



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 ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS August 8, 2016

Email Proposal

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) was asked to vote on proposed dollar amounts for five budget change proposals previously approved for recommendation to the Judicial Council at its August 26, 2016 meeting:

- 1) Trial Court Operations Discretionary Funding and Employee Compensation.** Proposed ongoing augmentation of \$158 million in support of trial court operations, which will allow the trial courts to hire additional staff, retain existing staff, and improve the public's access to justice. The request consists of the following: 1) \$117.506 million, the equivalent of 5 percent of the amount of funding needed by the trial courts based on the 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) estimate, to reduce the gap between the funding needed to support trial court operations and the funding available; and 2) \$40.983 million to fund the equivalent of a 2.5% cost of living increase for all trial court employees, consistent with the salary increases provided for executive branch staff in FY 2015–2016 and half of the 5% increase for state employees of the judicial branch in FY 2016–2017 and FY 2017–2018; The \$40.983 million augmentation would be utilized to provide any of the following (or any combination thereof): the reduction or elimination of budget reduction-related concessions such as furloughs, reduced work weeks, previously enacted or planned future layoffs; a cost of living increase; enhanced employee benefits; or to address other personnel matters as deemed appropriate by each trial court in negotiations with their related employee representatives.
- 2) Dependency Counsel.** Proposed ongoing augmentation of \$22 million to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. The need based on the current workload model to achieve the Judicial Council's statewide caseload standard of 141 clients per attorney is \$202.9 million. This request represents 25 percent of the \$88.2 million required to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children at every stage of the dependency proceeding, from the initial detention hearing until the court terminates its jurisdiction.
- 3) New Judgeships (AB 159).** Proposed augmentation of \$8.3 million for 10 of the 50 trial court judgeships authorized by AB 159. This includes \$8.2 million in ongoing funding (\$117,000 one-time) for the 10 judgeships and accompanying support staff. While the latest Judicial Needs Assessment

(2014) shows that the branch needs just over 269 judgeships based on workload metrics, efforts to secure funding for the 50 previously-authorized judgeships have been unsuccessful. This request for a more modest amount of 10 judgeships to begin to address the critical resource shortfalls in trial courts with the greatest need.

- 4) **Self-Help Services.** Proposed ongoing augmentation of \$22 million to support self-help centers in trial court facilities. The need, based on a 2006 survey to support self-help centers in all trial court facilities, is \$44 million. Currently, \$11.2 million is allocated for self-help centers and this request represents approximately 67 percent of the \$32.8 million remaining need. This request will allocate \$20 million for attorney and qualified paralegal staff at each court and \$2 million to promote cooperative projects across county lines such as increased technology, sharing of bilingual resources, and ideas to provide services as cost-effectively as possible.

- 5) **Increased Costs for New Court Facilities.** This proposal would address increased operating costs for new facilities opening in 2017-2018 (operations and maintenance, utilities, and insurance). As there are currently no new facilities scheduled to open in 2017-2018, this BCP will not be submitted.

Notice

On August 1, 2016, a notice was posted advising that the TCBAC was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(A).

Public Comment

The public comment period ended at 9 a.m., Monday, August 8, 2016. No comments were received.

Action Taken

TCBAC members were asked to vote between 9:16 a.m. August 8, 2016 and 5 p.m. August 8, 2016. Twenty-six members submitted votes via e-mail. All votes were in favor of the proposed recommendations save for three no votes for item 1 and one no vote for item 3.