**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: Ronald G. Overholt, AOC Chief Deputy Director, 415-865-4241, ron.overholt@jud.ca.gov
Stephen Nash, Director, AOC Finance Division, 415-865-7584, stephen.nash@jud.ca.gov

DATE: October 20, 2009

SUBJECT: Allocation of Special Fund Monies for Court System Projects and Programs in Fiscal Year 2009–2010 (Action Required)

## Issue Statement

The Judicial Council has statutory authority to approve the allocation of funding from statewide special funds for projects and programs that support the trial courts. This report presents recommendations related to Fiscal Year (FY) 2009–2010 allocations for specific projects and programs funded from the Trial Court Improvement Fund (Improvement Fund), the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Modernization Fund), and the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF).

## Summary of Recommendations

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff recommends that for FY 2009–2010 the council:

1a. Approve allocation of $53.831 million for projects and programs from the Modernization Fund ($8.414 million) and the Improvement Fund ($45.417 million);

1b. Authorize restoration of ongoing funding for the Alternative Dispute Resolution Program in FY 2010–2011 and authorize staff to proceed with program planning, including (1) soliciting court proposals for FY 2010–2011, (2) recommending

projects to E&P for approval, and (3) entering into Intrabranch Agreements for FY 2010–2011 funding;

2. Approve allocation of:

   a. $87.771 million for statewide administrative programs and services, from the Modernization Fund ($9.958 million), the Improvement Fund ($38.309 million), and the TCTF ($39.504 million), and

   b. $83.353 million for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects, from the Modernization Fund ($20.337 million), the Improvement Fund ($30.481 million), and the TCTF ($32.535 million);

3. Approve allocation of $7.4 million to courts for the replacement of technology assets, such as personal computers and printers, but also authorize courts to redirect these funds to offset the impact of budget reductions, as deemed necessary by each court, in FY 2009–2010; and

4. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to adjust allocations of funds to courts and for approved programs and projects, as needed, to address unanticipated needs and contingencies. Any adjustments will be reported back to the council after the end of the fiscal year.

## I. Special Funds Allocations (excluding statewide administrative and technology infrastructure)

Background

The Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (AB 233; Ch. 850, Stats. 1997) created the Modernization Fund and the Improvement Fund to support projects and programs that improve the provision and administration of and access to justice and address emergencies in the trial courts. Until FY 2003–2004, the council approved detailed allocations from these special funds. Since then, however, in accordance with California Rules of Court rule 10.11 and in conformance with the internal guidelines approved by the council on January 30, 2002, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) has approved special funds allocations on behalf of the council. For FY 2009–2010 allocations, staff allocation recommendations are being presented to E&P for review and recommendation, and subsequently to be presented to the council for overall approval.

Resources

Ending FY 2008–2009 fund balances and projected FY 2009–2010 revenues and transfers represent the special funds resources that are anticipated to be available to fund the various projects and programs. Table 1 displays an overview of approved budget for and actual FY 2008–2009 resources and expenditures/encumbrances (Columns A and B) and projected FY 2009–2010 resources and recommended allocations (Column E) from the Modernization Fund, the Improvement Fund, and their combined totals.

The Modernization Fund receives revenue mainly from two sources (see Table 2a for FY 2008–2009 actual and FY 2009–2010 projected revenues). The primary source is an annual appropriation of state General Fund monies, which is $38.709 million in FY 2009–2010. The other revenue source is interest earned on retained funds through the Surplus Money Investment Fund (SMIF). This fiscal year the amount is projected to be $350,022. Including the beginning balance of $27.618 million, the total projected resources for the Modernization Fund in FY 2009–2010 is $38.709 million.

The Improvement Fund receives funding from a number of sources: a one-percent transfer from the TCTF (Government Code section 77209); 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue (Government Code section 77205) representing the state's fifty-percent share of the fee, fine, and forfeiture revenue exceeding each county's base Maintenance of Effort (revenue) level from FY 1998–1999; interest earned on retained funds; Two Percent Automation Fund (Government Code section 68090.8) revenues representing two percent of the fine, penalty, and forfeiture collections in criminal cases; and revenues from sale of documents and royalties from publication of uniform jury instructions (see Table 3a for FY 2008–2009 actual and FY 2009–2010 projected revenues). Including the beginning balance of $35.611 million, the total projected resources for FY 2009–2010 is $104.858 million.

Recommended FY 2009–2010 Allocations for Projects and Programs

This section discusses the proposed special funds allocations for projects and programs. Proposed allocations for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure are discussed in Section II of this report.

Staff recommends that the council approve ongoing allocations, adjustments to previously approved allocations, requests to roll over unused prior-year allocations, and new funding requests. Charts 1 and 2 display, by category for each of the special funds, the amounts of allocations that were previously approved by E&P, proposed adjustments

to previously approved allocations, rollover requests, new funding requests, and the resulting recommended allocations for FY 2009–2010.

**Chart 1. Modernization Fund**

| Category | Ongoing Allocations | Proposed Adjustments | Proposed Rollover of Prior-Year Funds | New Funding Requests | Recommended Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Education and Developmental Programs | $3,561,653 | ($814,848) | $0 | $25,000 | **$2,771,805** |
| 3. Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives and Ongoing Programs | 7,345,702 | (2,188,837) | 0 | 0 | **5,642,312** |
| **Total** | **$11,392,802** | **($2,978,685)** | **$0** | **$25,000** | **$8,414,117** |

**Chart 2. Improvement Fund**

| Category | Ongoing Allocations | Proposed Adjustments | Proposed Rollover of Prior-Year Funds | New Funding Requests | Recommended Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Ongoing Statewide Programs | $19,218,744 | ($3,637,380) | $1,577,634 | $0 | **$17,158,998** |
| 2. Trial Court Projects and Model Programs | 18,123,495 | (3,056,000) | 376,110 | 225,000 | **15,668,605** |
| 3. Emergency Funding Reserve | 12,589,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **12,589,700** |
| **Total** | **$49,931,939** | **($6,693,380)** | **$1,953,744** | **$225,000** | **$45,417,303** |

The various projects and programs included in these recommendations are described below, by fund.

*Modernization Fund*

Projects and programs funded from the Modernization Fund fall under three categories. Projects and programs included in Category I (Statewide Technology Projects) are discussed in section II (see Table 2b for the recommended allocation by project and program). Category II (Education and Developmental Programs) programs fall into five general subcategories: mandated state education programs for judges, nonmandated education programs for judges, education/training/programs related to court administration, education programs for court staff, and other educational and developmental programs.

The council's strategic plan identifies education of judges, subordinate judicial officers, and nonjudicial court staff as a significant means to advance the mission and goals of the judiciary in the areas of access, fairness, diversity, and ethics. With the increasing complexity of the law and court procedures, delivery of justice to the people of California requires judges and court personnel to be equipped with knowledge, skills, and abilities that enable them to administer the justice system in a fair, effective manner that fosters public confidence. Funding covers the costs of lodging and group meals for judges, court executives, and other court staff as well as the development and transmission of broadcast programs.

Mandated state judicial education programs include:

- Orientation for New Trial Court Judges
- Family Law Assignment Education
- Juvenile Law Assignment Education
- Ethics Training for Judges

Other recommended judicial education programs include:

- Probate and Mental Health Institute
- Criminal Law and Procedure Institute
- Statewide Fairness Conference
- Cow County Judges Institute
- Continuing Judicial Studies Program
- Civil Law and Procedure Institute
- Overview Courses
- Probate Conservatorship Institute

Programs related to court administration include:

- Court Management Courses (Presiding Judge/Court Executive Officer Management Program; Supervising Judges Institute; Institute of Court Management Courses)
- Technical Assistance to Local Courts
- Train the Trainers – Faculty Development
- Training Coordinators Conference
- Trial Court Faculty (Statewide Education Programs)
- Court Management Curriculum
- Fall Summit of Judicial Leaders
- Western States Court Leadership Academy

Programs for trial court staff include:

- Human Resources Staff Training
- Manager/Supervisor Training
- Court Staff Training
- Court Clerk Training Institute
- Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast)
- Trial Court Judicial Attorney Institute

Other educational and developmental programs include:

- CFCC Programs, which include various symposia and conferences, including Beyond the Bench and the Statewide Family Dispute Resolution Institute.
- CFCC Publications, which include the production and distribution of publications, including the *Dependency Online Guide* book, dependency brochures in Spanish and English, domestic violence form instructions on a CD in Spanish and English, a domestic violence victims' pamphlet, and *Going to Court Without a Lawyer* booklets.
- New Council Member (Trial Court) Orientation, which provides an orientation to branchwide judicial administration issues for superior court judges who are new Judicial Council members.
- Budget-Focused Training and Meetings, which include the meetings of the Trial Court Budget Working Group and other budget-related meetings that affect trial courts.
- Labor Relations Academy, which is held in the regional offices to support and educate trial court personnel in all critical areas of labor and employee relations, such as negotiation with unions, disciplinary action in a union environment, bargaining in poor budget years, contingency planning, memoranda of understandings language considerations, and legal and legislative updates.

Category III (Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs) includes the following projects and programs:

- Alternate Dispute Resolution, which is designed to expand the mediation and settlement programs for civil cases in the trial courts. The project helps courts meet the goal of section 10.70(a) of the Standards of Judicial Administration, which provides that all trial courts should implement mediation programs for civil cases as part of their core operations.

- Complex Civil Litigation, which provides funding to courts for staff, including attorneys, who work in complex civil litigation departments.
- Self-Help Videos for the Websites, which posts training sessions from the self-help conferences online to allow staff and judicial officers who were unable to participate in the workshops to view the courses.
- Interactive Software - Self-represented Litigant Electronic Forms, which, developed in collaboration with legal services programs, are interactive programs that can be used in every county to help litigants complete pleadings in workshop settings more quickly and accurately. In addition, the project supports a national document assembly server that will enable litigants to complete their forms online at no charge.
- Court-Appointed Counsel Performance Database, which covers monthly hosting and maintenance charges and network licensing fees for Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding and Training (DRAFT) courts. The database is designed to help in assessing attorney quality, availability, and cost in dependency representation.
- Presiding Judge and Court Executive Meetings, which provide a forum for the presiding judges, assistant presiding judges, court executive officers, assistant court executive officers, and other court leaders to discuss and consider both local and statewide court administration issues affecting trial court operations.
- Ralph N. Kleps Award Program, which encourages and celebrates innovative contributions of courts to the administration of justice.
- California Courts Review Magazine, which reports on initiatives and issues facing state courts and serves as a forum for court leaders and branch stakeholders. With a printrun of 6,500, the magazine is mailed out to all judges and court executives in California, as well as chief justices and administrative directors in all 50 states.
- Developing Promising Practices, which currently support two programs: the California JusticeCorps Program and the California on My Honor Civics Institute for Teachers. The California JusticeCorps Program is an AmeriCorps program. JusticeCorps members assist court-based attorneys in serving the public by helping to triage cases, providing information and referral, identifying and completing legal forms, and assisting in day-of-court hearings. Through specially trained teacher leaders, California on My Honor Civics Institute for Teachers provides professional development to teachers on designing curriculum related to the judicial branch.
- Trial Courts Performance and Accountability, which supports activities related to the development of measures of performance and accountability in the trial courts, such as the Resource Allocation Study model and judicial workload assessment.

The program also supports activities related to meeting the requirements of SB 56 (Government Code section 77001.5).

- Court Interpreter Program - Testing Development/Implementation, which supports various activities of the Court Interpreter Program, including administration of written and oral exams, bilingual oral proficiency screening exams, review and analysis of the consortium exam, test preparation seminar, court interpreters ethics and orientation workshops, and the language need and interpreter use study.
- Court Interpreter Recruitment Campaign, which develops outreach; advertisement materials, including press releases and radio, television and print advertisements that are run throughout California; and interpreter recruitment toolkits, including brochures describing the court interpreting profession, advertising posters, and a frequently asked questions sheet.

*Improvement Fund*

Projects and programs funded from the Improvement Fund fall under three categories. Category I (Ongoing Statewide Programs) projects or programs that are part of statewide administrative and technology infrastructure are discussed in section II (see Table 3b for the recommended allocations by project or program). The other Category I projects and programs include the following:

- Trial Court Security Grants, which provides grants to trial courts for training and the acquisition of necessary equipment to maintain public safety within court facilities.
- Litigation Management Program, which pays for the costs of defending trial courts, judicial officers, and court employees, including costs of attorneys from the Attorney General's Office and private counsel and of settlements and judgments of civil claims and actions brought against covered entities and individuals. Government Code section 811.9 requires the council to provide for the representation, defense, and indemnification of the state's trial courts, trial court judicial officers, and trial court employees.
- Judicial Performance Defense Insurance, which provides a comprehensive loss prevention program by covering defense costs in proceedings related to Commission on Judicial Performance complaints, protecting judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties, and lowering through required ethics training for judicial officers the risk of conduct that could develop into complaints.
- Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support, which supports a statewide conference, training sessions for self-help centers, and development of plans to provide more comprehensive services to self-represented litigants.

- Domestic Violence Family Law Interpreter Program, which provides assistance and grants to trial courts for providing interpreter services for litigants with limited English proficiency in general family law cases and in cases where domestic violence or elder abuse protective orders have been issued or are being sought.
- Self-Help Centers, which supports the establishment and/or expansion of self-help centers in every California county.
- Branchwide Strategic Planning, which supports the development of strategic plans that provide goals and direction for California's judicial branch.
- California Courts – Connecting with Constituents, which supports various outreach and educational initiatives to connect courts with the general public, such as Website Design and Usability Tools, the Community Forum, and Teacher Training Institutes.
- Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers, which provides judges, subordinate judicial officers, and assigned judges personal consultation services online or via a toll-free number and access to appropriate treatment, providers, and/or community resources.

Category II (Trial Court Projects and Model Programs) includes the following projects and programs:

- Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force, which is currently overseeing the implementation of practices and guidelines adopted by the council at its meeting on February 22, 2008.
- Quadrennial Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline, which supports a study whose findings and recommendations must be submitted to the Legislature by December 31, 2009.
- Workers' Compensation Program Reserve, which is a reserve set aside to resolve outstanding liabilities with counties for workers' compensation tail claims from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2003 related to employees of courts that have joined the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program.
- Audit Contract, which supplements the AOC's internal audit program that conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) at each of the 58 trial courts approximately once every four years, encompassing court administration, cash controls, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations. The goal is to reach a three-year audit cycle.

Category III (Emergency Funding Reserve), required by Government Code section 77209(b), is the set aside of one-half of the 1 percent transfer from the Trial Court Trust

Fund to the Improvement Fund until March 15, 2010. This year the amount of the transfer will be $12.590 million, with the funding reserved through March 15 to address unforeseen contingencies and financial emergencies at the trial courts.

*Adjustments to Allocations Previously Approved by E&P*

Given the need to offset trial court funding reductions, staff proposes adjustments to 23 previously approved allocations for a total reduction of $9.212 million ($2.518 million from the Modernization Fund and $6.693 million from the Improvement Fund). Column C of Tables 2b and 3b displays the adjustment amount by individual project or program for the Modernization Fund and Improvement Fund, respectively. The adjustment amount and rationale for each of the 23 projects or programs are discussed below, by fund.

*Modernization Fund*

1. CFCC Programs
   Reduction: $57,000
   Rationale: Hotel rates have been reduced through renegotiation and other conference and meals savings are planned.

2. CFCC Publications
   Reduction: $68,961
   Rationale: Instead of printing its materials, including the *California Dependency Online Guide*, the Blue Ribbon Commission will be publishing nearly all of its materials online in FY 2009–2010, and there will be savings related to content development and conversion for the AOC web redesign.

3. CJER - Miscellaneous Programs
   Reduction: $629,887
   Rationale: Several meetings have been deferred to FY 2010–2011 and the Bench Bar Biannual Conference was cancelled for this year.

4. Trial Court Outreach - Visits to Council/AOC
   Reduction: $50,000
   Rationale: The program has been suspended for FY 2009–2010.

5. Labor Relations Academy
   Reduction: $9,000
   Rationale: Only four of five initially planned training sessions will be held.

6. Alternative Dispute Resolution
   One-Time Savings: $1,740,000
   Rationale: Funding for FY 2009–2010 program costs was already encumbered. However, to ensure that there is no interruption in funding for this program, council approval of restoration of program funds in FY 2010–2011 is recommended to enable staff to solicit court proposals, recommend projects for approval by E&P, and enter into Intrabranch Agreements for approved FY 2010–2011 projects. To ensure that an accelerated timeline for subsequent years' projects will allow courts to begin their projects approximately a year earlier than under the current timeline, Request for Proposals will be distributed to courts in fall 2009 and recommendations will be presented to E&P in spring 2010.

7. Collaborative Justice
   Reduction: $9,600
   Rationale: The reduction amount is associated with printing costs, which will now be funded by the CFCC Publications project.

8. Presiding Judges/Court Executive Officers Meeting
   Reduction: $37,000
   Rationale: One of the three planned statewide business meetings will not occur, and videoconferencing will be used for two of the six individual in-person meetings.

9. Ralph N. Kleps Award Program
   Reduction: $25,500
   Rationale: The program will be scaled down in FY 2009–2010: the award ceremony has been redesigned; one in-person committee meeting has been eliminated; and the book that profiles the Kleps Award winners and statewide initiatives in California will be published online, thus eliminating printing and mailing costs.

10. California Courts Review Magazine
    Reduction: $700
    Rationale: 400 copies of the magazine will be printed instead of 6,500.

11. Developing Promising Practices
    Reduction: $30,500

Rationale: JusticeCorps grants to courts will be reduced and consulting costs will decrease because of implementation of the "train the trainer" program.

12. Trial Court Performance and Accountability
    Reduction: $116,000
    Rationale: The planned number of students used for research will be reduced.

13. CIP Testing Development and Implementation
    Reduction: $199,537
    Rationale: The oral proficiency screening (OPS) exam, which tests bilingual fluency in both English and the target language for all court interpreter candidates, will be deferred until FY 2010–2011. The request for proposals for the provision of OPS exams did not meet the testing program's needs; therefore, no contract will be awarded in FY 2009–2010.

14. Interpreter Recruitment Campaign
    Reduction: $30,000
    Rationale: The number of planned recruitment events for court interpreters will be reduced.

*Improvement Fund*

15. Trial Court Security Grants
    Reduction: $1,000,000
    Rationale: Various nonurgent court security projects will be deferred to FY 2010–2011.

16. Subscription Costs – Judicial Conduct Reporter
    Reduction: $1,500 (ongoing)
    Rationale: The subscription costs related to assigned judges will be paid from the Assigned Judges Program budget in the Trial Court Trust Fund.

17. Branchwide Strategic Planning
    Reduction: $450,880
    Rationale: Most of the planned activities related to the Public Trust and Confidence Survey will be deferred to FY 2010–2011; planning meetings will be held at AOC facilities; and paid facilitators will be replaced with volunteers.

18. California Courts – Connecting With Constituencies
    Reduction: $85,000
    Rationale: A symposium on court media issues will be cancelled.

19. Chambers Reimbursement Program
    Reduction: $2,000,000 (ongoing)
    Rationale: This program will be suspended until the council adopts a permanent policy on judicial benefits.

20. Trial Court Benefits Program for Legal Advice
    Reduction: $100,000 (ongoing)
    Rationale: With the termination of the AOC's trial court benefits program, there is no longer a need for legal advice related to the program.

21. Regional Office Grants
    Reduction: $1,170,000 (ongoing)
    Rationale: Rather than provide grants to courts, the funding will be used to offset reductions to trial court funding.

22. Audit Contract
    Reduction: $750,000
    Rationale: Funding encumbered in FY 2008–2009 will be used in FY 2009–2010.

23. Trial Court Healthcare Reserve Account
    Reduction: $1,136,000
    Rationale: Because the AOC's health benefit program for trial courts ended on December 31, 2008, there is no longer a need for a reserve.

*Rollover Requests*

Staff proposes that six projects or programs funded by the Improvement Fund be allowed to roll over unused prior-year allocations totaling $1.953 million (Column D of Table 3b displays the rollover amount by individual project or program). The rollover amount and rationale for each of the six projects or programs are discussed below.

1. Litigation Management Program
   Rollover: $1,500,000
   Rationale: The rollover funding would be used to supplement the ongoing allocation in the program for representing trial courts in litigation matters. With the

council now responsible for hundreds of transferred court facilities, there may be a need for additional funding in this area, as the base allocation that the council approved in 1999 was not intended to cover facilities-related matters.

2. Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program
   Rollover: $77,634
   Rationale: The rollover funding would be used to pay outside counsel fees and costs for representation of trial courts for legal services.

3. Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force
   Rollover: $30,608
   Rationale: The rollover funding would be used to pay for continuation of the task force's activities in FY 2009–2010, including one task force meeting to ensure implementation of the process, developing three subject-matter-specific distance learning programs that will focus on judicial education related to the task force's recommendations, conducting a forum for courts to discuss implementation plans and the impact on court operations, and assisting courts and providing technical assistance on a local level to develop implementation plans and to carry out the task force's recommended practices.

4. Commission for Impartial Courts
   Rollover: $3,222
   Rationale: In addition to funding from AOC's General Fund, the rollover funding would be used to support the remainder of the commission's work, which will include a task force meeting in FY 2009–2010, and enable the commission to continue its plans to finalize and present its report to the Judicial Council in October 2009. The report has been delayed primarily to accommodate requests by the California Judges Association and the judges of the Superior Court of Los Angeles to have sufficient time to study the report and make comments on the 109 recommendations.

5. Workers' Compensation Program Reserve
   Rollover: $143,780
   Rationale: The rollover would be used to support the final phase of the contract with the current vendor through August 31, 2010. Among other things, the vendor will resolve issues relating to outstanding worker's compensation liabilities for claims with dates of injury prior to August 1, 2003, analyze multiyear data and

perform actuarial studies, and provide a status report on outstanding liabilities for the counties.

6. Trial Court Health Reserve Account
   Rollover: $198,500
   Rationale: The rollover funding would be used to support the final phase of the contract with the current vendor. The vendor will develop a disengagement strategy for the self-insured trial court benefits plan, which ended as of December 31, 2008, address the retroactive benefits issues brought forth by the trial courts, and assist the AOC in maintaining compliance with legislation affecting the benefits program until March 31, 2010.

*New Funding Requests*
Staff recommends approval of two new one-time funding requests, as follows.

1. California Courthouses Book
   Allocation: $25,000 (Modernization Fund)
   Rationale: Funding for this one-time project would be used to redesign and reprint a publication of historic courthouses, which was originally published in 2000 by the California Supreme Court Historical Society and is used as an outreach tool. The new version will be printed as a paperback, since the current spiral-bound version is less convenient for distribution to the Courts of Appeal, the Historical Society, and distinguished visitors.

2. Investment Advisory for Trial Court Investment Program
   Allocation: $225,000 (Improvement Fund)
   Rationale: Funding for this one-time project would be made available to contract with an investment consultant to review and recommend, as appropriate, potential investment program enhancements for the current trial court investment program and recommend a comprehensive strategy to address the long-term investment needs of the trial courts.

FY 2008–2009 Excess 50/50 Split Revenue
Government Code section 77205(a) and California Rules of Court rule 6.105 require the council to determine an allocation of 50/50 split revenues that exceed the total FY 2002–2003 level. On December 7, 2004, the council adopted a methodology whereby courts in counties whose 50/50 split revenues exceeded the FY 2002–2003 base would receive a prorata share of a minimum of 20 percent of the total excess revenues. In the past five

years, total 50/50 split revenues have exceeded the total FY 2002–2003 base, and prorata distributions have been made to eligible courts from 20 percent of the excess revenue. In FY 2008–2009, total 50/50 split revenues ($57.844 million) did not exceed the total amount collected in FY 2002–2003 ($61.883 million); therefore, no excess revenue is available for distribution to courts.

Recommendation

1a. Allocate $53.831 million for projects and programs from the Modernization Fund ($8.414 million) and Improvement Fund ($45.417 million), which include adjustments to allocations previously approved by E&P, six rollover requests, and two new one-time funding requests.

1b. Authorize restoration of ongoing funding for the Alternative Dispute Resolution Program in FY 2010–2011 and authorize staff to proceed with program planning, including (1) soliciting court proposals for FY 2010–2011, (2) recommending projects to E&P for approval, and (3) entering into Intrabranch Agreements for FY 2010–2011 funding.

Rationale for Recommendation

The recommended allocations retain funding levels for projects and programs that support access to justice at the trial courts (e.g., self-help and complex civil litigation) and redirect allocations from other projects and programs to offset a portion of the $360.809 million reduction in funding to trial courts.

Alternative Actions Considered

None.

Comments From Interested Parties

Not applicable.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

None.

## II. Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure

In FY 2009–2010, continued development and deployment is planned for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects as well as maintenance and operations of ongoing programs that benefit trial court operations. AOC staff

recommends approval of a total of $171.123 million in allocations for these projects in FY 2009–2010 ($30.295 million from the Modernization Fund, $68.789 million from the Improvement Fund, and $72.039 million from TCTF). Appropriated General Fund moneys, which also support these statewide efforts, are indicated below.

In this section, the statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects, programs, and services are divided into two categories: Projects and Ongoing Programs and Services. The Project category consists of development and deployment of technology projects, which have a limited-term scope and include very large branch-wide initiatives, as well as projects of interest to trial courts and the Judicial Council, or are projects oriented towards improvements to the IT infrastructure at the branch that support trial court projects. The Ongoing Programs and Services category consists of maintenance and operations activities of very large branch-wide initiatives, those ongoing operations that are necessary for system maintenance, miscellaneous programs that provide service to the trial courts, and AOC staff support of the statewide administrative and technology infrastructure. Table 4 provides a list of all the projects and programs and the recommended allocations by fund source.

## Projects

### California Court Case Management System (CCMS)

*FY 2009–2010 Allocation from All Fund Sources - $62,318,777*

CCMS is a statewide initiative to develop and deploy a unified case management system for all 58 superior courts. The project is being managed by AOC's Southern Regional Office, with the participation of more than 200 court representatives from more than 25 counties, the Information Services Division (IS Division), and the Center for Families, Children, & the Courts. The CCMS interim application for civil, small claims, probate, and mental health is in production in the Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties.

CCMS utilizes the technology and the functionality developed for an interim civil system, incorporates the criminal and traffic functionality developed for an interim application, and has developed new functionality for family law, juvenile delinquency, and juvenile dependency. Additional areas of functionality in CCMS include court interpreter and court reporter management. CCMS has four distinct components: a core product, an internet portal, a statewide data warehouse, and data exchanges.

CCMS will have broad-ranging impacts once completed and deployed statewide. Far from just affecting the way the courts perform their day-to-day business, CCMS will provide significant advantages to state and local law enforcement agencies, child welfare services, child support services, and all Californians who participate in the court system as litigants, jurors, attorneys, victims, and witnesses.

During FY 2009–2010, funding will support continuation of the development of CCMS-V4. This is a multiyear development, which began in June 2007. The final functional design has been approved for the core application (including e-filing), statewide reporting data warehouse, and internet portal. Working groups are currently determining what can be standardized statewide, as well as developing a governance process for updating and maintaining common items like codes, calendar formats, bail schedule, and forms. Product Acceptance Testing will be performed by the AOC and court subject matter experts to verify the system meets all of the requirements before accepting the application. Testing is scheduled to begin January 13, 2010, and will continue for nineteen weeks. Product acceptance is on target for fall 2010. The balance of the development contract is approximately $18 million. In addition, funding will be used for the technical infrastructure, data integration, outside legal counsel, independent project oversight, and consulting services.

Funding will also support beginning the following major deployment activities:

- Deployment tools and templates that may be leveraged for future court deployments;
- Early adopter deployment for up to three courts (Ventura, San Diego, and potentially a third court);
- Data Conversion Assessment and Plan for each of the Early Adopter Courts;
- Infrastructure Assessments specific to each early adopter court; and
- Local Integration Assessment with justice partners for the early adopter courts.

An early adopter deployment plan will be created for the Ventura and San Diego Superior Courts and potentially a third court. The plan provides a schedule for all court deployment phases, identifies key tasks and deliverables, and the critical risks throughout the deployment. The plan will also include data conversion, data integration, and infrastructure assessments that will analyze the complex, integrated systems at each of the courts. The AOC, courts, and the deployment vendor will begin work with local justice partners in order to ensure a coordinated effort for data exchanges.

**Phoenix Financial and Human Resources System**
*FY 2009–2010 Allocation from All Fund Sources - $13,883,698*

*Financial Component*
The financial component of the Phoenix system enables courts to maintain control over expenditures, providing timely information about fiscal needs while complying with policies, procedures, regulations, and standardized processes. The current configuration includes General Ledger, Cost Accounting, Materials Management, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Project Accounting, and Trust Accounting. As of July 2009, all 58 courts are on the Phoenix Financial Module.

*Los Angeles Superior Court Transitioning to the Phoenix Financial System*
The Los Angeles Superior Court was the final court to be brought onto the Phoenix Financial System in July 2009. Due to the court's size and complexity, the system is being implemented in stages with completion anticipated by the end of the fiscal year. Court and AOC staff are currently collaborating to minimize the overall impact of the transition from the court's present legacy system (ECaps) to the Phoenix Financial System.

*Bank Account Consolidation Project*
This effort will introduce new Treasury functionality and will streamline existing business processes while reducing bank account fees for the trial courts statewide. It will consequently reduce daily bank reconciliation efforts performed manually by AOC staff. It is also anticipated that the consolidation of bank account balances will result in higher yields for short-term investment. Preparation and design efforts will continue through the current fiscal year with the initial target implementation in January, 2010.

*Human Resources Component*
The human resources component of the Phoenix system will leverage technology for human resources administration and in-house payroll processing, develop a customer service call center, standardize processes and procedures, collect data at the source, provide central administrative processing, and provide Manager Self Service (MSS) and Employee Self Service (ESS) functions to the employees of the courts. To date, six courts (Lake, Riverside, Sacramento, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, and Stanislaus) are live on the module, and the projected time frame for statewide completion is FY 2014–2015.

*Phoenix HR System Implementation Efforts for San Bernardino*
The San Bernardino Superior Court will cease to receive county human resources and payroll administrative services on July 1, 2010. In August 2009, the AOC initiated its Phoenix HR System deployment activities and is currently fully engaged with the San Bernardino Superior Court. Phoenix System Payroll activities will be activated on June 20, 2010, ensuring no gap in services.

**Interim Case Management System**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $546,232*

Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) is an interim case management system selected by the courts until they convert to CCMS. SJE operates in ten courts hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). Five courts use the system locally (i.e., not based at the CCTC), for a total of 15 courts statewide, with approximately 48 court locations and 2,552 licensed court users.

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support the completion of the deployment of the SJE case management system for criminal case types in Humboldt Superior Court. This deployment also includes three automated interfaces with the local justice partners and will unify the Humboldt Superior Court onto a single case management system for all case types. Additionally, funding will be utilized to update the existing SJE version used for the Plumas Superior Court to process traffic citations for Sierra Superior Court.

**California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $679,334*

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support the design, development, and testing for the CCPOR, scheduled for completion by March 2010. CCPOR will provide a centralized, statewide system allowing judicial officers from the bench (and law enforcement) to view order images and help prevent conflicting orders. Further, CCPOR will interface with the Department of Justice system for more timely and accurate processing of restraining and protective order data.

CCPOR requirements and design has been completed, and application development is underway with the CCTC work order currently being executed. Presentations to all 58 courts during June and July 2009 resulted in over 30 courts expressing interest and over 20 courts enrolled for participation. Courts and law information will be able to make

better, timelier decisions in executing and enforcing restraining and protective orders that will result in increased public safety.

**E-Exchange (Statewide Electronic Filing)**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $2,003,468*

Funding will support various activities related to CCMS-V3 and CCMS-V4 support (although the support work performed is done independently as a parallel process), e-filing service providers, San Mateo EZLegal program, smart forms, branch-owned e-filing portal and e-business strategic initiative, as follows:

- The CCMS-V3 Support project will assist at least one court with deploying the electronic filing component of CCMS-V3 (release 10). The benefits of these efforts will be the successful deployment of an e-filing solution in one or more courts, which will increase operational efficiencies through automation of filing and other business practices.
- The CCMS-V4 Support for this fiscal year is related to participating in the Product Acceptance Testing of the e-filing component of CCMS-V4. The benefits of these efforts will ensure that the CCMS-V4 product incorporates and improves upon the e-filing functionality in CCMS-V3 and will move the branch closer to its vision of statewide electronic filing.
- The efforts currently underway with the E-Filing Service Providers project include engaging private vendors in discussions aimed at establishing a baseline of technical, functional, and service level requirements that can be reasonably supported by private vendors. The goal will be to establish statewide contracts with vendors as a method of standardizing e-filing services for all court filers. The benefit of this effort includes realizing the branch goal of statewide e-filing and improved access to the courts for self-represented litigants and government filers.
- The EZlegal Program support will consist of exploring options for continuing this program, which San Mateo Superior Court is no longer able to host. The benefit of this effort is that it allows a Kleps award-winning program to continue operating and providing a valuable service to the courts and self-represented litigants.
- Smart forms are fill-able, save-able, and case management system consumable forms. This fiscal year, the smart forms project is moving forward on three fronts: (1) developing a business case and recommendation on the benefits, risks, deployment strategies, and costs associated with using this technology; (2)

developing a strategy for conversion of the Judicial Council forms to smart forms technology; and (3) supporting a proof of concept project which will allow the benefits of this technology to be measured. The benefits of these efforts include reduced data entry time and errors, and increased usability of e-filing solutions. Additionally, this technology would allow forms to contain business validations at the point of forms completion, which will help to ensure data integrity and accuracy.

- A branch-owned e-filing portal would increase e-filing participation throughout the state by providing access to all court filers, but particularly the filer communities that are not typically served by private vendors, namely self-represented litigants and government filers. This fiscal year, the e-filing team is moving forward with developing a business case and recommendation on the available technologies, benefits, risks, resource demands, and costs associated with a branch-owned e-filing portal. The benefits of these efforts include the ability to make an informed decision about the feasibility of a branch-owned portal versus finding an alternate solution for providing e-filing services to self-represented litigants at low or no-cost to the courts.
- The E-Business Strategic Initiative project is aimed at developing a strategic vision for how courts should operate with the technologies that are available to them, including those technologies that have already been procured and those that are on the market and should be considered. This fiscal year, the focus is on partnering with a consulting firm to do the vision and roadmap work. The benefits of this effort include identification of technologies that will help courts operate more efficiently and establishing a roadmap for how the branch should go about attaining a comprehensive e-business model for court operations.

**Uniform Civil Fees System**

*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $191,965*

The Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS) was developed to support the centralized reporting and distribution of civil fees until CCMS-V4, which has this function integrated into the system, is fully deployed. The total amount collected by the courts ranges between $45 and $50 million on a monthly basis. Failure to distribute fees to the appropriate entities within 45 days after the end of the collection month results in the state assessing a penalty of approximately $20,000 for each day that the distribution is late.

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support distribution updates required due to major legislative changes by the state as well as at the local level that normally occur in January and July. Minor changes will be supported throughout the year. In addition, additional functions will be developed to allow the users to input and validate distribution changes into the system without programming involvement. This function will enable the user to implement many of the changes that are mandated by local governments, but not more complex changes legislated by the state.

**CLIK System Development Project (formally known as Themis System Project)**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $548,216*

The current Themis System is a series of applications that support the courts and the AOC. At the center of the Themis System is the Contact and Positions System (CAPS) database that tracks data regarding judges, justices and commissioners for communication distribution. The related Themis System applications that use this database are the Assigned Judges Tracking System (AJTS), Education Audio Video System (AV), Education Faculty System, and Nomination System.

The Themis System database was first developed in 2001 on a platform that is no longer supported by the software vendors. In addition, AJTS can no longer be enhanced to support changes in business processes due to conflicts with the original design. Workaround solutions have been implemented, when possible, but the workaround solutions have negatively impacted business processes efficiencies and system performance.

The purpose of this project is to rewrite CAPS and AJTS and make relatively minor changes to other applications to accommodate changes in the underlying CAPS database. Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support the development of User Requirements and Functional Specifications Documents, system architecture design, and database design for the new CLIK system.

**Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools)**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $3,180,845*

The Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS) is a project to develop and implement a suite of tools required by AOC software development teams. The tools consist of Rational Functional Tester (a tool to test software functionality), Rational Performance Tester (a tool to test the limits of software performance), Rational ClearQuest (a defect

tracking tool), Rational Requisite Pro (a repository for software requirements documents) and Subversion (a system to keep track of program versions during development).

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support the following activities:

- Administration of the tools (adding/deleting users and projects);
- Configuring the tools for the various teams using the tools (e.g., CAFM, Phoenix, ACCMS, Web, CCPOR, ISB, ERP group);
- Integration of the tools with CCTC systems (e.g., integration of ClearQuest with the Remedy trouble ticket system, Integration of Subversion with ClearQuest);
- Training of staff in the use of these tools;
- Software Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure development; and
- Software maintenance for the existing tools (upgrading, patching, vendor support).

Some of the benefits resulting from these activities include:

- Automated software testing to speed up development and deliver a product with fewer defects;
- Reduced costs and impacts to court staff and other users by identifying defects earlier in the development process, before they are identified in production;
- Defect tracking so that defects can be fixed in a timely fashion and that defects can be addressed according to severity;
- Performance testing to determine in development when applications will become unacceptably slow which can be addressed with additional hardware or changes in application design;
- Requirements-driven testing so that each application requirement can be tested, and auditing to validate that each requirement has been tested; and
- Formal software quality assurance policies to institutionalize software development best practices and bring application quality to a uniform and high standard.

## Ongoing Programs and Services

### V2 Case Management System – Criminal & Traffic

*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $4,932,943*

V2 is a case management system for criminal and traffic case categories. Fresno Superior Court implemented V2 in July 2006. Maintenance and support of V2, the case

management system for criminal and traffic case types in Fresno Superior Court, successfully transitioned from Deloitte Consulting to the AOC in September 2009. Knowledge transfer classes were completed in July 2009. Significant projects during the transition include the AOC team's first functional release to correct critical issues in Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) reports in October 2009. By assuming internal responsibility for supporting the application, the total savings over the projected useful life of V2 is estimated at $4.98 million.

During FY 2009–2010, funding will support management and support activities. The V2 maintenance and operations funding will support:

- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at the CCTC;
- Help desk support for end users; and
- New releases of the product to address judicial branch requirements and legislative changes.

**California Court Case Management System (CCMS) – Ongoing Maintenance & Operations**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $22,339,875*

CCMS maintenance and operations includes support for the interim civil application, which is still in development. During FY 2009–2010, funding will support:

- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at vendor data center;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services for testing, training, and production environments at CCTC;
- Vendor help desk support for end users; and
- New releases of the products to address judicial branch requirements and legislative changes.

**Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $19,186,302*

*Maintenance and Operations Stabilization and Baseline Project*
One of the fundamental goals of the upcoming year is to reduce the effort necessary to implement system configuration changes for key components. In the stabilized system, it will be easier to fix a potential defect and to add new business parameters or modify

existing ones (such as updating the system after a change in a Memorandum of Understanding). Numerous benefits from the stabilization project are anticipated, including the reduction of the configuration effort to rollout the human resources component to the remaining courts. Additionally, in the upgraded version of the platform there is a new replacement module for the General Ledger of the Finance component. This module was not implemented previously during the upgrade in July as it had not been distributed anywhere in the public sector at the time and Phoenix staff chose to avoid the potential problems initial users would face utilizing the new technology.

*Flexible Reporting Remediation*

An effort is also underway to remediate existing business intelligence functionality. The goal is to reduce the time and effort required to implement reporting enhancements and increase user awareness and satisfaction of the tool.

**Interim Case Management System**

*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $7,485,920*

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support maintenance and operational activities such as implementation of legislative updates, deployment of maintenance releases as well as providing steady state and disaster recovery support for SJE and the related system interfaces.

**California Court Technology Center - Ongoing Operations**

*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $12,812,340*

The California Court Technology Center (CCTC) continues to provide ongoing maintenance and operational support to areas including the data center, data network management, desktop computing and local server, help desk, and IT service management, which includes service delivery and support. The current vendor for the CCTC is committed to delivering cost effective and high quality technical solutions statewide utilizing a dual data center model that standardizes trial court application systems and operations for all trial courts. The CCTC provides consistent, high quality case management, financial and HR systems, and an updated and more robust infrastructure available without interruption.

**Data Integration**

*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $7,321,774*

Data Integration provides access to, and the ability to share, information between courts, third parties, the public and AOC sponsored applications. This involves the maintenance of a services oriented architecture (SOA)-based integration services backbone (ISB). There are currently over seventeen distinct exchanges using the ISB, to exchange information within the judicial branch applications and external service providers. Exchanges range from once-a-month files to real-time credit card payment authorizations. A justice partner portal was also developed which uses the ISB infrastructure. Data Integration also provides central services relating to CLETS and DMV access by the courts as well as support to multiple projects.

**Telecommunications Support**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $14,717,279*

The Telecommunications Support program develops and supports a standardized level of network infrastructure for the superior courts. Components of the program include cabling, data network hardware, security hardware and monitoring, connectivity between court sites and justice partners, and training. This infrastructure provides a foundation for enterprise system applications such as Phoenix and CCMS, via shared services at the CCTC, which eases deployment and provides operational efficiencies and secures valuable court information resources.

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support the following activities:

*Local Area Network (LAN)/Wide Area Network (WAN) Technology Refresh* – The purpose of the technology refresh project is to:

- Maintain an infrastructure aligned with the emerging needs of the enterprise applications;
- Maintain the investment made in the original LAN/WAN project;
- Enable the courts to further utilize their Internet Protocol (IP)-based network foundation by supporting other technologies such as Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP); and by building automation systems, installing security cameras, electronic signage, energy management systems, etc.;
- Provide continuous access to all court systems;
- Support information and data security; and
- Support the courts as they complete a logical separation from their counties.

*Network Training* - As technology changes or is upgraded, it's critical to keep staff up to date on these enhancements. Network training is offered to the courts so staff can

administer and maintain their networks. This activity ensures reliable network operation as well as contributes to higher with staff retention rates.

*Information Security Monitoring* – Intrusion Detection System (IDS) monitoring has been a cornerstone of this program since its inception, providing the judicial branch with continuous pro-active monitoring for intrusions, viruses and other types of electronic attacks. Judicial branch data could be seriously compromised without this monitoring to prevent undetected intrusions.

**Enterprise Policy/Planning - Operations**
*FY 2009–2010 Budget from All Fund Sources - $4,710,795*

Funding will provide continued administrative and technical support for the Enterprise Technology Architecture (EA) program, which provides a roadmap on how the various court technology initiatives fit together from a business and technology perspective. Activities planned for FY 2009–2010 include continuing to lead the technical architecture design process for major enterprise-wide initiatives for the judicial branch; consultation on technical designs and issues for the CCMS, Phoenix, Computer-Aided Facilities Management (CAFM), Document Management System (DMS), Data Integration and other branch-wide initiatives; support of the trial courts with EA-related issues and solution design; implementation of the EA governance and decision process; investigation and lead review for technical issues brought to governing bodies; consultation on technology decisions affecting the branch; and staffing the Enterprise Technology Architecture unit.

**Enhanced Collections**
*FY 2009–2010 Improvement Fund - $801,947*

With funding in FY 2009–2010, the Enhanced Collection Unit (ECU) will continue to provide ongoing professional and technical support to all court and county collection programs, as well as justice partners (including the California State Bar), and enhance the performance and effectiveness of the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt statewide. Pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.010, the first annual report on the performance of each collection program will be sent to the Legislature on December 31, 2009. The 2010 Sentencing Fines and Fees Assistant database update, which provides assistance to judicial officers with the imposition of fines, fees, penalties and assessment on selected criminal and traffic offenses, will be posted on the two collections websites, Serranus, and an external site accessible to all users. The ECU will continue to

participate in CCMS meetings to contribute to the functional design and application of the system as it pertains to the collection of court-ordered debt and other related financial components. The ECU will make a presentation to the California Revenue Officers Association regarding the enforcement of delinquent court-ordered debt and new legislation, and will provide several web-based seminars and training sessions to court and county collection staff on improving the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. Upon request, additional training sessions and/or web-based seminars will be provided to judicial officers, staff and justice partners on the imposition and collection of fines, fees, and assessments.

**Regional Office Assistance Group**
*FY 2009–2010 Improvement Fund - $1,740,862*

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will be used to provide legal support for regional offices, with staff primarily based at the regional offices. Each regional office serves as liaison, clearinghouse, advocate, consultant, and service provider to the trial courts. Staff with expertise in court services, finance, legal, facilities, human resources, and education and training are stationed at the regional offices and work directly with the courts to improve court administration and operations. Court visits and regional meetings ensure that the regions' perspectives are brought forward to the Judicial Council.

**California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System**
*FY 2009–2010 Improvement Fund - $263,322*

The California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) is a secure, statewide network utilized by criminal justice and related agencies to access a variety of state level or interstate databases. Five courts are now using the statewide network to access and update various California and federal databases, including the Domestic Violence Restraining Order System. For FY 2009–2010, 2 to 3 additional courts will be deployed onto the CLETS network. Funding will provide ongoing support of the system.

**Internal Audits**
*FY 2009–2010 Improvement Fund - $764,664*

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will support the continued contractor assistance for the branch's ongoing internal audit program. The internal audit program was initially approved by the Judicial Council in FY 2000–2001 and Internal Audit Services conducts

comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) at each of the 58 trial courts approximately once every 4 years encompassing court administration, cash controls, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations. These activities improve accountability regarding the judicial branch's use of public resources, assist the branch in identifying opportunities to improve operational efficiency, and evaluate the branch's adherence to its statutory and constitutional mandates.

**Trial Court Reengineering**
*FY 2009–2010 Improvement Fund - $290,946*

The Reengineering and Process Improvement Unit focuses on assisting trial courts in reengineering their business processes and systems to achieve improvement in business performance. Funding in FY 2009–2010 will allow the Reengineering Unit to continue assisting two trial courts in the AOC's Northern/Central Region as well as providing reengineering services to other trial courts as workload permits.

**Treasury**
*FY 2009–2010 Improvement Fund - $228,230*

Funding in FY 2009–2010 will be utilized for ongoing costs associated with staff responsible for the accounting and distribution of civil fees collected by the trial courts. Staff receive the monthly UCF collection reporting data from all 58 trial courts, enter this reporting data into a financial systems application that calculates the statutory distributions, and execute the monthly cash distributions due to state and local agency recipients.

Recommendation

2. Approve allocation of:

    a. $87.771 million for statewide administrative programs and services, from the Modernization Fund ($9.958 million), the Improvement Fund ($38.309 million), and the TCTF ($39.504 million), and

    b. $83.353 million for statewide administrative and technology infrastructure projects, from the Modernization Fund ($20.337 million), the Improvement Fund ($30.481 million), and the TCTF ($32.535 million)

Rationale for Recommendation
The recommendations above are consistent with Judicial Branch goals and the statutory purposes of the special funds, and represent prudent use of the special funds for achieving various goals of the Judicial Branch as they apply to trial courts.

Alternative Actions Considered
Last year, staff had presented proposed allocations for statewide technology initiatives that reflected a higher level of deployment activity for CCMS and the human resources component of Phoenix than currently recommended. The deployments were modified as a result of the allocation by the council of $170.3 million to offset court reductions and unfunded costs in the current fiscal year. The original funding model and deployment strategy included a plan to deploy CCMS statewide as quickly as possible in order to begin realizing the operational and financial benefits as stated in the business case. The Phoenix payroll deployment schedule, which originally was planned to complete in December 2012, now has been pushed back to June 2015. While development of these systems proceeds as planned, deferred deployment will delay the cost savings and efficiencies gained from statewide deployment of the Phoenix system.

Comments From Interested Parties
Not applicable.

Implementation Requirements and Costs
Once approved, program staff will prepare the appropriate documents such as Requests for Proposals, Standard Agreements, and Memoranda of Understanding to implement these projects.

## III. Asset Replacement

Background
At its August 24, 2000 business meeting, the council allocated $7.4 million from the TCTF to courts for the purpose of replacing information technology equipment. Since FY 2000–2001 courts have received an annual statewide allocation of $7.4 million from TCTF for asset replacement, although in FY 2001–2002 and FY 2002–2003 the allocation was distributed from the Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund due to one-time allocated reductions of the $7.4 million from TCTF included in the state budget. In FY 2002–2003 courts were permitted to redirect their special fund allocations for asset replacement to offset the impact of budget reductions in that fiscal year.

Recommendation

3. Allocate $7.4 million to courts for the replacement for technology assets, such as personal computers and printers, but also authorize courts to redirect these funds to offset the impact of budget reductions, as deemed necessary by each court, in FY 2009–2010.

Rationale for Recommendation

Given the substantial ongoing funding reductions to trial courts, removing the restrictions on the use of the asset replacement allocations will permit courts to redirect these funds for more critical needs, including offsetting a portion of their reductions.

Alternative Actions Considered

None.

Comments From Interested Parties

AOC's Information Services Division concurs with the recommendation.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

None.

## IV. Delegation of Technical Adjustment Authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts

Background

Government Code section 77209(g) allows the Judicial Council, with appropriate guidelines, to delegate the administration of the Improvement Fund and the Modernization Fund to the Administrative Director of the Courts (Administrative Director). At its January 30, 2002 business meeting, the council approved guidelines for the delegation of the administration of the two special funds to the Administrative Director. Under the guidelines, once E&P approves allocations from the special funds, the Administrative Director can, among other things, approve new projects or programs within the approved funding level of the budget categories; approve changes to, defer, or eliminate programs or projects in the approved budget, if the changes, deferrals, or eliminations do not result in a transfer of money from any budget category; approve one-time emergency funding requests from the reserve; and transfer up to 20 percent of the budget from categories one and two to any other category.

Recommendation

4. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to adjust allocations of funds to courts and for approved programs and projects, as needed, to address unanticipated needs and contingencies. Any adjustments will be reported back to the council, after the end of the fiscal year.

Rationale for Recommendation

This is a standard technical delegation to the Administrative Director, needed to manage the budget during the fiscal year. For some of the allocations included in this report, the actual amounts may change as updated information is received from project and program managers. Rather than being required to return to the council during the fiscal year to seek authority to amend these allocations, having the authority delegated to the Administrative Director to do so in advance will facilitate allocating funding when final amounts are known.

In addition, each year some courts incur unanticipated costs that, depending on the financial health of the court, may be difficult to address, creating a cash flow problem. Such unanticipated issues make it advisable that the Administrative Director have the ability to direct unallocated statewide special fund monies in an efficient and flexible manner.

Alternative Actions Considered

No specific alternatives were considered, other than coming back to the council any time technical adjustments need to be made or if unanticipated costs arise. This approach, though, would likely cause delays for getting necessary funding to the courts, programs, or projects involved.

Comments From Interested Parties

Not applicable.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

None.

Table 1

# Overview of Special Funds
# FY 2008-09 Budgets and Actuals and FY 2009-10 Recommended Allocation
**(amount in dollars)**

| I. Modernization Fund | FY 2008-09 Budget | FY 2008-09 Actual | FY 2009-10 Budget | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Projected Resources / Previously Approved Allocation | Adjustment, Rollover, and New | Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocations |
| | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E |
| Adjusted Beginning Balance | 20,773,297 | 23,793,198 | 27,618,428 | - | **27,618,428** |
| Revenues and Transfers | 39,630,333 | 39,655,197 | 11,090,572 | - | **11,090,572** |
| **Total Resources** | **60,403,630** | **63,448,395** | **38,709,000** | **-** | **38,709,000** |
| All Other Projects and Programs | 12,888,087 | 11,142,079 | 11,392,802 | (2,978,685) | **8,414,117** |
| Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure | 47,276,849 | 24,687,888 | - | 30,294,883 | **30,294,883** |
| **Total Expenditures and Encumbrances** | **60,164,936** | **35,829,967** | **11,392,802** | **27,316,198** | **38,709,000** |
| **Ending Fund Balance** | **238,694** | **27,618,428** | **27,316,198** | | **-** |

| II. Improvement Fund | FY 2008-09 Budget | FY 2008-09 Actual | FY 2009-10 Budget | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Projected Resources / Previously Approved Allocation | Adjustment, Rollover, and New | Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation |
| | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E |
| Adjusted Beginning Balance | 80,050,994 | 81,749,735 | 35,610,873 | - | **35,610,873** |
| Revenues and Transfers | 77,491,898 | 73,510,533 | 69,246,692 | - | **69,246,692** |
| **Total Resources** | **157,542,891** | **155,260,267** | **104,857,564** | **-** | **104,857,564** |
| All Other Projects and Programs | 52,024,884 | 29,443,528 | 37,342,239 | (4,514,636) | **32,827,603** |
| Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure | 103,254,161 | 87,885,112 | - | 68,370,291 | **68,370,291** |
| Emergency Funding Reserve (reserved until March 15) | - | 1,625,899 | 12,589,700 | - | **12,589,700** |
| Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve | 52,024,884 | 31,069,427 | | (9,589,030) | **(9,589,030)** |
| **Total Expenditures and Encumbrances** | **155,279,045** | **118,954,539** | **49,931,939** | **63,855,655** | **104,198,564** |
| Prorata | 695,000 | 694,856 | 659,000 | - | **659,000** |
| **Ending Fund Balance** | **1,568,846** | **35,610,873** | **54,266,625** | | **-** |

| III. Combined | FY 2008-09 Budget | FY 2008-09 Actual | FY 2009-10 Budget | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Projected Resources / Previously Approved Allocation | Adjustment, Rollover, and New | Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation |
| | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E |
| Adjusted Beginning Balance | 100,824,291 | 105,542,933 | 63,229,301 | - | **63,229,301** |
| Revenues and Transfers | 117,122,231 | 113,165,730 | 80,337,264 | - | **80,337,264** |
| **Total Resources** | **217,946,521** | **218,708,662** | **143,566,564** | **-** | **143,566,564** |
| All Other Projects and Programs | 64,912,971 | 40,585,607 | 48,735,041 | (7,493,321) | **41,241,720** |
| Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure | 150,531,010 | 112,573,000 | - | 98,665,174 | **98,665,174** |
| Emergency Funding Reserve | - | 1,625,899 | 12,589,700 | | **3,000,670** |
| **Total Expenditures and Encumbrances** | **215,443,981** | **154,784,506** | **61,324,741** | **91,171,853** | **142,907,564** |
| Prorata | 695,000 | 694,856 | 659,000 | - | **659,000** |
| **Ending Fund Balance** | **1,807,540** | **63,229,301** | **81,582,823** | | **-** |

# Modernization Fund
## Summary of FY 2008-09 Budgets and Actuals and FY 2009-10 Recommended Allocation
**(amount in dollars)**

| | FY 2008-09 Budget | FY 2008-09 Actual | FY 2009-10 Budget | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Projected Resources / Previously Approved Allocation | Adjustment | Rollover | New | Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation |
| | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E | Column F | Column G |
| **Adjusted Beginning Balance** | **20,773,297** | **23,793,198** | **27,618,428** | **-** | | **-** | **27,618,428** |
| **Revenues and Transfers** | | | | | | | |
| Income from Surplus Money Investment Fund | 921,333 | 880,205 | 350,022 | | | | **350,022** |
| Miscellaneous Revenue | - | 65,992 | - | | | | **-** |
| State General Fund Transfer | 38,709,000 | 38,709,000 | 38,709,000 | | | | **38,709,000** |
| Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund | | | (27,968,450) | | | | **(27,968,450)** |
| **Total, Revenues and Transfers** | **39,630,333** | **39,655,197** | **11,090,572** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **11,090,572** |
| **Total Resources** | **60,403,630** | **63,448,395** | **38,709,000** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **38,709,000** |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Expenditures and Encumbrances** | | | | | | | |
| Category 1 - Statewide Technology Projects | 47,276,849 | 24,687,888 | - | - | - | 30,294,883 | **30,294,883** |
| Category 2 - Education and Developmental Programs | 3,566,433 | 2,692,526 | 3,561,653 | (814,848) | - | 25,000 | **2,771,805** |
| Category 3 - Pilot, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects | 9,321,654 | 8,449,553 | 7,831,149 | (2,188,837) | - | - | **5,642,312** |
| **Total Expenditures and Encumbrances** | **60,164,936** | **35,829,967** | **11,392,802** | **(3,003,685)** | **-** | **30,319,883** | **38,709,000** |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Ending Fund Balance** | **238,694** | **27,618,428** | **27,316,198** | | | | **-** |
| | | | | | | | |
| Budget Act Appropriation Authority | 44,675,999 | 44,676,000 | 38,709,000 | | | | **38,709,000** |
| **Unused or (Needed) Appropriation Authority** | **(15,488,937)** | **8,846,033** | **27,316,198** | | | | **-** |

# Modernization Fund
## FY 2009-2010 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program
**(amount in dollars)**

| Line # | Project and Program Description | Term of Funding | Previously Approved Allocation | Recommended | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Adjustment | Rollover | New | Total Allocation |
| | | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E | Column F |
| 1 | **Category 1 - Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure** | | | | | | |
| 2 | **I. Projects** | | | | | | |
| 3 | California Court Case Management Systems (CCMS) | | | | | 18,957,475 | **18,957,475** |
| 4 | California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) | | | | | 639,412 | **639,412** |
| 5 | CLIK System Development Project | | | | | 548,216 | **548,216** |
| 6 | Interim Case Management Systems | | | | | - | **-** |
| 7 | Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services | | | | | - | **-** |
| 8 | Uniform Civil Fees | | | | | 191,965 | **191,965** |
| 9 | **II. Ongoing Programs and Services** | | | | | | |
| 10 | California Court Case Management Systems (CCMS) | | | | | - | **-** |
| 11 | California Court Case Management Systems (CCMS) V2 | | | | | - | **-** |
| 12 | California Court Technology Center - Ongoing Operations | | | | | 91,803 | **91,803** |
| 13 | Data Integration | | | | | 4,345,603 | **4,345,603** |
| 14 | Enterprise Policy/Planning Operations | | | | | 3,021,915 | **3,021,915** |
| 15 | Interim Case Management Systems | | | | | 2,498,494 | **2,498,494** |
| 16 | Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services | | | | | - | **-** |
| 17 | **Total, Category 1** | | **-** | **-** | **-** | **30,294,883** | **30,294,883** |
| 18 | **Category 2 - Education and Developmental Programs** | | | | | | |
| 19 | California Courthouses Book | Ends in 09-10 | - | | | 25,000 | **25,000** |
| 20 | CFCC Publications | Ongoing | 168,961 | (68,961) | | | **100,000** |
| 21 | Criminal Law and Procedure Institute | Ongoing | 20,000 | 6,000 | | | **26,000** |
| 22 | New Council Member (Trial Court) Orientation | Ongoing | 23,000 | | | | **23,000** |
| 23 | Trial Court Outreach - Visits to Council and AOC | Ongoing | 50,000 | (50,000) | | | **-** |
| 24 | B.E. Witkin Judicial College of California | Ongoing | 246,000 | 81,000 | | | **327,000** |
| 25 | Budget Focused Training and Meetings | Ongoing | 34,823 | - | | | **34,823** |
| 26 | CA Judicial Administration Conference (every odd-numbered fiscal year) | Ongoing | 270,000 | (270,000) | | | **-** |
| 27 | CFCC Programs | Ongoing | 234,957 | (57,000) | | | **177,957** |
| 28 | Civil Law and Procedure Institute | Ongoing | 45,000 | (45,000) | | | **-** |
| 29 | Court Clerk Training Institute | Ongoing | 360,000 | (210,000) | | | **150,000** |
| 30 | Court Management Course (Fall CJSP) | Ongoing | 61,000 | 97,000 | | | **158,000** |
| 31 | Court Management Curriculum | Ends in 09-10 | 33,333 | | | | **33,333** |
| 32 | Court Staff Training | Ongoing | 20,000 | (10,000) | | | **10,000** |
| 33 | Cow County Judges Institute | Ongoing | 38,500 | (38,500) | | | **-** |
| 34 | Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast) | Ongoing | 350,000 | (30,000) | | | **320,000** |
| 35 | Ethics Training for Judges | Ongoing | 2,000 | (1,000) | | | **1,000** |
| 36 | Family Law Assignment Education | Ongoing | 68,000 | (43,000) | | | **25,000** |
| 37 | Human Resources Staff Training | Ongoing | 10,000 | | | | **10,000** |
| 38 | Judicial Attorney Institute (every odd-numbered fiscal year) | Ongoing | 25,000 | 28,000 | | | **53,000** |
| 39 | Juvenile Law Assignment Education | Ongoing | 50,000 | (50,000) | | | **-** |
| 40 | Labor Relations Academy | Ongoing | 45,150 | (9,000) | | | **36,150** |
| 41 | Mid-level Management Conferences | Ongoing | 50,000 | (5,000) | | | **45,000** |
| 42 | Orientation for New Court Judges | Ongoing | 135,000 | (9,000) | | | **126,000** |
| 43 | Overview Courses | Ongoing | 106,000 | 1,000 | | | **107,000** |
| 44 | Probate and Mental Health Institute | Ongoing | 54,500 | (54,500) | | | **-** |
| 45 | Probate/Conservatorship Institute | Ends in 09-10 | 74,150 | (37,150) | | | **37,000** |
| 46 | Statewide Fairness Conference (Spring CJSP) | Ongoing | 50,000 | (50,000) | | | **-** |
| 47 | Technical Assistance to Local Courts | Ongoing | 200,000 | | | | **200,000** |
| 48 | Train the Trainers - Faculty Development | Ongoing | 115,000 | 70,000 | | | **185,000** |
| 49 | Training Coordinators Conference | Ongoing | 7,500 | 1,042 | | | **8,542** |

# Modernization Fund
## FY 2009-2010 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program
**(amount in dollars)**

| Line # | Project and Program Description | Term of Funding | Previously Approved Allocation | Recommended | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Adjustment | Rollover | New | Total Allocation |
| | | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E | Column F |
| 50 | Trial Court Faculty (Statewide Education Programs) | Ongoing | 325,000 | 55,000 | | | **380,000** |
| 51 | Western States Court Leadership Academy | Ends in 09-10 | 97,779 | (97,779) | | | **-** |
| 52 | Winter Continuing Judicial Studies Program (CJSP) | Ongoing | 191,000 | (18,000) | | | **173,000** |
| 53 | **Total, Category 2** | | **3,561,653** | **(814,848)** | **-** | **25,000** | **2,771,805** |
| 54 | **Category 3 - Pilot, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects** | | | | | | |
| 55 | Alternative Dispute Resolution for Civil Cases | Ongoing | 1,740,000 | (1,740,000) | | | **-** |
| 56 | Collaborative Justice | Ends in 09-10 | 48,000 | (9,600) | | | **38,400** |
| 57 | Complex Civil Litigation | Ongoing | 4,001,010 | | | | **4,001,010** |
| 58 | Court Interpreter Program - Testing Development/Implementation | Ongoing | 500,000 | (199,537) | | | **300,463** |
| 60 | Court-Appointed Counsel, Performance Database | Ongoing | 230,000 | - | | | **230,000** |
| 61 | Courts Review Magazine | Ongoing | 123,789 | (700) | | | **123,089** |
| 62 | Developing Promising Practices | Ongoing | 369,500 | (30,500) | | | **339,000** |
| 63 | Interactive Software - Self-rep Electronic Forms | Ongoing | 60,000 | | | | **60,000** |
| 64 | Interpreter Recruitment Campaign | Ongoing | 125,000 | (30,000) | | | **95,000** |
| 66 | Kleps Award Program | Ongoing | 80,000 | (25,500) | | | **54,500** |
| 67 | Presiding Judge and Court Executive Meetings | Ongoing | 200,000 | (37,000) | | | **163,000** |
| 68 | Self-help Videos for the Website | Ongoing | 3,850 | | | | **3,850** |
| 70 | Trial Court Performance and Accountability | Ongoing | 350,000 | (116,000) | | | **234,000** |
| 71 | **Total, Category 3** | | **7,831,149** | **(2,188,837)** | **-** | **-** | **5,642,312** |
| 72 | **Total, All Categories** | | **11,392,802** | **(3,003,685)** | **-** | **30,319,883** | **38,709,000** |

# Trial Court Improvement Fund
## Summary of FY 2008-09 Budgets and Actuals and FY 2009-10 Recommended Allocation
**(amount in dollars)**

| | FY 2008-09 Budget | FY 2008-09 Actual | FY 2009-10 Budget | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Projected Resources / Previously Approved Allocation | Adjustment | Rollover | New | Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation |
| | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E | Column F | Column G |
| **Adjusted Beginning Balance** | **80,050,994** | **81,749,735** | **35,610,873** | **-** | | **-** | **35,610,873** |
| **Revenues** | | | | | | | |
| 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue | 61,907,213 | 57,843,774 | 56,739,641 | - | | - | **56,739,641** |
| 2% Automation Fund | 18,125,870 | 17,893,248 | 17,959,913 | - | | - | **17,959,913** |
| Income from Surplus Money Investment Fund | 2,323,805 | 2,757,317 | 567,787 | - | | - | **567,787** |
| Royalties from Publications and Other | 482,011 | 363,484 | 362,951 | - | | - | **362,951** |
| **Subtotal, Revenues** | **82,838,898** | **78,857,823** | **75,630,292** | **-** | | **-** | **75,630,292** |
| **Transfers and Adjustments** | | | | | | | |
| 1% Transfer from Trial Court Trust Fund | 26,216,000 | 26,215,710 | 25,179,400 | - | | - | **25,179,400** |
| Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund | (31,563,000) | (31,563,000) | (31,563,000) | - | | - | **(31,563,000)** |
| **Subtotal, Transfers and Adjustments** | **(5,347,000)** | **(5,347,290)** | **(6,383,600)** | **-** | | **-** | **(6,383,600)** |
| **Total Resources** | **157,542,891** | **155,260,267** | **104,857,564** | **-** | | **-** | **104,857,564** |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Expenditures and Encumbrances** | | | | | | | |
| Category 1 - Ongoing Statewide Programs (excluding statewide administrative and technology infrastructure) | 21,859,318 | 16,014,051 | 19,218,744 | (3,637,380) | 1,577,634 | - | **17,158,998** |
| Category 2 - Trial Court Projects and Model Programs | 30,165,566 | 13,429,477 | 18,123,495 | (3,056,000) | 376,110 | 225,000 | **15,668,605** |
| Category 3 - Emergency Funding Reserve (reserved until March 15) | - | 1,625,899 | 12,589,700 | | | - | **12,589,700** |
| Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve | | | | (9,589,030) | | | **(9,589,030)** |
| **Subtotal, Local Assistance** | **52,024,884** | **31,069,427** | **49,931,939** | **(6,693,380)** | **1,953,744** | **225,000** | **35,828,273** |
| Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure - Local Assistance | 85,979,481 | 76,069,222 | - | - | | 54,792,110 | **54,792,110** |
| Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure - Administrative Support | 17,274,680 | 11,815,890 | | - | | 13,578,181 | **13,578,181** |
| **Subtotal, Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure** | **103,254,161** | **87,885,112** | **-** | **-** | | **68,370,291** | **68,370,291** |
| **Total Expenditures and Encumbrances** | **155,279,045** | **118,954,539** | **49,931,939** | **(6,693,380)** | | **68,595,291** | **104,198,564** |
| Prorata | 695,000 | 694,856 | 659,000 | - | | - | **659,000** |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Ending Fund Balance** | **1,568,846** | **35,610,873** | **54,266,625** | | | | **-** |

# Improvement Fund
# FY 2009-2010 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program

**(amount in dollars)**

| Line # | Project and Program Description | Term of Funding | Previously Approved Allocation | Recommended | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Adjustment | Rollover | New | Total Allocation |
| | | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E | Column F |
| 1 | **Category 1 - Ongoing Statewide Programs** | | | | | | |
| 2 | ***(1) Non Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure*** | | | | | | |
| 3 | Branchwide Strategic Planning | Ongoing | 500,000 | (450,880) | | | **49,120** |
| 4 | CA Courts - Connecting with Constituencies | Ongoing | 400,000 | (85,000) | | | **315,000** |
| 5 | Chambers Reimbursement Program | Ongoing | 2,000,000 | (2,000,000) | | | **-** |
| 6 | Domestic Violence Family Law Interpreter Program | Ongoing | 1,750,000 | | | | **1,750,000** |
| 7 | Employment Assistance Program for Bench Officers | Ongoing | 100,000 | | | | **100,000** |
| 8 | Judicial Performance Defense Insurance | Ongoing | 762,134 | | | | **762,134** |
| 9 | Litigation Management Program | Ongoing | 4,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 | | **6,000,000** |
| 10 | Self-Help Center | Ongoing | 5,000,000 | | | | **5,000,000** |
| 12 | Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support | Ongoing | 300,000 | | | | **300,000** |
| 13 | Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter | Ongoing | 21,610 | (1,500) | | | **20,110** |
| 14 | Trial Court Benefits Program for Legal Advice | Ongoing | 200,000 | (100,000) | | | **100,000** |
| 15 | Trial Court Security Grants | Ongoing | 3,000,000 | (1,000,000) | | | **2,000,000** |
| 16 | Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program | Ongoing | 685,000 | | 77,634 | | **762,634** |
| 17 | ***Subtotal, Non-Technology*** | | **19,218,744** | **(3,637,380)** | **1,577,634** | **-** | **17,158,998** |
| 18 | ***(2) Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure*** | | | | | | |
| 19 | **I. Projects** | | | | | | |
| 20 | California Courts Protective Order Registry | | | | | 39,922 | **39,922** |
| 21 | California Court Case Management System (CCMS) | | | | | 15,128,585 | **15,128,585** |
| 22 | E-Exchange | | | | | 2,003,468 | **2,003,468** |
| 23 | Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools) | | | | | 3,180,845 | **3,180,845** |
| 24 | Interim Case Management Systems | | | | | - | **-** |
| 25 | Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services | | | | | 9,708,860 | **9,708,860** |
| 26 | **Subtotal, Projects** | | | | | **30,061,680** | **30,061,680** |
| 27 | **II. Ongoing Programs and Services** | | | | | | |
| 28 | **(I) Ongoing Programs and Services (Local Assistance)** | | | | | | |
| 29 | California Court Case Management System (CCMS) | | | | | - | **-** |
| 30 | California Courts Technology Center - Ongoing Operations | | | | | 768,396 | **768,396** |
| 31 | Data Integration | | | | | 2,277,709 | **2,277,709** |
| 32 | Enterprise Policy/Planning Operations | | | | | 1,688,880 | **1,688,880** |
| 33 | Interim Case Management Systems | | | | | 934,650 | **934,650** |
| 34 | Telecom Support | | | | | 14,717,279 | **14,717,279** |
| 35 | V2 Case Management System | | | | | 4,343,516 | **4,343,516** |
| 36 | **Subtotal, Ongoing Programs and Services (Local Assistance)** | | | | | **24,730,430** | **24,730,430** |
| 37 | **(II) Ongoing Programs and Services (Administrative Support)** | | | | | | |
| 38 | ***A. Support Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure*** | | | | | | |
| 39 | California Courts Case Management System (CCMS) | | | | | 5,252,309 | **5,252,309** |
| 40 | California Courts Technology Center - Ongoing Operations | | | | | 1,491,243 | **1,491,243** |
| 41 | Data Integration | | | | | 698,462 | **698,462** |
| 42 | Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services | | | | | 1,456,769 | **1,456,769** |
| 43 | V2 Case Management System | | | | | 589,427 | **589,427** |

# Improvement Fund
# FY 2009-2010 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program

**(amount in dollars)**

| Line # | Project and Program Description | Term of Funding | Previously Approved Allocation | Recommended | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Adjustment | Rollover | New | Total Allocation |
| | | Column A | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E | Column F |
| 44 | **Subtotal, Support Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure** | | | | | **9,488,210** | **9,488,210** |
| 45 | ***B. Support Related to Other Ongoing Programs and Services*** | | | | | | |
| 46 | Enhanced Collections | | | | | 801,947 | **801,947** |
| 47 | Regional Office Assistance Group | | | | | 1,740,862 | **1,740,862** |
| 48 | California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System | | | | | 263,322 | **263,322** |
| 49 | Internal Audits | | | | | 764,664 | **764,664** |
| 50 | Trial Court Re-engineering | | | | | 290,946 | **290,946** |
| 51 | Treasury | | | | | 228,230 | **228,230** |
| 52 | **Subtotal, Support Related to Other Ongoing Programs and Services** | | | | | **4,089,971** | **4,089,971** |
| 53 | **Total, Ongoing Programs and Services Administrative Support** | | **-** | **-** | **-** | **13,578,181** | **13,578,181** |
| 54 | **Total, Ongoing Programs and Services Local Assistance** | | | - | - | **54,792,110** | **54,792,110** |
| 55 | **Total, Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure** | | **-** | **-** | **-** | **68,370,291** | **68,370,291** |
| 56 | **Total, Category 1** | | **19,218,744** | **(3,637,380)** | **1,577,634** | **68,370,291** | **85,529,289** |
| 57 | **Category 2 - Trial Court Projects and Model Programs** | | | | | | **-** |
| 59 | Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force | Ends in 09-10 | | | 30,608 | | **30,608** |
| 61 | Quadrennial Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline | Ends in 09-10 | 102,000 | | | | **102,000** |
| 62 | SRO Grant | Ongoing | 450,000 | (450,000) | | | **-** |
| 63 | NCRO Grant | Ongoing | 360,000 | (360,000) | | | **-** |
| 64 | BANCRO Grant | Ongoing | 360,000 | (360,000) | | | **-** |
| 66 | Commission for Impartial Courts | Ends in 09-10 | | - | 3,222 | - | **3,222** |
| 67 | Audit Contract | Ongoing | 750,000 | (750,000) | | | **-** |
| 68 | Investment Advisory for Trial Court Investment Program | One-time | | | | 225,000 | **225,000** |
| 69 | Workers Compensation Program Reserve | Ongoing rollover | 14,965,495 | - | 143,780 | - | **15,109,275** |
| 70 | Trial Court Healthcare Reserve Account | Ends in 09-10 | 1,136,000 | (1,136,000) | 198,500 | - | **198,500** |
| 71 | **Subtotal** | | **18,123,495** | **(3,056,000)** | **376,110** | **225,000** | **15,668,605** |
| 72 | **Total, Category 2** | | **18,123,495** | **(3,056,000)** | **376,110** | **225,000** | **15,668,605** |
| 73 | **Category 3 - Emergency Funding Reserve** | | | | | | **-** |
| 74 | 1/2 of 1% transfer from TCTF (Reserved until March 15) | Ongoing | 12,589,700 | | | | **12,589,700** |
| 75 | Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve | | | (9,589,030) | | | **(9,589,030)** |
| 76 | **Total, Category 3** | | **12,589,700** | **(9,589,030)** | **-** | **-** | **3,000,670** |
| 77 | **Total, All Categories** | | **49,931,939** | **(16,282,410)** | **1,953,744** | **68,595,291** | **104,198,564** |

Table 4

# FY 2009-2010 STATEWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE

| | General Fund | Trial Court Improvement Fund | Trial Court Trust Fund | Judicial Administration Efficiency & Modernization Fund | Total Allocations | Recommended Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Projects:** | | | | | | |
| California Court Case Management System (CCMS) | $ - | $ 15,128,585 | $ 28,232,717 | $ 18,957,475 | $ 62,318,777 | **$ 62,318,777** |
| Phoenix Financial and Human Resources System | $ - | $ 9,708,860 | $ 4,174,838 | $ - | $ 13,883,698 | **$ 13,883,698** |
| Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS) | $ - | $ - | $ 546,232 | $ - | $ 546,232 | **$ 546,232** |
| California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) | $ - | $ 39,922 | $ - | $ 639,412 | $ 679,334 | **$ 679,334** |
| E-Exchange (Statewide Electronic Filing) | $ - | $ 2,003,468 | $ - | $ - | $ 2,003,468 | **$ 2,003,468** |
| CLIK System Development Project | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 548,216 | $ 548,216 | **$ 548,216** |
| Uniform Civil Fees | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 191,965 | $ 191,965 | **$ 191,965** |
| Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools) | $ - | $ 3,180,845 | $ - | $ - | $ 3,180,845 | **$ 3,180,845** |
| **Subtotal, Projects** | **$ -** | **$ 30,061,680** | **$ 32,953,787** | **$ 20,337,068** | **$ 83,352,535** | $ 83,352,535 |
| **Ongoing Programs and Services:** | | | | | | |
| V2 Case Management System | $ - | $ 4,932,943 | $ - | $ - | $ 4,932,943 | **$ 4,932,943** |
| California Court Case Management System (CCMS) | $ 408,405 | $ 5,252,309 | $ 17,087,566 | $ - | $ 22,748,280 | **$ 22,339,875** |
| Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services | $ 8,899,451 | $ 1,456,769 | $ 8,830,082 | $ - | $ 19,186,302 | **$ 10,286,851** |
| Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS) | $ 752,190 | $ 934,650 | $ 3,300,586 | $ 2,498,494 | $ 7,485,920 | **$ 6,733,730** |
| California Courts Technology Center Operations | $ 175,000 | $ 2,259,639 | $ 10,285,898 | $ 91,803 | $ 12,812,340 | **$ 12,637,340** |
| Data Integration | $ - | $ 2,976,171 | $ - | $ 4,345,603 | $ 7,321,774 | **$ 7,321,774** |
| Telecommunications Support | $ - | $ 14,717,279 | $ - | $ - | $ 14,717,279 | **$ 14,717,279** |
| Enterprise Policy/Planning Operations | $ - | $ 1,688,880 | $ - | $ 3,021,915 | $ 4,710,795 | **$ 4,710,795** |
| Statewide Enhanced Collections | $ - | $ 801,947 | $ - | $ - | $ 801,947 | **$ 801,947** |
| Regional Office Assistance Group (ROAG) | $ - | $ 1,740,862 | $ - | $ - | $ 1,740,862 | **$ 1,740,862** |
| CA Law Enforcement Telecommunications System | $ - | $ 263,322 | $ - | $ - | $ 263,322 | **$ 263,322** |
| Internal Audits | $ - | $ 764,664 | $ - | $ - | $ 764,664 | **$ 764,664** |
| Trial Court Reengineering | $ - | $ 290,946 | $ - | $ - | $ 290,946 | **$ 290,946** |
| Treasury | $ - | $ 228,230 | $ - | $ - | $ 228,230 | **$ 228,230** |
| **Subtotal, Ongoing Operations and Other Initiatives** | **$ 10,235,046** | **$ 38,308,611** | **$ 39,504,132** | **$ 9,957,815** | **$ 98,005,604** | $ 87,770,558 |
| **Total by Fund** | **$ 10,235,046** | **$ 68,370,291** | **$ 72,457,919** | **$ 30,294,883** | **$ 181,358,139** | $ 171,123,093 |