	36,145	3,104	39,249	6,207	45,456	931	44,525	1,552	43,904
Solano	53,657	28,439	82,095	56,877	138,973	8,532	130,441	14,219	124,753
Sonoma	56,310	32,278	88,588	64,555	153,143	9,683	143,460	16,139	137,004
Stanislaus	57,911	34,594	92,505	69,188	161,693	10,378	151,315	17,297	144,396
Sutter	38,251	6,150	44,402	12,301	56,703	1,845	54,857	3,075	53,627
Tehama	36,860	4,138	40,999	8,277	49,276	1,242	48,034	2,069	47,206
Trinity	34,652	943	35,595	1,886	37,481	283	37,199	472	37,010
Tulare	53,553	28,289	81,842	56,577	138,419	8,487	129,933	14,144	124,275
Tuolumne	36,707	3,916	40,623	7,833	48,456	1,175	47,281	1,958	46,498
Ventura	71,996	54,971	126,966	109,941	236,907	16,491	220,416	27,485	209,422
Yolo	42,848	12,802	55,650	25,603	81,253	3,840	77,413	6,401	74,852
Yuba	37,246	4,696	41,942	9,392	51,335	1,409	49,926	2,348	48,987
Total	\$ 3,700,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 6,200,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 11,200,000	750,000	10,450,000	1,250,000	9,950,000

6. Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support

With a 15% cut, there would be a reduction of \$15,000 for translations of forms and instructions for self-represented litigants. Each form costs approximately \$500 for translation and formatting per language depending on the length of the form and the amount of change. So, on average, 30 translations would not be completed with this proposed cut. These forms have included fee waivers, family law, civil harassment and other areas where courts have requested that forms be translated to minimize the cost of sight interpretation and to provide increased efficiencies in the courts. Most forms are only translated into Spanish due to the cost of translation. As forms are modified, they would not be retranslated. Alternatively, the efforts to provide more videos and audio-video content to assist courts in educating self-represented litigants in a more cost-effective manner could be terminated. A number of courts have made requests for these resources since they do not have the resources to produce them locally. They have indicated that having this information available saves them significant time.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)

2A.

1. CFCC Educational Programs (Table 1, row 1)

a. Program/Project Description

The FY 2015–2016 allocation will be used to assist judicial officers and court employees to attend the 2015 Beyond the Bench conference and the Youth Court Summit. Programming is coordinated with CJER and open to all courts.

CFCC Educational Programs provide multidisciplinary and mandatory education for court professionals. These are the only multidisciplinary programs for judicial officers, court professionals, and their partners in child welfare, probation, and family law that also meet mandatory educational requirements.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

A \$22,500 or 25 percent reduction would cut funding for the travel of approximately 54 judicial officers or court staff to Beyond the Bench in 2015 (approximately 25 percent of all judicial officers and court staff who receive travel support). Given that CFCC and CJER now alternate the major juvenile law educational events annually; this means that a significant proportion of judicial officers will not have an opportunity for comprehensive training for nearly two years.

This option would also require the Youth Summit to reduce total event size by 30 attendees or approximately two court teams consisting of judge, court staff and youth representatives.

2. Interactive Software – Self-Rep Electronic Forms (Table 1, row 2)

a. Program/Project Description

Funding supports the license to allow all courts to use Law Help Interactive Server and middleware to allow courts to use Hotdocs document assembly programs in self-help centers, family court services offices and through their court website or linked to the California Courts self-help center.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

The Judicial Council has a license which is available for use by all the courts. The cost is projected to be \$40,000 in FY 15-16 for the same level of usage. The remaining \$20,000 has been used to fund consultants to develop and update the Hotdocs programs used by the courts. Similar to “Turbotax,” these programs ask questions which litigants can answer which then populate Judicial Council and other necessary forms. The program uses logic which either eliminates or asks additional questions based on previous answers. Typed, legible and complete pleadings are produced along with instructions for service and filing.

Currently, more than 70,000 people use these programs each year in California self-help centers. This translates into less than \$1 for every person served. There are only three court licenses available nationally at the deeply discounted rate that has been provided to the Judicial Council. If the license was not negotiated on a statewide basis, courts would have to develop their own server and middle-ware capacity in order to maintain the programs currently in use. It does not seem wise to cut that capacity.

Two alternative options are proposed for achieving a 25% reduction:

Option A. Continue to pay \$40,000 for license for the server and would reduce available funds to \$5,000 per year for consultants who prepare modifications and enhancements as requested by the courts. At current rate of development, that would address approximately one court request per year. Remaining courts would need to contract directly for updates and enhancements.

Option B. Courts could contribute a prorata share of the cost of the license and development could continue at the current level.

3. CFCC Publications (Table 1, row 3)

a. Program/Project Description

In FY 2015-2016, the allocation will be used to fund the license to use a proprietary web-based knowledge management tool that was developed specifically for juvenile dependency judges, court staff and dependency stakeholders the *California Dependency Online Guide* (“*CalDOG*”). The system is used by over 90 percent of judicial officers with dependency court assignments.

The *California Dependency Online Guide* (“CalDOG”) is available at no cost to all courts statewide. *The California Dependency Online Guide* is a training and information resource used by nearly all of the judicial officers, court staff, and court-appointed attorneys in dependency proceedings across the state and a source of relevant, up-to-date and no-cost information for judicial officers, attorneys, and all professionals working in California’s child welfare system. CalDOG provides quality summaries and links to opinions of the most recent state and federal dependency cases, new child welfare and probation regulation and policy guidelines interpreted for the courts, an up-to-date calendar of educational opportunities around the state and new publications and web resources. All material is categorized and searchable by major topics in dependency law. CalDOG’s 4,150 subscribers include 270 judges and other judicial officers, 2,330 attorneys, 700 county child welfare workers, and 850 other child welfare professionals including educators, probation officers, tribal representatives, psychologists and others.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

A reduction of \$5,000 or 25% would require CFCC to renegotiate license terms with the vendor. CFCC would suggest that the site be limited to the functionality most used by subscribers: the case law section. Courts would no longer have access to new publications, federal and state guidance, and other documents on the web site. It is also likely that the vendor will not agree to reducing the license cost by this amount, which will necessitate taking down the site and attempting to find other solutions to providing the service. Judicial officers, particularly those from small courts, have communicated to CalDOG staff that because of CalDOG they have been able to reduce the cost of their legal subscriptions and books. Eliminating CalDOG or major functionality would require judicial officers to find other ways of accessing publications.

4. Domestic Violence Interpreters Program (Table 1, row 4)

a. Program/Project Description

Since interpretation costs have shifted to project 45-45, these funds are solely used for translation of forms and instructional material related to domestic violence. California Code of Civil Procedure section 185(b) requires the Judicial Council to make available to all courts, translations of domestic violence protective order forms in languages other than English, as the Judicial Council deems appropriate. Since 2000, the Judicial Council has translated those forms into Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese and Korean, based on data regarding requested language interpreters and language needs studies. Since they are statewide forms, it is more cost-efficient to translate once for statewide use rather than have courts go through the expense of translating locally. The area of domestic violence is one where there are regular statutory changes requiring changes to Judicial Council forms and funds are fully used every year for these translations.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

A 25% cut would leave \$15,000 for these translations. It costs approximately \$500 per language per translated form for translation and formatting depending on the length of the form and how significant the change is.

Two alternative options are proposed for achieving a 15% reduction:

Option A: The Judicial Council could translate the forms into fewer languages.

Option B: The Judicial Council could determine not to translate all forms and instructional material. That would potentially pose difficulties for the court by having fewer language resources as the translated forms save time from interpreters and self-help staff having to sight-translate the forms.

5. Self-Help Centers (Table 1, row 5)

a. Program/Project Description

These funds go directly to trial courts to provide self-help assistance. Over 95% of the funds are used for staffing of the centers. These funds enable self-help centers to serve more than 450,000 persons per year by helping litigants to complete legal forms, explaining the court process and legal issues, and providing referrals for additional assistance.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

With a 25% cut of \$1,250,000, 50,236 fewer people will be served by self-help centers. It is likely that some courts will have to cut back on staff hours or lay staff off if these funds are reduced. These cuts will have a significant impact on court clerks and other court staff as well as judicial officers. One evaluation found that self-help center workshops save \$1.00 for every \$.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$.36 to \$.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to help them finish their divorce cases, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$.45 spent. In the evaluation of one program that had to cut self-help services, the number of guardianship continuances went from 7 per year to 402 per year. Clerks reported that they had to spend 45 minutes at the counter with guardianship litigants and that the time was often not productive since they needed more help with their paperwork.

Two alternative options are proposed for achieving a 15% reduction:

Option A: Pro rata reduction between the courts based on the current formula which relies on the population in each county. This has the benefit of allowing trial courts an early notification of budget cuts that they would need to address.

Option B: The Judicial Council could develop a new formula for distribution of these funds rather than have them based on population in the county. This would allow for a

more nuanced approach, but would take more time to develop and might appear less equitable than pro rata reduction.

6. Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support (Table 1, row 6)

a. Program/Project Description

Funds support the California Courts On-Line Self Help Center which is used by over 5 million people per year including updates based on changes in the law and maintaining the Spanish mirror site, for training for court self-help staff and for translations of forms and instructional materials commonly used by self-represented litigants.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Given the large number of Californians who use the self-help website and rely on it for assistance, it is critical that the site be legally correct and up-to-date. Provision of one statewide self-help website allows the courts to link to those materials rather than developing their own. Training for self-help staff has been dramatically restricted and is now primarily on-line and by co-sponsoring with other organizations. Many courts have asked for additional audio and video resources to be developed for the websites and for use in their self-help centers and courtrooms. These materials can be developed in collaboration with local courts, but require professional services for editing and captioning.

Since unrepresented persons pose special challenges when they do not speak English, this fund has been used to translate Judicial Council forms that are primarily used by self-represented litigants. These include family law forms, fee waivers, small claims and civil harassment. That would potentially pose difficulties for the court by having fewer language resources as the translated forms save time from interpreters and self-help staff having to sight-translate the forms. It costs approximately \$500 per language for translating and formatting a form depending on the length of the form and how significant the change is. Since these are statewide forms, it is more cost-efficient to translate once for statewide use rather than have courts go through the expense of translating locally.

A cut of 25% would be \$25,000. Two alternative options for absorbing that cut would be:

Option A - Eliminate translation of all forms and instructional handouts.

Option B - Eliminate development of audio-visual materials requested by courts for the self-help website and local courts self-help centers as well as approximately 15 forms.

Comparison of the 25% Reduction Options

1. CFCC Programs

Pro rata reduction is considered the only remaining option, since cuts in program cycles and scope have been made in response to prior budget reductions. Statewide programs such as Beyond the Bench and Family Law Education Programs are now offered every other fiscal year rather than annually.

2. Interactive Software – Self-Rep Electronic Forms

This project pays for \$40,000 in a license for all California courts and \$20,000 for consultants to update and adapt the software programs. A 25% cut could come from a \$15,000 cut to the consultants, which would increase the backlog of requests from courts for development of programs. Local courts could potentially contract to purchase this expertise themselves. Since there are only 3 court licenses available nationwide at this reduced cost, it does not seem feasible for local courts to purchase this license on their own, but they could potentially transfer funds to the Judicial Council for a pro rata share of the license. This seems as if would be costly to administer and difficult for courts that are struggling for resources.

3. CFCC Publications

Because all of the allocation is used to support one license, there is no other reduction option but to reduce the funds available for that license.

4. Domestic Violence Interpreters Program

A 25% cut would leave \$15,000 for translations. Each form costs approximately \$500 for translation and formatting per language depending on the length of the form and the amount of change. So, on average, 10 translations would not be completed with this proposed cut. The area of domestic violence is one where there are regular statutory changes requiring changes to Judicial Council forms so these funds have been fully utilized in past years. One option is to translate into fewer languages. As forms are modified, a language might be dropped depending on the costs of translations. This would affect litigants who only spoke the language that was lost. Alternatively, the Judicial Council could determine not to translate all forms and instructional material, and could determine that some materials did not need to be translated. This might be more of a concern in some years than others.

5. Self-Help Centers

A pro rata reduction between the courts based on the current formula which relies on the population in each county. This has the benefit of allowing trial courts an early notification of budget cuts that they would need to address. The Judicial Council could develop a new formula for distribution of these funds rather than have them based on population in the county. This would allow for a more nuanced approach, but would take more time to develop and might appear less equitable than pro rata reduction. Table 4 above shows the level of funding per court under the 15% and 25% reduction scenarios.

6. Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support

With a 25% cut, there would be a reduction of \$25,000 for translations of forms and instructions for self-represented litigants. Each form costs approximately \$500 for translation and formatting per language depending on the length of the form and the amount of change. These forms have included fee waivers, family law, civil harassment and other areas where courts have requested that forms be translated to minimize the cost of sight interpretation and to provide increased efficiencies in the courts. Most forms are only translated into Spanish due to the cost of translation. As forms are modified, they would not be retranslated. Generally, less than \$20,000 has been spent on these translations, so a cut of 25% would also require that the development of audio-video content would also have to be ended. A number of courts have made requests for these resources since they do not have the resources to produce them locally. They have indicated that having this information available saves them significant time.

CJER (Center for Judiciary Education and Research)

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) has requested that CJER provide options for 15% and 25% reductions to its Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) allocation. The IMF funds the majority of all direct costs associated with education and training for the trial courts, including food and lodging for participants, all costs for faculty, materials, and costs to support distance education. CJER's IMF allocation is divided into five line items, as shown below. Line item #4, *Faculty and Curriculum Development*, is interdependent with the other line items because it funds the costs for faculty who develop and teach the courses funded by line items 1, 2, 3 and 5. The five line items and their FY2014-15 allocations are:

1. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers	\$ 841,000
2. Essential and Other Education for CEOs, Managers, and Supervisors	\$ 46,000
3. Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel	\$ 92,000
4. Faculty and Curriculum Development	\$ 288,000
5. Distance Education	\$ 147,000
Total	\$1,414,000

As with past budget reduction drills, a subcommittee of the CJER Governing Committee worked closely with CJER's Management to review programs currently planned for the second year of the Governing Committee's approved 2014-16 Education Plan and provide direction on what should be reduced, if required. The subcommittee was composed of Justice Ronald Robie (Chair), Judge Ted Weathers and Mr. Michael Roddy. The Governing Committee had intended to seek additional funding this year to increase education for experienced judges. Cuts to CJER's funding over the past several years have disproportionately impacted programming for experienced judges in California.

As a result of the subcommittee's work, four options are provided below for the 15% and 25% reduction scenarios. In each case, Option 1A and Option 2A is a straight percentage cut to each line item. Option 1B and Option 2B is an itemized list of potential reductions to the plan (and their estimated costs) that would result in the event of a full 15% or 25% reduction to the aggregate total of CJER's allocation. The five line items change from year to year, based on the specific programs and products planned for delivery under the approved education plan for that fiscal year. The list of potential reductions is in priority order based on the priorities of the CJER Governing Committee. The CJER Governing Committee recommends Option 1B and 2B, and requests that if reductions must be made, that they be made to the aggregate total of its allocation rather than to the five line items.

Options 1B and 2B are preferred to Options 1A and 2A because they would enable the CJER Governing Committee to exercise its assigned advisory committee role, which is the effective assessment and prioritization of overall education needs. And they would enable CJER to be more efficient in its overall allocation and use of the remaining funding. The items are listed in priority order, with item 1 being the highest recommendation for reduction if necessary.

CJER Chart 1: TCBAC March 2015			
Priority Order	Item to Reduce from 2014-16 Education Plan (Year 2)	Total Reduction Value	Notes
1	<i>Primary Assignment Orientations: reduce attendance at PAOs for next fiscal year.</i>	\$44,000	0
2	<i>Criminal Law Institute: eliminate program for next fiscal year.</i>	\$48,500	
3	<i>PJ/CEO Court Management Institute: Limit attendance for next fiscal year.</i>	\$7,500	
4	<i>Core 40 and 24 Courses: Require courts to pay participant lodging costs</i>	\$21,000	
5	<i>Core Leadership Courses: Require courts to pay participant lodging costs.</i>	\$9,000	
6	<i>New Judge Orientation Program: Reduce number of programs for next fiscal year.</i>	\$52,000	
7	<i>Civil & Criminal Evidence : Eliminate one of two courses for next fiscal year.</i>	\$12,000	
8	<i>Probate & Mental Health Experienced Course: eliminate course for next fiscal year.</i>	\$13,000	
9	<i>ICM Programs: Reduce the number of courses offered for next fiscal year.</i>	\$5,000	
	Sub Total 15%	\$212,000	0
10	<i>Primary Assignment Orientations: Reduce attendance by Experienced Judges new to an assignment for next fiscal year.</i>	\$39,000	
11	<i>Primary Assignment Orientations: Eliminate one each of Felony Sentencing Part 1 and Part 2, Homicide Trials, and Death Penalty Trials Courses for next fiscal year.</i>	\$36,000	
12	<i>Complex Civil Litigation Workshop: Eliminate program for next fiscal year.</i>	\$3,000	
13	<i>Trail Court Judicial Attorneys Institute: Eliminate Program for next fiscal year</i>	\$63,000	
	25% Total	\$353,000	0

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A. Pro-Rata Reduction Across All Programs

1. All Programs

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option is not recommended because it would leave some of the line items overfunded and some underfunded to be able to implement the planned education programs for next year. It would force inefficient reductions in areas identified as of higher priority while retaining funding in areas identified as of lower priority. It would also have a disproportionate impact on the Faculty and Curriculum Development line item that funds the costs for faculty who develop and teach the courses funded by line items 1, 2, 3 and 5. It would significantly impact the Court Personnel line item which is planned for an increase next year balanced by an offsetting reduction in another line item (because some institutes are funded from different line items and are offered on a biannual basis. This is why the court personnel line item request in option 1B shows a requested increase). In short, the funding in each line item required to implement the biennial education plan changes from year to year. This means that making pro rata reductions to the line items based on last year's line item amounts would not reflect the needs already planned for the coming year (the second year of the current biannual plan). Finally, this approach would also be the least effective at enabling the Governing Committee to exercise its assigned advisory committee role, which is the effective assessment and prioritization of overall education needs for all judicial branch learners.

1B. 15% Reduction to CJER's Aggregate Total IMF Allocation (Reduction Target \$212,000).

1. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *Primary Assignment Orientations* (Table 1, row 11)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Reduce by \$44,000. Reduce attendance at Criminal, Family, Juvenile Dependency, Juvenile Delinquency, Probate, Civil Basic, Civil Limited Jurisdiction and Traffic Primary Assignment Orientation (PAO) courses by 20%. This would reduce total attendance by approximately 50 judges. The Primary Assignment Orientation courses (PAOs) provide new judges and SJOs with an intense immersion in their new primary assignment (civil, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, traffic, probate) with a heavy emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the assignment, detailed procedures and protocols, as well as classroom exercises designed to test their skills in the assignment. Although this would not impact new judges and subordinate judicial officers (SJOs), it would impact experienced judges who wish to attend to obtain continuing education and experienced

judges returning to the assignment. Fewer judges would be able to attend. It should be noted that the category of “experienced” judges can include judges who have been on the bench for only a short time so long as they have sat in an assignment. Consequently, many experienced judges register for the PAO courses because of the very practical and useful education provided for them in their assignment. And Presiding Judges frequently contact CJER to request that their judges be admitted even after the classes are already full because of the effectiveness of these courses for their judges.

2. **Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *Criminal Law Institute*** (Table 1, row 11) and **Faculty and Curriculum Development: *Criminal Law Institute*** (Table 1, row 10)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Reduce by \$44,000 and \$4,500. Eliminate the Criminal Law Institute planned for the next fiscal year. The impact would primarily be on experienced judges in criminal assignments, reducing education in the area of criminal law. This institute is currently offered every other year and because of previous reductions to statewide institutes, the remaining institutes are considered valuable opportunities for experienced judges to learn from and interact with their peers. The specialized institutes are keyed for those audiences. All of these two day programs typically offer between 12 and 20 courses covering topics of current interest, legal updates, and so forth. Participants frequently comment that the learning environment is greatly enhanced by meeting statewide with their colleagues, because it provides an opportunity to learn about different strategies for dealing with the many challenges faced by judges in the same assignment or by the specific audiences attending the institute.

3. **Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *PJ/CEO Court Management Program*** (Table 1, row 11)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Reduce by \$7,500. Reduce attendance at the PJ/CEO Court Management Program by limiting attendance to only CEOs, Presiding Judges and Assistant Presiding Judges This would impact the larger leadership teams that attend the program from some courts. Larger courts, in particular, have larger leadership teams. The PJ/CEO Court Management Program brings together the top leadership in the trial courts for a multi-day education event which focuses on the challenges of managing trial courts (especially in the current environment) as well as focusing on the rewards of creating and building an effective partnership between the Presiding Judge and Court Executive Officer. This is an

especially critical opportunity for new Presiding Judges to begin building a partnership with their CEOs.

4. **Essential and Other Education for CEOs, Managers, and Supervisors: *Core 40 courses, Core 40 Part 2 course, and Core 24 courses*** (Table 1, row 8)
 - a. Program/Project Description
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce by \$21,000. Eliminate Paid Lodging for Manager/Supervisor Programs, including two (2) Core 40 courses, one (1) Core 40 Part 2 course, and two (2) Core 24 courses. Courts would have to fund lodging for participants or ask their managers to fund their own lodging, creating a larger impact on those courts which have made significant reductions to their operating budgets.
 - i. Core 40 (5-day course) This is the fundamental supervisory training program for court staff brand new to supervision, and would impact the courts because many experienced court leaders are retiring. Classes are always full; there is high interest in this course.
 - ii. Core 40, Part 2 (3-day course) This new course is intended for experienced trial court supervisors (many of whom stay in this position for many years) where there are no comparable education opportunities.
 - iii. Core 24 (3-day course) The three-day CORE 24 program is designed for experienced managers and takes them through more advanced topics and areas, including topics such as leadership skills, fiscal/budget management and planning, presentation skills, business reengineering, communication, technology, and conflict management. This course is also intended to begin preparing /developing experienced managers for the next phase of their careers in the courts.

5. **Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel: *CORE leadership and Training Skills Courses*** (Table 1, row 9)
 - a. Program/Project Description
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce by \$9,000. Eliminate Paid Lodging for two (2) CORE leadership and Training Skills Courses for Court Personnel (3-day course). Courts would have to fund lodging for participants or ask their staff to fund their own lodging, creating a larger impact on those courts which have made significant reductions to their operating budgets. The Core Leadership and Training Skills Course, also offered regionally and locally, is designed for lead/senior clerks and assistant supervisors. Among other things, this two-day course teaches participants behaviors that contribute to effective leadership, discusses challenges to leading friends and former peers and identifies strategies to meet those challenges, and

identifies approaches to building successful and effective work relationships at all levels of the organization.

6. **Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *New Judge Orientation*** (Table 1, row 11) and **Faculty and Curriculum Development: *New Judge Orientation*** (Table 1, row 10)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Reduce by \$36,000 and \$16,000. Reduce the number of budgeted New Judge Orientation Programs to seven (7) instead of (10). If a large number of new judges were appointed or elected, the budgeted NJO programs would be insufficient to meet the demand and new judges would have to wait longer to attend the program or the class sizes would need to be expanded beyond faculty recommendations. The week-long New Judge Orientation Program is designed to assist new judges and subordinate judicial officers in making the transition from attorney advocates to judicial officers and includes the subject areas of judicial ethics, fairness, and trial management. Program participants focus on ethics, including demeanor, fairness, and courtroom control in this highly interactive program. The number of programs required depends on the number of judicial appointments in a given year. In the past several years, no more than seven (7) programs have been required.

7. **Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *Civil & Criminal Evidence Three-Day Course*** (Table 1, row 11) and **Faculty and Curriculum Development: *Civil & Criminal Evidence Three-Day Course*** (Table 1, row 10)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Reduce by \$9,000 and \$3,000. Eliminate one (1) of the two planned Civil & Criminal Evidence Three-Day Courses. Experienced judges seeking continuing judicial education about evidentiary issues would be impacted. This is a continuing judicial education course designed for judges experienced in Civil and Criminal assignments. It has been very popular among the judiciary and was recently redesigned with an additional day of instruction as a result of feedback from participants.

8. **Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *Probate and Mental Health Experienced Assignment Course*** (Table 1, row 11) and **Faculty and Curriculum Development: *Probate and Mental Health Experienced Assignment Course*** (Table 1, row 10)

a. Program/Project Description

- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce by \$10,500 and \$2,500. Eliminate the Probate and Mental Health Experienced Assignment Course. The impact of eliminating this course would be reduced education in probate and mental health for experienced trial court judges. This new course was recently added to the current Education Plan by the CJER Governing Committee in response to a recommendation from its Probate Curriculum Committee because unlike the other major assignment areas there is virtually no other live education beyond the introductory PAO and the biennial Institute,. This course is not a PAO (is not required by rule of court) and is primarily designed for judges experienced in a Probate and Mental Health assignment.

9. **Essential and Other Education for CEOs, Managers, and Supervisors: *ICM programs*** (Table 1, row 8) and **Faculty and Curriculum Development: *ICM programs*** (Table 1, row 10)

- a. Program/Project Description
- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce by \$2,000 and \$3,000. Eliminate three ICM programs per year. Reduce the number of courses from twelve (12) to ten (10). These reductions would mean that it would take longer for court managers to become certified. Also, the process of developing future faculty would be significantly elongated, making faculty recruitment and course delivery increasingly difficult in future and reducing the availability of future courses. The remaining ICM Courses would still be offered. The Institute for Court Management (ICM) courses comprises a series which lead to certification by the National Center for State Courts. The courses serve a dual purpose: (a) to provide relevant education courses for court leaders based on the core competencies identified by the National Association for Court Managers, and (b) to provide this education locally at a significantly reduced cost to courts and participants as compared to the national programs. The series of twelve (12) courses are the primary education offered by CJER which addresses essential functions of court managers.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)

2A. Pro-Rata Reduction Across All Programs

1. All Programs

- a. Program/Project Description
- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option is not recommended because it would leave some of the line items overfunded and some underfunded to be able to implement the planned education programs for next year. It would force inefficient reductions in areas identified as of higher priority while retaining funding in areas identified as of lower priority. It would also have a disproportionate impact on the Faculty and Curriculum Development line item that funds the costs for faculty who develop and teach the courses funded by line items 1, 2, 3 and 5. It would significantly impact the Court Personnel line item which is planned for an increase next year balanced by an offsetting reduction in another line item (because some institutes are funded from different line items and are offered on a biannual basis). In short, the funding in each line item required to implement the biennial education plan changes from year to year. This means that making pro rata reductions to the line items based on last year's line item amounts would not reflect the needs already planned for the coming year (the second year of the current biannual plan). Finally, this approach would also be the least effective at enabling the Governing Committee to exercise its assigned advisory committee role, which is the effective assessment and prioritization of overall education needs for all judicial branch learners.

2B. 25% Reduction to CJER's Aggregate Total IMF Allocation (Reduction Amount \$353,000)

1. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *Primary Assignment Orientations* (Table 1, row 11)

- a. Program/Project Description
- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce the 15% option under 1B by an additional \$39,000. Further reduce attendance at Primary Assignment Orientation courses by limiting the number of judges who are completely new to the assignment in addition to all other experienced judges. The most significant impact would be that experienced judges seeking education about a brand new assignment that they have never been in before may not be able to attend Primary Assignment Courses (PAOs). Many experienced judges register for the PAO courses because of the very practical and useful education provided to them in an area that they are not familiar with. The PAO courses designed for new judges are also available to experienced judges who are moving into a new assignment for the very first time in their career, but those judges are not required to attend the courses provided by CJER.

2. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *Primary Assignment Orientations* (Table 1, row 11) and ***Faculty and Curriculum Development: Primary Assignment Orientations*** (Table 1, row 10)

- a. Program/Project Description

- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce the 15% option under 1B by an additional \$30,000 and \$6,000. Eliminate one iteration (or, one-half) of the Primary Assignment Orientation (PAO) courses for Criminal Law Judges changing assignment, including the Felony Sentencing Part 1, Felony Sentencing Part 2, Homicide Trials and Death Penalty Trials Courses. This would most greatly impact experienced judges returning to the assignment and judges seeking continuing education. There would still be one course available for judges new to the assignment.
 - i. Felony Sentencing Part 1 -- This course provides a comprehensive overview of felony sentencing from basic concepts through second strike sentencing and realignment.
 - ii. Felony Sentencing Part 2 -- This course focuses on discrete sentencing topics and alternative sentencing schemes, including indeterminate terms, third strike sentencing computations, sex crime and one strike sentencing.
 - iii. Death Penalty Trials -- Per rule of court judges who are to hear capital cases are expected to complete this course. This rule of court came about in an attempt to reduce judicial error in these trials, which have a huge impact on the judicial branch and involved parties and justice system partners.
 - iv. Homicide Trials -- This course is intended for experienced criminal judges and explores the complexities and nuances of homicide trials.

3. Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers: *Complex Civil Litigation Workshop* (Table 1, row 11)

- a. Program/Project Description
- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
Reduce the 15% option under 1B by an additional \$3,000. Eliminate the Complex Civil Litigation Workshop. The impact would be on experienced judges in the pilot complex civil courts and a small number of additional experienced judges in a civil assignment. This is an annual continuing judicial education course designed for judges experienced in a complex civil litigation assignment. It also provides a valuable opportunity for peer education among experienced judges. There are few other opportunities for education in the area of complex civil law.

4. Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel: *Trial Judicial Attorneys Institute* (Table 1, row 9) and **Faculty and Curriculum Development: *Trial Judicial Attorneys Institute*** (Table 1, row 10)

- a. Program/Project Description
- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

Reduce the 15% option under 1B by an additional \$55,000 and \$8,000. Eliminate the Trial Judicial Attorneys Institute for next fiscal year. The trial judicial attorneys would be impacted because they do not receive any other specialized education developed by CJER for their work and other available legal education that meets their MCLE requirements is not as relevant to their judicial branch work. The 2 1/2 day Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute (TCJAI) is offered on a biannual basis. TCJAI is typically attended by research attorneys employed by the trial courts throughout the state and offers a wide variety of education in the major judicial assignments of criminal, family, dependency, delinquency and civil law.

Court Operations Services

Court Operations Services (COS) office recognizes the difficult situation the judicial branch faces this fiscal year with regards to the shortfall in IMF funds. As requested, COS has completed the task of identifying means to achieve an overall 15 & 25 % reduction. The four options are:

- 1A. A strategic office approach to meet the proposed 15% reduction
 - 21% reduction to *CIP Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education*
 - 0% reduction to the *JusticeCorps Program*
 - 15% reduction to *Trial Court Performance Measures*
 - 19% reduction of the *Trial Court Security Grants*

- 1B. A 15% reduction across each program

- 2A. A strategic office approach to the meet the proposed 25% reduction
 - 21% reduction to *CIP Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education*
 - 0% reduction to the *JusticeCorps Program*
 - 25% reduction *Trial Court Performance Measures*
 - 33% reduction of the *Trial Court Security Grants*

- 2B. A 25% reduction across each program

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A. A strategic office approach to meet the proposed 15% reduction

- 2. *CIP –Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education* {2014-2015 allocation, \$168,000}
(Table 1, row 14)
 - a. Program/Project Description

Since the start of the 2014-15 fiscal year, there have been two significant changes that impact the Court Interpreter Program: 1) The Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan*

for Language Access in the California Courts on January 22, 2015, outlining full language accessibility for limited English proficient (LEP) court users, and 2) Passage of a new law that affects the provision and use of court interpreters, which enables courts to provide interpreters to LEP parties without regard to income, and establishes priorities of case types. Together, these changes have substantially increased the need for language access services, which in turn increases the demand for more certified and registered interpreters.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 21% reduction, totaling \$28,000. This level of funding would be the same as fiscal year 2013-14 allocation of \$140,000. In order to accommodate this reduction, the program would limit costs associated with outreach, recruitment and training, which may mean suspension of certain outreach activities, resulting in a direct impact to the court's ability to provide qualified interpreters to meet the needs of LEP court users. The program will try to mitigate the impact to the courts through outreach measures that are less costly.

3. ***JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$347,600} (Table 1, row 15)

a. Program/Project Description

Each year, JusticeCorps members help self-represented litigants complete over 100,000 legal forms accurately and completely, contributing significantly to more efficient court operations. The JusticeCorps members provide services that would either have to be ended (to the detriment of the public) or otherwise fall to already strained self-help staff, freeing up staff to concentrate on more complex litigant issues and center-wide operations. Seven courts currently operate a JusticeCorps program: Santa Clara, San Francisco, San Mateo and Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego. All IMF funding goes directly to Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego as fiscal agents for the program to help them meet the required matching funds to draw down the AmeriCorps funding for the program.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects no reduction of IMF funds associated with the JusticeCorps program. All IMF funds allocated to the JusticeCorps program are distributed directly to the courts to meet their matching funds requirement.

The program cannot sustain any reduction to its allocation because it would directly affect the participating courts' ability to pay staff and continue program operations according to the program design approved by the statewide AmeriCorps funder, CaliforniaVolunteers. Because the IMF funds act as a match commitment we have made in our grant application, any reduction may jeopardize our AmeriCorps grant.

The superior courts of Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego counties receive the entirety of the program's yearly allocation, budgeting the majority to support court staff positions dedicated 100% to the JusticeCorps program. These staffing costs, and other operating costs supported by IMF funds, make up the required program match that each participating court and the Judicial Council commit to in order to receive the \$850,000 federal AmeriCorps grant. Additionally, several courts have expressed interest in participating in JusticeCorps – with that in mind, we plan to request a modest increase in funding this year to make it possible for more courts and self-represented litigants to benefit statewide.

4. ***Trial Court Performance Measures*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$13,000} (Table 1, row 16)

a. Program/Project Description

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) is charged with updating the workload models which serve as a critical component to the Workload-based Allocation Funding Model (WAFM). The funding is used to support in person meetings of WAAC. The committee is beginning the work leading up to the next workload study, and the complex nature of the group's work is such that having an appropriate number of in-person meetings allows the group to carry out its charge more effectively and in a less time consuming manner than could be accomplished solely with telephonic or video meetings.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 15% reduction, totaling \$1,950 for FY 2015-16, which would reduce travel cost reimbursement to the courts thus limiting their ability to fully participate in critical meetings. The office will try to identify other funding for 15-16 to support this need.

4. ***Trial Court Security Grants*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$1,200,000} (Table 1, row 17)

a. Program/Project Description

IMF funds are used for the purchase and maintenance of court video surveillance (cameras), access systems, duress alarm systems and other security enhancements, such as ballistic glass, critical fencing, and secured parking for bench officers.

The maintenance of security systems in capital projects, including large systems such as the San Bernardino courthouse, has been added as the warranties on these systems expire. An additional 9 courthouses will be opening within the next year, the systems for 8 of which will be out of warranty by the end of FY 2015-16, and will be added to the maintenance portfolio. Maintenance costs are expected to increase by approximately \$100,000 in the next year due to normal cost increases and the addition of the systems in these new facilities.

A BCP was submitted to request additional funds to address the maintenance and repair of security systems that are not currently being maintained or have no identified funding source for maintenance. If the BCP is not approved, the Trial Court Security Grant Program will be forced to absorb additional maintenance and system replacement costs.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 19% reduction of the funding for Trial Court Security Grants, totaling \$229,340. For fiscal year 2014-15, approximately 50 projects, including maintenance, will be funded. However funds for 19 needed projects were not available, and those were deferred to 2015-16. Annual maintenance costs for existing systems are expected to increase to approximately \$400,000 and the 19 projects deferred from the current year total approximately \$500,000, leaving no funds available to address urgent requests and projects that have not been identified. A cut of this magnitude will significantly impact the ability to respond to court requests and emergencies such as catastrophic system failure. There is no additional funding for this grant program; projects will need to be eliminated.

1B. A 15% reduction across each program

5. *CIP – Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education* {2014-2015 allocation, \$168,000} (Table 1, row 14)

a. Program/Project Description

Since the start of the 2014-15 fiscal year, there have been two significant changes that impact the Court Interpreter Program: 1) The Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* on January 22, 2015, outlining full language accessibility for limited English proficient (LEP) court users, and 2) Passage of a new law that affects the provision and use of court interpreters, which enables courts to provide interpreters to LEP parties without regard to income, and establishes priorities of case types. Together, these changes have substantially increased the need for language access services, which in turn increases the demand for more certified and registered interpreters.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 15% reduction of \$25,200.

This level of funding would be nearly the same as the fiscal year 2013-14 allocation of \$140,000. In order to accommodate this reduction, the program would limit costs associated with outreach, recruitment and training, which may mean suspension of certain outreach activities, resulting in a direct impact to the court's ability to provide

qualified interpreters to meet the needs of LEP court users. The program will try to mitigate the impact to the courts through outreach measures that are less costly.

6. *JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)* {2014-2015 allocation, \$347,600} (Table 1, row 15)

a. Program/Project Description

Each year, JusticeCorps members help self-represented litigants complete over 100,000 legal forms accurately and completely, contributing significantly to more efficient court operations. The JusticeCorps members provide services that would either have to be ended (to the detriment of the public) or otherwise fall to already strained self-help staff, freeing up staff to concentrate on more complex litigant issues and center-wide operations. Seven courts currently operate a JusticeCorps program: Santa Clara, San Francisco, San Mateo and Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego. All IMF funding goes directly to Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego as fiscal agents for the program to help them meet the required matching funds to draw down the AmeriCorps funding for the program.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 15% reduction of \$52,140, which would directly affect the participating courts' ability to pay staff and continue program operations according to the program design approved by the statewide AmeriCorps funder, CaliforniaVolunteers. Because the IMF funds act as a match commitment we have made in our grant application, any reduction may jeopardize our AmeriCorps grant.

The program cannot sustain any reduction to its allocation because it would directly affect the participating courts' ability to pay staff and continue program operations according to the program design approved by the statewide AmeriCorps funder, CaliforniaVolunteers. Because the IMF funds act as a match commitment we have made in our grant application, any reduction may jeopardize our AmeriCorps grant.

The superior courts of Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego counties receive the entirety of the program's yearly allocation, budgeting the majority to support court staff positions dedicated 100% to the JusticeCorps program. These staffing costs, and other operating costs supported by IMF funds, make up the required program match that each participating court and the Judicial Council commit to in order to receive the \$850,000 federal AmeriCorps grant. Additionally, several courts have expressed interest in participating in JusticeCorps – with that in mind, we plan to request a modest increase in funding this year to make it possible for more courts and self-represented litigants to benefit statewide.

3. ***Trial Court Performance Measures*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$13,000} (Table 1, row 16)

a. Program/Project Description

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) is charged with updating the workload models which serve as a critical component to the Workload-based Allocation Funding Model (WAFM). The funding is used to support in person meetings of WAAC. The committee is beginning the work leading up to the next workload study, and the complex nature of the group's work is such that having an appropriate number of in-person meetings allows the group to carry out its charge more effectively and in a less time consuming manner than could be accomplished solely with telephonic or video meetings.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 15 % reduction of \$1,950, which would reduce travel cost reimbursement to the courts thus limiting their ability to fully participate in critical meetings.

4. ***Trial Court Security Grants*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$1,200,000} (Table 1, row 17)

a. Program/Project Description

IMF funds are used for the purchase and maintenance of court video surveillance (cameras), access systems, duress alarm systems and other security enhancements, such as ballistic glass, critical fencing, and secured parking for bench officers.

The maintenance of security systems in capital projects, including large systems such as the San Bernardino courthouse, has been added as the warranties on these systems expire. An additional 9 courthouses will be opening within the next year, the systems for 8 of which will be out of warranty by the end of FY 2015-16, and will be added to the maintenance portfolio. Maintenance costs are expected to increase by approximately \$100,000 in the next year due to normal cost increases and the addition of the systems in these new facilities.

A BCP was submitted to request additional funds to address the maintenance and repair of security systems that are not currently being maintained or have no identified funding source for maintenance. If the BCP is not approved, the Trial Court Security Grant Program will be forced to absorb additional maintenance and system replacement costs.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

15% Reduction Scenario:

This option reflects a 15% reduction of \$180,000. For fiscal year 2014-15, approximately 50 projects, including maintenance, will be funded. However funds for 19 needed projects were not available, and those were deferred to 2015-16. Annual

maintenance costs for existing systems are expected to increase to approximately \$400,000 and the 19 projects deferred from the current year total approximately \$500,000, leaving no funds available to address urgent requests and projects that have not been identified. A cut of this magnitude will significantly impact the ability to respond to court requests and emergencies such as catastrophic system failure. There is no additional funding for this grant program; projects will need to be eliminated.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)

2A. A strategic office approach to the meet the proposed 25% reduction

1. ***CIP –Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$168,000} (Table 1, row 14)
 - a. Program/Project Description

Since the start of the 2014-15 fiscal year, there have been two significant changes that impact the Court Interpreter Program: 1) The Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* on January 22, 2015, outlining full language accessibility for limited English proficient (LEP) court users, and 2) Passage of a new law that affects the provision and use of court interpreters, which enables courts to provide interpreters to LEP parties without regard to income, and establishes priorities of case types. Together, these changes have substantially increased the need for language access services, which in turn increases the demand for more certified and registered interpreters.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 21% reduction, totaling \$28,000. This level of funding would be the same as fiscal year 2013-14 allocation of \$140,000. In order to accommodate this reduction, the program would limit costs associated with outreach, recruitment and training, which may mean suspension of certain outreach activities, resulting in a direct impact to the court’s ability to provide qualified interpreters to meet the needs of LEP court users The program will try to mitigate the impact to the courts through outreach measures that are less costly.
2. ***JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$347,600} (Table 1, row 15)
 - a. Program/Project Description

Each year, JusticeCorps members help self-represented litigants complete over 100,000 legal forms accurately and completely, contributing significantly to more efficient court operations. The JusticeCorps members provide services that would either have to be ended (to the detriment of the public) or otherwise fall to already strained self-help staff,

freeing up staff to concentrate on more complex litigant issues and center-wide operations. Seven courts currently operate a JusticeCorps program: Santa Clara, San Francisco, San Mateo and Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego. All IMF funding goes directly to Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego as fiscal agents for the program to help them meet the required matching funds to draw down the AmeriCorps funding for the program.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects no reduction of IMF funds associated with the JusticeCorps program. All IMF funds allocated to the JusticeCorps program are distributed directly to the courts to meet their matching funds requirement.

The program cannot sustain any reduction to its allocation because it would directly affect the participating courts' ability to pay staff and continue program operations according to the program design approved by the statewide AmeriCorps funder, CaliforniaVolunteers. Because the IMF funds act as a match commitment we have made in our grant application, any reduction may jeopardize our AmeriCorps grant.

The superior courts of Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego counties receive the entirety of the program's yearly allocation, budgeting the majority to support court staff positions dedicated 100% to the JusticeCorps program. These staffing costs, and other operating costs supported by IMF funds, make up the required program match that each participating court and the Judicial Council commit to in order to receive the \$850,000 federal AmeriCorps grant. Additionally, several courts have expressed interest in participating in JusticeCorps – with that in mind, we plan to request a modest increase in funding this year to make it possible for more courts and self-represented litigants to benefit statewide.

3. *Trial Court Performance Measures* {2014-2015 allocation, \$13,000} (Table 1, row 16)

a. Program/Project Description

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) is charged with updating the workload models which serve as a critical component to the Workload-based Allocation Funding Model (WAFM). The funding is used to support in person meetings of WAAC. The committee is beginning the work leading up to the next workload study, and the complex nature of the group's work is such that having an appropriate number of in-person meetings allows the group to carry out its charge more effectively and in a less time consuming manner than could be accomplished solely with telephonic or video meetings.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 25% reduction, totaling \$3,250, which would reduce travel cost reimbursement to the courts thus limiting their ability to fully participate in critical meetings. The office will try to identify other funding for 15-16 to support this need.

4. ***Trial Court Security Grants*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$1,200,000} (Table 1, row 17)

a. Program/Project Description

IMF funds are used for the purchase and maintenance of court video surveillance (cameras), access systems, duress alarm systems and other security enhancements, such as ballistic glass, critical fencing, and secured parking for bench officers.

The maintenance of security systems in capital projects, including large systems such as the San Bernardino courthouse, has been added as the warranties on these systems expire. An additional 9 courthouses will be opening within the next year, the systems for 8 of which will be out of warranty by the end of FY 2015-16, and will be added to the maintenance portfolio. Maintenance costs are expected to increase by approximately \$100,000 in the next year due to normal cost increases and the addition of the systems in these new facilities.

A BCP was submitted to request additional funds to address the maintenance and repair of security systems that are not currently being maintained or have no identified funding source for maintenance. If the BCP is not approved, the Trial Court Security Grant Program will be forced to absorb additional maintenance and system replacement costs.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 33% reduction, totaling \$400,900. For fiscal year 2014-15, approximately 50 projects, including maintenance, will be funded. However funds for 19 needed projects were not available, and those were deferred to 2015-16. Annual maintenance costs for existing systems are expected to increase to approximately \$400,000 and the 19 projects deferred from the current year total approximately \$500,000, leaving no funds available to address urgent requests and projects that have not been identified. A cut of this magnitude will significantly impact the ability to respond to court requests and emergencies such as catastrophic system failure. There is no additional funding for this grant program; projects will need to be eliminated.

2B. A 25% reduction across each program

1. ***CIP Court Interpreter Program Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education*** (Table 1, row 14)

a. Program/Project Description

Since the start of the 2014-15 fiscal year, there have been two significant changes that impact the Court Interpreter Program: 1) The Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* on January 22, 2015, outlining full language accessibility for limited English proficient (LEP) court users, and 2) Passage of a new law that affects the provision and use of court interpreters, which enables courts to provide interpreters to LEP parties without regard to income, and establishes priorities of case types. Together, these changes have substantially increased the need for language access services, which in turn increases the demand for more certified and registered interpreters.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 25% reduction of \$42,000

This level of funding would take the funding below the fiscal year 2013-14 allocation of \$140,000. In order to accommodate this reduction, the program would limit costs associated with outreach, recruitment and training, which may mean suspension of certain outreach activities, resulting in a direct impact to the court's ability to provide qualified interpreters to meet the needs of LEP court users. In light of the increased expectations on the program, with the scrutiny of the US Department of Justice and the adoption of the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts, a reduction of this magnitude would put the program at serious risk.

2. ***JusticeCorps (Court Access and Education)*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$347,600} (Table 1, row 15)

a. Program/Project Description

Each year, JusticeCorps members help self-represented litigants complete over 100,000 legal forms accurately and completely, contributing significantly to more efficient court operations. The JusticeCorps members provide services that would either have to be ended (to the detriment of the public) or otherwise fall to already strained self-help staff, freeing up staff to concentrate on more complex litigant issues and center-wide operations. Seven courts currently operate a JusticeCorps program: Santa Clara, San Francisco, San Mateo and Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego. All IMF funding goes directly to Los Angeles, Alameda and San Diego as fiscal agents for the program to help them meet the required matching funds to draw down the AmeriCorps funding for the program.

b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 25% reduction of \$86,900, which may result in the elimination of the program in one or more of the participating courts, which would directly affect the participating courts' ability to pay staff and continue program operations according to the program design approved by the statewide AmeriCorps funder, CaliforniaVolunteers. Because the IMF funds act as a match commitment we have made in our grant application, any reduction may jeopardize our AmeriCorps grant.

The program cannot sustain any reduction to its allocation because it would directly affect the participating courts' ability to pay staff and continue program operations according to the program design approved by the statewide AmeriCorps funder, CaliforniaVolunteers. Because the IMF funds act as a match commitment we have made in our grant application, any reduction may jeopardize our AmeriCorps grant.

The superior courts of Los Angeles, Alameda, and San Diego counties receive the entirety of the program's yearly allocation, budgeting the majority to support court staff positions dedicated 100% to the JusticeCorps program. These staffing costs, and other operating costs supported by IMF funds, make up the required program match that each participating court and the Judicial Council commit to in order to receive the \$850,000 federal AmeriCorps grant. Additionally, several courts have expressed interest in participating in JusticeCorps – with that in mind, we plan to request a modest increase in funding this year to make it possible for more courts and self-represented litigants to benefit statewide.

3. ***Trial Court Performance Measures*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$13,000} (Table 1, row 16)
 - a. Program/Project Description

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) is charged with updating the workload models which serve as a critical component to the Workload-based Allocation Funding Model (WAFM). The funding is used to support in person meetings of WAAC. The committee is beginning the work leading up to the next workload study, and the complex nature of the group's work is such that having an appropriate number of in-person meetings allows the group to carry out its charge more effectively and in a less time consuming manner than could be accomplished solely with telephonic or video meetings.
 - b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts

This option reflects a 25% reduction of \$3,250, which would eliminate travel cost reimbursement to the courts thus limiting their ability to fully participate in critical meetings.
4. ***Trial Court Security Grants*** {2014-2015 allocation, \$1,200,000} (Table 1, row 17)
 - a. Program/Project Description

IMF funds are used for the purchase and maintenance of court video surveillance (cameras), access systems, duress alarm systems and other security enhancements, such as ballistic glass, critical fencing, and secured parking for bench officers.

The maintenance of security systems in capital projects, including large systems such as the San Bernardino courthouse, has been added as the warranties on these systems expire.

An additional 9 courthouses will be opening within the next year, the systems for 8 of which will be out of warranty by the end of FY 2015-16, and will be added to the maintenance portfolio. Maintenance costs are expected to increase by approximately \$100,000 in the next year due to normal cost increases and the addition of the systems in these new facilities.

A BCP was submitted to request additional funds to address the maintenance and repair of security systems that are not currently being maintained or have no identified funding source for maintenance. If the BCP is not approved, the Trial Court Security Grant Program will be forced to absorb additional maintenance and system replacement costs.

- b. Description of the Reduction and, If Possible, Impact on the Trial Courts
This option reflects a 25% reduction of \$300,000, which would negatively impact the security of the courts. For fiscal year 2014-15, approximately 50 projects, including maintenance, will be funded. However funds for 19 needed projects were not available, and those were deferred to 2015-16. Annual maintenance costs for existing systems are expected to increase to approximately \$400,000 and the 19 projects deferred from the current year total approximately \$500,000, leaving no funds available to address urgent requests and projects that have not been identified. A cut of this magnitude will significantly impact the ability to respond to court requests and emergencies such as catastrophic system failure. There is no additional funding for this grant program; projects will need to be eliminated.

Leadership Services Division

Audit Services

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A.

1. **Audit Contract** (Table 1, row 25)

a. Program/Project Description

The \$150,000 allocated to the Audit Contract represents monies utilized to cover the possibility of contracting out to an audit firm/entity to cover either special projects that are requested by a superior court or approximately two regular court audits. The two audits that would allow Audit Services to reach its annual audit average of ten superior court audits that would meet the required six year cycle of the superior courts. Without the two audits from the contract, Audit Services is adjusting schedules and scopes to attempt to accomplish the six year cycle with current staffing levels.

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of the entire \$150,000. In order to accommodate annual budgetary reductions Audit Services has not used the \$150,000 for the last two fiscal years. This allows the Audit Services to retain the judicial council staff (4) that it has which is funded by the IMF.

2. 25% Reduction Option(s)

2A.

1. **Audit Contract** (Table 1, row 25)

a. Program/Project Description

Same as under Option 1A.

b. Description of the Reduction

Same as under Option 1A.

2. **Audit Services** (Table 1, row 26)

a. Program/Project Description

The \$150,000 allocated to the Audit Contract represents monies utilized to cover the possibility of contracting out to an audit entity to cover either special projects that are requested by a superior court or more importantly the approximately two regular court audits that would allow Audit Services to reach its annual audit average goal of ten superior court audits that allows for the six year cycle of the superior courts. Without the two audits from the contract, Audit Services is adjusting schedules and scopes to attempt to accomplish the six year cycle with current staffing levels.

b. Description of the Reduction

There are only really three budget lines that allow discretion (personnel services, travel, and training). A staff reduction of one staff person would allow the reduction target to be met and would minimally impact the other two minor categories. This staff reduction would affect the audit cycle explained above. The two minor categories are travel and training. Travel is required for the work to be accomplished and is constantly reviewed to minimize cost. Training is de minimus.

Legal Services

1. 15% Reduction Option(s)

1A.

1. **Complex Civil Litigation Program** (Table 1, row 41)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$1,123,455 (28%) from the Complex Civil Litigation Program. The Complex Civil Litigation Program in Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco and Santa Clara are currently funded through the program.

2. **Litigation Management Program** (Table 1, row 44)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$400,000 (8.9%), from \$4,500,000 to \$4,100,000. The total expenditure from this fund has historically been under \$4,000,000.

3. **Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program** (Table 1, row 47)

a. Program/Project Description: Since 2004, TCTAP funds have been used to assist the trial courts through the provision of outside counsel for (1) labor arbitration matters, complaints before the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB), and significant administrative matters, e.g., claims and hearings before the Employment Development Department and the Labor Commissioner; (2) major transactions involving information services and finance; (3) significant transactional matters; and (4) as necessary, tax, employee benefit-related, and other legal advice where LS does not have the needed expertise.

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$200,000 (44.3%), from \$451,000 to \$251,000.

Based upon prior expenditures of TCTAP funds for attorney fees in the various listed categories, a reduction of \$200,000 in the TCTAP allocation would result in the following reduction of services:

TCTAP would no longer fund outside counsel for arbitrations and administrative hearings except where Legal Services determines that the matter may have important statewide implications or precedential consequences;

TCTAP would continue to fund outside counsel for all PERB matters, which concern alleged violations of the Trial court employee Protection and Governance Act (Govt. Code, § 71600 et seq.) or the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act (Govt. Code, § 71800 et seq.) and therefore are likely to have statewide or precedential consequences;

TCTAP would continue to fund outside counsel for major transactions involving information services and finance, significant transactional matters, and, as necessary, legal advice on tax, employee benefits, and other matters where LS does not have the needed expertise.

Legal Services attorneys would continue to provide advice and legal services to the trial courts on labor arbitration and administrative matters; such legal services may include representation of the courts in arbitrations and administrative hearings, as appropriate and consistent with LS attorney workload and the discretion of LS.

1B.

1. **Complex Civil Litigation Program** (Table 1, row 41)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction

This option reduces the Complex Civil Litigation Program in the amount of \$1, 723,455.

2. **25% Reduction Option(s)**

2A.

1. **Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers** (Table 1, row 40)

a. Program/Project Description:

This program contracts for the development of materials to help support court-connected ADR programs across the state. The reduction would eliminate the program.

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$75,000, the entire allocation to this program.

2. **Complex Civil Litigation Program** (Table 1, row 41)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$2,180,324 (54%). The Program currently funds the program in 6 courts; Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco and Santa Clara.

3. **Litigation Management Program** (Table 1, row 44)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$200,000 (44.3%), from \$451,000 to \$251,000.. Same as 1A 2 above.

4. **Subscription Costs-Judicial Conduct Reporter** (Table 1, row 46)

a. Program/Project Description

Program provides for four quarterly issues of the Judicial Conduct Reporter. Each of the four editions is distributed to every judicial officer electronically through court administration.

b. Description of Reduction

Reduction of \$17,100, resulting in the elimination of the service.

5. **Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program** (Table 1, row 47)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$400,000 (8.4%), from \$4,000,000. Same as 1A 3 above.

2B.

1. **Complex Civil Litigation Program** (Table 1, row 41)

a. Program/Project Description

b. Description of the Reduction

Reduction of \$2,872,424 (71.7%). The Program currently funds the program in 6 courts; Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.

Information Regarding Phoenix Program, Regional Office Assistance Group, and IT Staff and Consultants

Phoenix Program

There are currently 10 courts on the Phoenix HR System. There are 10 FTEs in the Phoenix Human Resources Services unit. This unit is fully funded by the 10 courts utilizing the Phoenix HR/Payroll System via TCTF Reimbursements. The unit's budget is \$1,349,000. Any funds not expended during a fiscal year are returned to the Phoenix HR courts proportionately.

There are 90.88 FTE's in the Phoenix Program, 58.88 of which are funded by the IMF.

Phoenix Program Units with IMF Positions	Support Finance	Support HR	Support Both Finance & HR
Treasury Services	11.88		
Phoenix Purchasing Support	3		
General Ledger and Reports	10		
Accounts Payable	8		
Payroll Financial Services			10
Production Support	2	4	3
ITSO ERP Unit			7

Of the 58.88 FTE's, there are 20 staff that support both the Finance and HR components of the Phoenix Program. The time spent on either component fluctuates greatly as priorities change and a firm percentage cannot be assigned. Projects and workload for both components are primarily determined by court needs and events that include:

- Changes made to the Phoenix System based on court negotiations for third party benefit providers;
- Permissions for system access updated continually as court staff is hired, promoted, demoted, or separates;
- Trouble tickets generated by system users can originate from issues in either component;
- New legislation may affect system configuration in both areas;
- Development of new reports generated by the system for either component;
- Federal and state tax laws and changes in regulations;
- Direct support of day-to-day processing of financial and payroll activities despite the different payroll solutions used by the trial courts (e.g., Phoenix System, ADP, county, or private provider);
- Assistance with payroll analysis, banking, payment and tax services, liability account maintenance, and health benefit reconciliations;
- System upgrades and adjustments are continual, as with any software; and,
- Regular system maintenance is required and ongoing for both components.

Although no firm percentage can be assigned to staff supporting both the Finance and HR components of the Phoenix Program because of the unpredictability of area-specific workload, it can be noted that 18 percent of courts utilize the Phoenix HR/Payroll system. A total of 19 percent of court staff statewide utilizes the payroll system. All 58 courts utilize the financial component of the system and the day-to-day services provided by program staff.

Regional Office Assistance Group

EMPLOYEES	FUNCTIONS
Andrea McCann	Legal Opinions (Sacramento office): Provides oral and written legal advice to the trial courts on issues related to court administration, with specific expertise in the areas of criminal law, grand juries, election day issues for trial courts, and the collection of court ordered debt by trial courts.
Margaret Hastings	Transactions and Business Operations (Sacramento office): Legal counsel to the trial courts in all aspects of business transactions and procurements of goods and services, including settlement of non-litigated disputes and application of the Judicial Branch Contract Law, public record requests, and open meetings requirements
Steve Crooks	Labor and Employment (Sacramento office): Legal counsel to the trial courts in the areas of labor and employment law, with specific expertise in benefits and pension issues, administrative proceedings before the EEOC and DFEH, and judicial conflicts of interest and other issues arising under the Political Reform Act.
Dee Ann Gage	Administrative Support: Provides administrative support to attorneys in the Sacramento office. Additional responsibilities include formatting the judicial branch contracting manual, training support staff and the preparation of formal legal opinions.
Oliver Cheng	Transactions and Business Operations (Burbank office): Legal counsel to trial courts in all aspects of business transactions and procurements of goods and services, including settlement of non-litigated disputes and application of the Judicial Branch Contract Law, public record requests, and open meetings requirements
Patrick Sutton	Labor and Employment (Burbank office): Legal counsel to the trial courts in the areas of labor and employment law, with specific expertise in PERB matters.

John Snyder

Administrative Support: Provides administrative support to attorneys in the Burbank office. Additional responsibilities include the bi-annual processing of superior court local rules, maintaining the Legal Opinion Library on Serranus, and preliminary legal research for attorneys.

Information Technology Programs**Projected FY 2015-16 FTEs and Consultants for IMF Funded Programs**

	Program	FTE's	Consultants
1	Adobe LiveCycle	0 FTEs	0 consultants
2	CCPOR	2.0 FTEs: 1 senior business systems analyst, 1 senior application development analyst	1 consultant: 1 IT program manager
3	CCTC	11.0 FTEs: 1 senior manager; 2 supervising IS analysts, 4 senior business systems analysts, 1 staff analyst II, 1 administrative coordinator II, 2 senior technical analysts	6 consultants: 1 infrastructure architect, 2 technical analysts, 2 network engineers, 1 IT program manager
4	CLETS	1.0 FTE: 1 business systems analyst	.5 consultant: .5 technical analyst
5	DI	3.0 FTEs: 1 IS manager, 1 senior business systems analyst, 1 senior technical analyst	3.5 consultants: 1 IT project manager, 2 Sr. TIBCO Engineers, .5 Technical Analyst
6	EPP	0 FTEs	1 consultant: 1 enterprise architect
7	ETMS	0 FTEs	1 consultant: 1 technical analyst
8	ICMS	0 FTEs	3.5 consultants: 1 technical analyst, .6 IT project manager, 1 sr. business applications analyst, .9 service delivery manager
9	JPO&E	1.0 FTE: 1 IS manager	1 consultant: 1 senior business systems analyst
10	Jury	0 FTEs	0 consultants
11	Telecom	0 FTEs	3 consultants: 1 IT project manager, 2 network engineers
12	UCFS	2.0 FTEs: 1 senior business systems analyst, 1 senior application development analyst	0 consultants

	Program	FTE's	Consultants
13	CMS V2	0 FTEs	0 consultants
14	CMS V3	9.0 FTEs: 1 IS manager, 1 supervising IS analyst, 3 business systems analysts, 2 senior business application analysts, 1 business application analyst, 1 senior application development analyst	12 consultants: 2 application support analysts, 1 application tester, 1 application testing lead, 1 applications IT architect, 1 database administrator, 1 infrastructure/operations IT architect, 3 IT developers, 1 IT developer lead, 1 sr business applications analyst

Modernization Fund

CALIFORNIA CODES – GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTION 77213

- (a) There is in the State Treasury the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund.
- (b) Moneys deposited into this fund shall be administered by the Judicial Council, subject to appropriation by the Legislature. The Judicial Council may, with appropriate guidelines, delegate to the Administrative Office of the Courts the administration of the fund. Moneys in the fund may be expended to promote improved access, efficiency, and effectiveness in trial courts that have unified to the fullest extent permitted by law. Moneys in the fund may be expended to implement projects approved by the Judicial Council. Expenditures may be made to vendors or individual trial courts that have the responsibility to implement approved projects. Projects approved by the Judicial Council may include, but are not limited to, the following:
- (1) Support the payment for cost of judicial officers or court staff who participate in in-state education programs, or to support local trial court education programs.
 - (2) Improved technology including information systems programming or equipment upgrades that meet standards approved by the Judicial Council and that promote efficiency and access to justice, or other technology that promotes access, efficiency, or security.
 - (3) Retain experienced jurists by establishing incentives of enhanced judicial benefits and educational sabbaticals, not to exceed 120 days every five years, as provided for by rules of court adopted by the Judicial Council.
 - (4) Acquire improved legal research through the use of law clerks or technology.
- (c) Annually, the Judicial Council shall adopt criteria, timelines, and procedures for the allocation of funds to support activities for the benefit of qualified courts. The Judicial Council may allocate funding to pay program costs directly, contract with courts, and permanently reallocate funding to courts subject to the following limitations:
- (1) Not more than 20 percent of the fund may be permanently reallocated pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (b). The Judicial Council shall develop a plan which will permit the extension of the benefits to all judges of the state at such time when the trial courts of all counties have unified to the maximum extent permitted by law.
 - (2) Not more than 40 percent may be permanently reallocated to trial courts for any other purpose approved by the Judicial Council.
 - (3) The Judicial Council shall retain at least 40 percent of the funding to support annual allocations for improvement projects and programs in qualifying courts.
 - (4) Written notice shall be given to the Director of the Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee of any permanent reallocation.
- (d) Except as specified in this section, the funding in the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund shall be subject to the expenditures as specified in Section 77205. Any funds in the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund that are unencumbered at the end of the fiscal year shall be retained in the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund for the following fiscal year.

Trial Court Improvement Fund

CALIFORNIA CODES – GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTION 77209

- (a) There is in the State Treasury the Trial Court Improvement Fund.
- (b) The Judicial Council shall reserve funds for projects by transferring 1 percent of the amount appropriated for support for operation of the trial courts to the Trial Court Improvement Fund. At least one-half of this amount shall be set aside as a reserve that shall not be allocated prior to March 15 of each year unless allocated to a court or courts for urgent needs.
- (c) Any funds in the Trial Court Improvement Fund that are unencumbered at the end of the fiscal year shall be reappropriated to the Trial Court Improvement Fund for the following fiscal year.
- (d) Moneys deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund shall be placed in an interest bearing account. Any interest earned shall accrue to the fund and shall be disbursed pursuant to subdivision (e).
- (e) Moneys deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund may be disbursed for purposes of this section.
- (f) Moneys deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund pursuant to Section 68090.8 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council for automated administrative system improvements pursuant to that section and in furtherance of Rule 991 of the California Rules of Court, as it read on July 1, 1996. As used in this subdivision, "automated administrative system" does not include electronic reporting systems for use in a courtroom.
- (g) Moneys deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund shall be administered by the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council may, with appropriate guidelines, delegate to the Administrative Director of the Courts the administration of the fund. Moneys in the fund may be expended to implement trial court projects approved by the Judicial Council. Expenditures may be made to vendors or individual trial courts that have the responsibility to implement approved projects.
- (h) Notwithstanding other provisions of this section, the 2 percent automation fund moneys deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund pursuant to Section 68090.8 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council to statewide initiatives related to trial court automation and their implementation. The Judicial Council shall allocate the remainder of the moneys deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund as specified in this section. For the purposes of this subdivision, the term "2 percent automation fund" means the fund established pursuant to Section 68090.8 as it read on June 30, 1996. As used in this subdivision, "statewide initiatives related to trial court automation and their implementation" does not include electronic reporting systems for use in a courtroom.
- (i) Royalties received from the publication of uniform jury instructions shall be deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund and used for the improvement of the jury system.
- (j) The Judicial Council shall present an annual report to the Legislature on the use of the Trial Court Improvement Fund. The report shall include appropriate recommendations.
- (k) Each fiscal year, the Controller shall transfer thirty-one million five hundred sixty-three thousand dollars (\$31,563,000) from the Trial Court Improvement Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund for allocation to trial courts for court operations.

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund

CALIFORNIA CODES – GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTION 77209

(Amended by Stats. 2012, Ch. 41, Sec. 60. Effective June 27, 2012. Conditionally inoperative as provided in Section 77400.)

- (a) There is in the State Treasury the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund is the successor fund of the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. All assets, liabilities, revenues, and expenditures of the Trial Court Improvement Fund and the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund shall be transferred to and become a part of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. Any reference in state law to the Trial Court Improvement Fund or the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund shall be construed to refer to the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.
- (b) Any funds in the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund that are unencumbered at the end of the fiscal year shall be reappropriated to the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for the following fiscal year.
- (c) Moneys deposited in the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund shall be placed in an interest-bearing account. Any interest earned shall accrue to the fund and shall be disbursed pursuant to subdivision (d).
- (d) Moneys deposited in the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund may be disbursed for purposes of this section.
- (e) Moneys deposited in the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund pursuant to Section 68090.8 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council for automated administrative system improvements pursuant to that section and in furtherance of former Rule 991 of the California Rules of Court, as it read on July 1, 1996. As used in this subdivision, “automated administrative system” does not include electronic reporting systems for use in a courtroom.
- (f) Moneys deposited in the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund shall be administered by the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council may, with appropriate guidelines, delegate to the Administrative Director of the Courts the administration of the fund. Moneys in the fund may be expended to implement trial court projects approved by the Judicial Council. Expenditures may be made to vendors or individual trial courts that have the responsibility to implement approved projects.
- (g) Notwithstanding other provisions of this section, the 2-percent automation fund moneys deposited in the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund pursuant to Section 68090.8 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council to statewide initiatives related to trial court automation and their implementation. The Judicial Council shall allocate the remainder of the moneys deposited in the Trial Court Improvement Fund as specified in this section. For the purposes of this subdivision, “2-percent automation fund” means the fund established pursuant to Section 68090.8 as it read on June 30, 1996. As used in this subdivision, “statewide initiatives related to trial court automation and their implementation” does not include electronic reporting systems for use in a courtroom.
- (h) Royalties received from the publication of uniform jury instructions shall be deposited in the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund and used for the improvement of the jury system.

(i) The Judicial Council shall present an annual report to the Legislature on the use of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. The report shall include appropriate recommendations.

(j) Each fiscal year, the Controller shall transfer thirteen million three hundred ninety-seven thousand dollars (\$13,397,000) from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund for allocation to trial courts for court operations.

Item 6
Children's Waiting Room Distributions
(Action Item)

Issue

The Children's Waiting Room Working Group is recommending changes and additions to the Judicial Council's policy regarding children's waiting room distributions.

Background

Government Code section 70640 authorizes the Judicial Council to provide monthly children's waiting room (CWR) distributions to each court where a CWR has been established or where the court has elected to establish such a service. CWR distributions for individual courts are made from the respective court's first paper fee collections, which would otherwise support all courts' Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) base allocations. The distribution to a court must be no less than two dollars and no more than five dollars per paid first paper civil filing fee.

The council first adopted a policy and procedure on court requests for CWR distributions on June 27, 2014. On December 12, 2014, the council amended the process for courts to request CWR distributions to specify that courts applying for new CWR distributions can request that distributions begin no more than one year in advance of the planned opening date of the CWR, unless there are extenuating circumstances. In addition, it amended the process for courts to request CWR distributions to specify that once any court's request to decrease its existing CWR distribution is approved by the Judicial Council, the request can be implemented by Judicial Council staff, effective either January 1 or July 1. Attachment 6B displays the current policy.

On November 5, 2014, the TCBAC asked the work group to revisit the following recommended policy that was provided to the TCBAC for consideration on November 5, 2014:

If a court ceases to operate any CWRs, but has a plan to reopen at least one CWR within two years of the most recent cessation date, the court can retain any unspent CWR distributions. However, if the court does not have plans to reopen at least one CWR within two years, the court must return any unspent CWR distributions to the Trial Court Trust Fund within 90 days of the most recent cessation date.

On January 15, 2015, the working group provided proposed language to the TCBAC (see Attachment 6C). Due to questions about whether courts had the authority to return CWR fund balance to the TCTF, whether fund balance returned to the TCTF would in fact become unrestricted, and whether the proposed language regarding the return of CWR fund balance through an allocation reduction would result in courts' general fund being reduced instead of their CWR fund, the subcommittee chair agreed to have the subcommittee revisit the proposed language.

Recommendations

The working group met on February 6, 2015 and is proposing changes to the January 15, 2015 language (see Attachment 6D). The working group received a legal opinion from the Judicial Council's Legal Services Office (LSO). LSO did not see any legal issues with courts returning

CWR distributions since January 1, 2006 and advised that those CWR distributions returned to the TCTF become unrestricted monies in the TCTF. Distributions for children's waiting rooms do not come from fees dedicated solely to that specific purpose. Instead, the distributions are allocated from the total sum held in the TCTF. The restriction on use of the distribution for the operation and maintenance of children's waiting rooms is imposed on courts only once they receive it. In addition, the LSO also advised that, according to the language of GC section 70640, when a court ceases operating a CWR the court's CWR distribution can be stopped only on either January 1 or July 1, regardless of when a court ceased operating a CWR. As such, the January 15, 2015 language regarding having a court's CWR distribution stopped as soon as practicable was revised (see lines 36 and 37 on Attachment 6D).

With regards to whether the return of CWR fund balance through an allocation reduction would result in courts' general fund being reduced instead of their CWR fund, the JC's Audit Service office advised that courts could return CWR fund balance to the TCTF through the TCTF distribution process, and should reflect the return in their financials through appropriate accounting entries. The subcommittee considered allowing courts the option to return CWR fund balance by writing a check, but believes it is easier administratively for courts and JC staff to do so through the distribution process and, perhaps more importantly, the return through the distribution process would guarantee that CWR fund balance would be returned to the TCTF on a timely basis.

Recognizing that courts and JC staff could potentially have a difference of opinion on how much CWR fund balance should be returned to the TCTF, the subcommittee is recommending that any unresolved dispute regarding the amount of CWR that a court should return according to council policy be brought before the TCBAC and JC. The added language is on lines 46-49, 74-77, and 97-100 of Attachment 6D.

For courts that have received a distribution but never operated a CWR, Section E is revised to give them until June 17, 2015 to apply for a continued distribution (see line 89-92). This would give courts two months to apply if the council approves this recommendation at its April 17, 2015 business meeting.

Current Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Policy

A. Applying for a New CWR Distribution

- A court's presiding judge or executive officer must submit a request to the director of the Judicial Council Finance Office 45 days prior to the date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
- The request must include the following information:
 - Date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
 - Requested effective date of the distribution (July 1 or January 1). If a court wants to begin receiving distributions more than one year in advance of the planned opening date of a CWR, the request should include an explanation of the extenuating circumstance(s).
 - The scheduled opening date of the CWR(s).
 - Description of the CWR(s).
 - The date when the court intends to make expenditures related to operating its CWR(s).
 - The requested distribution amount between \$2 and \$5. Courts can request the Judicial Council Finance Office to provide an estimate of annual distributions.
- The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.
- If the council approves that distributions begin prior to the operating of a CWR but the court does not operate a CWR six months after their planned opening date, the court must apply for a continued distribution.

B. Requesting a Decreased CWR Distribution Amount

- Any court's request to decrease its existing CWR distribution is approved by the Judicial Council and the request can be implemented by Judicial Council staff, effective either January 1 or July 1.

C. Applying to Continue Receiving a CWR Distribution While Not Operating a CWR

- Courts must apply to continue receiving a CWR distribution if they:
 - are currently receiving a distribution but have not operated a CWR since June 27, 2014.
 - received a distribution effective July 1, 2014 or after but have not operated a CWR six months after their planned opening date of the CWR.
- The request must follow the process for requesting a new distribution (see A above). In addition, a court must include in its request the amount of any unspent distributions.
- The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.
- For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the council, the council reserves the option of directing courts to return any unspent CWR distributions to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF).

January 15, 2015 Proposed Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Distribution and Fund Balance Policy

A. Applying for a New CWR Distribution

- A court's presiding judge or executive officer must submit a request to the director of the Judicial Council Finance Office 45 days prior to the date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
- The request must include the following information:
 - Date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
 - Requested effective date of the distribution (July 1 or January 1). If a court wants to begin receiving distributions more than one year in advance of the planned opening date of a CWR, the request should include an explanation of the extenuating circumstance(s).
 - The scheduled opening date of the CWR(s).
 - Description of the CWR(s).
 - The date when the court intends to make expenditures related to operating its CWR(s).
 - The requested distribution amount between \$2 and \$5. Courts can request the Judicial Council Finance Office to provide an estimate of annual distributions.
- The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.
- If the council approves that distributions begin prior to the operating of a CWR but the court does not operate a CWR six months after their planned opening date, the court must apply for a continued distribution.

B. Requesting a Decreased CWR Distribution Amount

- Any court's request to decrease its existing CWR distribution is approved by the Judicial Council and the request can be implemented by Judicial Council staff, effective either January 1 or July 1.

~~C. Applying to Continue Receiving a CWR Distribution While Not Operating a CWR~~

- ~~• Courts must apply to continue receiving a CWR distribution if they:

 - are currently receiving a distribution but have not operated a CWR since June 27, 2014.
 - received a distribution effective July 1, 2014 or after but have not operated a CWR six months after their planned opening date of the CWR.~~
- ~~• The request must follow the process for requesting a new distribution (see A above). In addition, a court must include in its request the amount of any unspent distributions.~~
- ~~• The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.~~
- ~~• For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the council, the council reserves the option of directing courts to return any unspent CWR distributions to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF).~~

C. Temporarily or Permanently Ceasing CWR Operations

- Courts that cease operating all CWRs must notify the director of the JC Finance Office within 60 days of the cessation date. Unless a court provides notification and submits an application to continue receiving distributions while not operating a CWR within 60 days of the cessation date, the court's CWR distributions will be stopped as soon as practicable and the court will be required to return any unspent funds to the TCTF through a reduction to the court's TCTF allocation.
- An application for a continued distribution must include all the information required of courts applying for a new distribution (see section An above) as well as the amount of any unspent distributions.
- The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the Judicial Council on each court's application.
- For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the Judicial Council, any unspent CWR distributions shall be returned to the TCTF.

D. Cap on CWR Fund Balance

- In general, courts should request a distribution amount that will not result in accumulating CWR fund balances.
- Effective July 1, 2015, there shall be a cap on the amount of CWR fund balance that courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next. The cap shall be the amount of the highest annual distribution within the three most recent fiscal years.
- Courts that have a CWR fund balance greater than the cap (as described above) at the end of the fiscal year will have their allocation reduced by the amount above the cap in the subsequent fiscal year.
- The cap applies only to courts that have received at least 12 months of distributions in a fiscal year while operating a CWR.
- If a court wants a cap adjustment, it must submit a request explaining the extenuating circumstance and including its CWR expenditure plan to the director of the JC Finance Office for consideration by the TCBAC and the Judicial Council. The request must be received by the Finance Director within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year for which the adjustment is being requested.
- JC staff will report any allocation reductions to the TCBAC and the Judicial Council.

E. Courts that have Received a Distribution but Never Operated a CWR

- Courts that received distributions between January 1, 2006 and June 30, 2014 but did not operate a CWR during that time period must either apply for a continued distribution by April 1, 2015 or have their distributions stopped as soon as practicable and return to the TCTF any unspent CWR distributions.

Proposed Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Distribution and Fund Balance Policy

A. Applying for a New CWR Distribution

- A court's presiding judge or executive officer must submit a request to the director of the Judicial Council Finance Office 45 days prior to the date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
- The request must include the following information:
 - Date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
 - Requested effective date of the distribution (July 1 or January 1). If a court wants to begin receiving distributions more than one year in advance of the planned opening date of a CWR, the request should include an explanation of the extenuating circumstance(s).
 - The scheduled opening date of the CWR(s).
 - Description of the CWR(s).
 - The date when the court intends to make expenditures related to operating its CWR(s).
 - The requested distribution amount between \$2 and \$5. Courts can request the Judicial Council Finance Office to provide an estimate of annual distributions.
- The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.
- If the council approves that distributions begin prior to the operating of a CWR but the court does not operate a CWR six months after their planned opening date, the court must apply for a continued distribution.

B. Requesting a Decreased CWR Distribution Amount

- Any court's request to decrease its existing CWR distribution is approved by the Judicial Council and the request can be implemented by Judicial Council staff, effective either January 1 or July 1.

C. Temporarily or Permanently Ceasing CWR Operations

- Courts that cease operating all CWRs must notify the director of the JC Finance Office within 60 days of the cessation date. Unless a court provides notification and submits an application to continue receiving distributions while not operating a CWR within 60 days of the cessation date, the court's CWR distributions will be stopped either January 1 or July 1, whichever is earlier, and the court will be required to return any CWR fund balance to the TCTF.
- For courts that are required to return all of their remaining CWR fund balance to the TCTF, the return of the CWR fund balance will be accomplished through a reduction in the court's trial court distribution for the month of February for those courts that had CWR distributions stopped on January 1; and through a reduction in the court's August trial court distribution for those courts that had CWR distributions stopped on July 1. This distribution reduction will be reflected in the court's financial reports as a reduction in its CWR fund balance.

- 46 • If there is a dispute between a court and JC staff over the amount of CWR fund balance
47 that should be returned to the TCTF, the dispute will be brought before the TCBAC and
48 the Judicial Council if the two parties cannot come to a resolution within 90 days of the
49 cessation date.
- 50 • An application for a continued distribution must include all the information required of
51 courts applying for a new distribution (see section A above) as well as the amount of
52 any CWR fund balance.
- 53 • The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the Judicial Council on each court's
54 application.
- 55 • For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the Judicial Council, any
56 CWR fund balance shall be returned to the TCTF. This return of funds will be
57 accomplished as a distribution reduction.

58

59 D. Cap on CWR Fund Balance

- 60 • Courts shall monitor the CWR distribution amount per filing to ensure it is adequate to
61 meet the CWR needs of the court without accumulating an amount in excess of the cap
62 described below.
- 63 • Effective July 1, 2015, there shall be a cap on the amount of CWR fund balance that
64 courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next. The cap shall be the amount
65 of the highest annual distribution within the three most recent fiscal years.
- 66 • Courts that have a CWR fund balance greater than the cap (as described above) at the
67 end of the fiscal year will be required to return to the TCTF the amount above the cap
68 in the subsequent fiscal year.
- 69 • For courts that are required to return the portion of their CWR fund balance above the
70 cap to the TCTF, the return of the funds in excess of the CWR fund balance cap will be
71 accomplished through a reduction in the court's a August trial court distribution. This
72 distribution reduction will be reflected in the court's financial reports as a reduction in
73 its CWR fund balance.
- 74 • If there is a dispute between a court and JC staff over the amount of CWR fund balance
75 that should be returned to the TCTF, the dispute will be brought before the TCBAC and
76 the Judicial Council for final determination if the two parties cannot come to a
77 resolution by September 30 of that year.
- 78 • The cap applies only to courts that have received at least 12 months of distributions in a
79 fiscal year while operating a CWR.
- 80 • If a court wants a cap adjustment, it must submit a request explaining the extenuating
81 circumstance and including its CWR expenditure plan to the director of the JC Finance
82 Office for consideration by the TCBAC and the Judicial Council. The request must be
83 received by the Finance Director within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year for which
84 the adjustment is being requested.
- 85 • JC staff will report any return of CWR fund balance through the trial court distribution
86 process to the TCBAC and the Judicial Council.

87

88 E. Courts that have Received a Distribution but Never Operated a CWR

- 89 • Courts that received distributions between January 1, 2006 and June 30, 2014 but did
90 not operate a CWR during that time period must either apply for a continued

- 91 distribution by June 17, 2015 or have their distributions stopped on July 1, 2015 and
92 return to the TCTF any CWR fund balance.
- 93 • For courts that are required to return all of their remaining CWR fund balance to the
94 TCTF must do so through a reduction of their TCTF distribution. This distribution
95 reduction will be recorded in the court's financial reports as a reduction in it CWR fund
96 balance.
 - 97 • If there is a dispute between a court and JC staff over the amount of CWR fund balance
98 that should be returned to the TCTF, the dispute will be brought before the TCBAC and
99 the Judicial Council if the two parties cannot come to a resolution within 90 days of the
100 cessation date.
- 101