



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 10, 2016

9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Judicial Council, Veranda Room C, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95833

Members Present: Judges: Jonathan B. Conklin (Co-Chair), Mark A. Cope, Barry P. Goode, Lesley D. Holland, and Carolyn B. Kuhl.

Executive Officers: Rebecca Fleming (Co-Chair), Sherri R. Carter, Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Jeffrey E. Lewis (on phone), Michael D. Planet, Michael M. Roddy, and Tania Ugrin-Capobianco.

Members Absent: Judges: Cynthia Ming-Mei Lee

Executive Officers: Tammy L. Grimm and Christina M. Volkers.

Others Present: Judicial Council staff: Leah Rose-Goodwin and Colin Simpson.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The co-chair called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 5, 2016 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting.

Public Comment

None received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-7)

Item 1

Civil Assessments and the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) (Discussion Item)

No action taken. An update from the co-chairs was provided on the activity of the Civil Assessment Working Group.

Item 2**New Judgeships Staffing Complement Funding (Discussion Item)**

The subcommittee unanimously approved, with one abstention, two recommendations:

1. For any funding requests related to the staffing complement for new judgeship positions, Judicial Council staff should estimate costs for the staffing complement as follows:
 - a. Staffing Ratio: Calculate the ratio of staff to judicial officers by dividing the most recent total Resource Assessment Study (RAS) full-time equivalent (FTE) need by the most recent total Judicial Needs Assessment;
 - b. Cost per Staff: Calculate the cost per staff using the most recent WAFM funding need divided by the RAS FTE need.
 - c. Total Staff Cost per Judgeship: Multiply the Staffing Ratio by the Cost per Staff.
 - d. Total Staffing Cost: Multiply the Total Staff Cost per Judgeship by the number of new judgeships.
 - e. This would exclude any estimates, if needed, for facilities costs.
2. Any new funding appropriated to the judicial branch related to the staffing complement for new judgeships would be allocated to the trial courts based on WAFM with an equal amount of the courts' FY 2013–2014 historical WAFM base allocation being reallocated, if the historical base allocation has not already been fully reallocated.

Item 3**Plans for FY 2018–2019 and Beyond (Discussion Item)**

The subcommittee unanimously approved the following recommendation:

1. Beginning in FY 2018–2019, until fully reallocated, each fiscal year reallocate an additional 10 percent, or the remaining amount if less than 10 percent, of the courts' FY 2013–2014 historical WAFM base allocation pursuant to the WAFM. The Judicial Council would continue to allocate any new money appropriated for general trial court operations entirely pursuant to the WAFM; and reallocate applicable base funding pursuant to the WAFM on a dollar-for-dollar basis for any new money appropriated for general trial court operations.

Item 4**Identify Technology Funding Streams (with JCTC and CITMF assistance) (Discussion Item)**

No action taken. Judicial Council staff will provide a breakdown of court technology expenditures by fund source for the next meeting.

Item 5**Subcommittee Work Plan (Action Item)**

The subcommittee unanimously adopted the following updated work plan:

FY 2015–2016

1. Plans for FY 2018–2019 and beyond (TCBAC recommendation pending)
2. Review operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) calculation and other WAFM components to determine handling of inflation, modification and refresh cycle (TCBAC recommendation approved)
3. New judgeships staffing complement funding (TCBAC recommendation pending)

FY 2016–2017

1. Identify technology funding streams (with JCTC and CITMF assistance)
2. Joint working group with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to evaluate the allocation methodology for Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding including review AB 1058 revenue as an offset to WAFM funding need.
3. Evaluate the impact of civil assessments as it relates to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
4. Review TCTF and IMF self-help funding allocation
5. Identify all funding sources and determine allocation models
6. Review funding floor calculation to determine handling of inflation and refresh cycle
7. Special circumstances cases funding
8. Allocation methodology for staffing complement funding of reallocated judgeships
9. Allocation methodology for undesignated reductions

Indefinite

1. Evaluate impact of JCC and other provided services
2. Evaluate how to include unfunded costs – courthouse construction

Item 6

FY 2016–2017 WAFM Funding Need (Discussion Item)

No action taken. Discussion of the changes to the WAFM components resulting in the FY 2016–2017 WAFM funding need estimate as well as estimated WAFM adjustments in 2016–2017 and 2017–2018.

Item 7

Open Discussion (Discussion Item)

No action taken.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

Approved by the subcommittee on April 12, 2017.