



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

August 9, 2017

8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

JCC Veranda Room, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA, 95833

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Co-Chair), Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, and Hon. Paul M. Marigonda.

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

Advisory Body Members Absent: None

Others Present: Hon. Wynne S. Carvill, Ms. Kimberly Flener, Mr. John Wordlaw, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Mr. Peter James, and Mr. Chad Finke.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. and roll was called.

ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 3)

Item 1 – Finalizing Definition of Objectives for Future Funding Model (No Action Required)

The members continued the discussion from the previous day to identify possible objectives, principles, and measures that may be applied to a future funding model. Those items were written on the whiteboard and are transcribed as part of the minutes from this meeting in Attachment A.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Mr. Peter James, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: No action taken.

Item 2 – Organizing 2017-2018 Funding Methodology (FMS) Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Work Plan (No Action Required)

Judicial Council staff were asked to prepare information for the October 2, 2017 FMS meeting, these actions were written are on the whiteboard and are transcribed as part of the minutes from this meeting in Attachment A.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Mr. Peter James, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: No action taken

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:31 a.m.

Approved by the advisory body on October 2, 2017.

Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS)
Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
Whiteboard Notes
August 8-9, 2017

A. Benefits and Concerns for Existing WAFM Model

Benefits

1. Equitable allocation of available funding based on workload.
2. Calculates the workload driven need for trial courts.
3. Predictability.
4. Considers local costs.
5. Courts agreed on an underlying model that was in the best interests of the branch (not local court).
6. Removes subjectivity.
7. Transparency.

Concerns

1. Volatility/Predictability.
2. Lack of uniformity in reporting through JBSIS.
3. No mechanism for ensuring courts are following uniform process (JBSIS).
4. Math difficult to follow (transitional).
5. Relies on base \$ from historical date.
6. Allocation relies on taking from one court to fund another court.
7. Difference of opinion; lack of uniformity of message from courts.
8. Lack of understanding of WAFM.
9. WAFM is missing pieces (all revenue/expenses) i.e. civil assessment.
10. Health benefits calculation.
11. No inflation calculator (affects funding floor).
12. Lack of tools.
13. BLS

Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS)
Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
Whiteboard Notes
August 8-9, 2017

B. Objectives, Principles, and Measures for Future WAFM Model

Objectives

1. Reach equity of available funding based on workload.
2. Develop process to identify trial court funding needs based on workload and related factors.

Principles

1. Minimize volatility, maximize stability and predictability to extent possible.
2. Committed to evaluating all submissions as submitted via the process (WAFM Adjustment Request Process).
3. Time for adjustment and adaptation.
4. Responsiveness to local circumstances.
5. Transparency and accountability.
6. Independent authority of the trial courts.
7. Simplification of reporting while maintaining transparency.

Measures

1. Parity of funding.
2. New money (General Fund) coming in.
3. Overall increase % of need funded.

Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS)
Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
Whiteboard Notes
August 8-9, 2017

C. Actions Requested from Judicial Council Staff and for Discussion

Actions – Information from Staff

1. Leveling to 75% - estimate.
2. Evaluate ARP submission.
3. What does WAFM-related funding look like with civil assessments and what would it look like if civil assessments were pooled and allocated based on WAFM %.
4. Look at adding an inflation factor/adjustment to funding floor calculation.
5. 0.90 BLS calculation (bring all up to) vs. analyze regional comparison of BLS or ?
6. Ask Lake for information on BLS issue.
7. Dollars reverted above one 1% cap.
8. Bands – 5%, 3%, 2% above/below average, and 1%, 2%, 3% max increase/decrease.

Use new RAS #'s moving forward. Looking backward use old #'s.

Actions to Discuss

1. Education of CEO's/PJ – WAFM Comm.
2. Maintain collaboration with CEAC (JBSIS) to support current efforts of standardization.
3. Chair (FMS) will contact WAAC chair.