Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courtinfo.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: July 22, 2011

Title
Special Funds: Allocations for Fiscal Year 2011–2012 (Action Required)

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
None

Recommended by
Trial Court Budget Working Group

Agenda Item Type
Action Required

Effective Date
July 22, 2011

Date of Report
July 19, 2011

Contact
Steven Chang, 415-865-7195
steven.chang@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Judicial Council has statutory authority to allocate funding from statewide special funds for projects and programs that support the trial courts. This report presents recommendations related to fiscal year (FY) 2011–2012 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).

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Working Group (TCBWG) recommends that, for FY 2011–2012, the council:

1. Approve allocation of $28.351 million for projects and programs from the Modernization Fund ($6.204 million) and the Improvement Fund ($22.147 million);

2. Approve allocation of $19.070 million for ongoing services for trial courts from the Modernization Fund ($0.755 million), the Improvement Fund ($10.122 million), and the TCTF ($8.193 million);

3. Approve allocation of $65.544 million for statewide technology infrastructure maintenance and operations from the Modernization Fund ($11.698 million), the Improvement Fund ($22.004 million), and the TCTF ($31.842 million);

4. Approve allocation of $5.716 million for statewide technology infrastructure projects from the TCTF; and

5. 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 to the council after the end of the fiscal year.

Previous Council Action

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (AB 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850, § 1) created the Modernization Fund and the Improvement Fund to support projects and programs that benefit trial courts and provide a means of addressing trial courts' unanticipated urgent needs. (See *id.,* §§ 3, 46.) Government Code sections 77209(g) and 77213(b) direct that the Judicial Council shall administer the Improvement Fund and Modernization Fund, respectively. Until FY 2003–2004, the council approved detailed allocations from these special funds. From FY 2004–2005 to FY 2008–2009, in accordance with rule 10.11 of the California Rules of Court and in conformance with the internal guidelines approved by the council on January 30, 2002, the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P) approved special funds allocations on behalf of the council. Since FY 2009–2010, special fund allocation recommendations have been presented to the council for consideration.

The Budget Act of 2011 (SB 87) includes a transfer of $20.0 million from the Modernization Fund to the TCTF to mitigate the impact of judicial branch funding reductions on trial court operations. Consistent with this action, the Legislature reduced the appropriation for program and project allocations from the fund in FY 2011–2012 from $38.7 million to $18.7 million. Given that the level of previously planned budgets from this fund in FY 2011–2012 would have totaled $39.3 million (see column A of Attachment J), $20.6 million in allocation reductions need to be identified. To address this issue, a TCBWG subcommittee was formed to review planned budgets and to develop recommendations for the full working group's consideration.

Twelve members of the TCBWG, five presiding judges and seven court executive officers, volunteered to serve on the ad hoc Modernization Fund Subcommittee. The subcommittee reviewed all planned project and program allocations as well as reduction options and impacts identified by staff. Recommendations regarding allocations and reductions were developed based

on this review. The subcommittee convened on June 2, 2011, with presentations provided by applicable AOC divisions on program and project activities, discussion on the impacts of reduction options, and additional information provided to subcommittee members as requested. The subcommittee reconvened on June 29, 2011, to review programs and projects allocated from the TCIF.

At the conclusion of these meetings, the subcommittee identified $19.962 million in reductions to programs and projects funded both by the Modernization Fund and Improvement Fund to recommend to the TCBWG (see column B of Attachment J). In addition, the subcommittee requested that Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff provide recommendations for a remaining reduction of $629,114 needed to achieve the overall reduction target of $20.6 million (see column C of Attachment J). Staff has subsequently prepared a list of additional reductions.

Staff identified one-time reductions to baseline allocations and the impact of those reductions to those programs and projects. When practicable, the subcommittee focused on activities that could be deferred, modified, or suspended, while attempting to preserve funding for as many of the core programs as possible.

As not all reduction amounts could be identified within the Modernization Fund, the California Courts Protective Order Registry, Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy, and Uniform Civil Fees program funding is proposed to be transferred to the Improvement Fund from the Modernization Fund in FY 2011–2012 in order for the budgeted amounts in the Modernization Fund to be less than the $18.7 million appropriation. Equivalent reductions in planned expenditures from the Improvement Fund allowed this transfer to be accommodated.

Recommendation 1: Special Funds Allocations (Excluding Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts and Statewide Technology Infrastructure)

1. Approve allocation of $28.351 million for projects and programs from the Modernization Fund ($6.204 million) and the Improvement Fund ($22.147 million).

Rationale for Recommendation 1

The recommended allocations would fund previously approved projects and programs that are intended to improve the administration of justice and access to justice in the trial courts.

Resources. Estimated ending fund balances for FY 2010–2011 and projected FY 2011–2012 revenues and transfers represent special fund resources that are anticipated to be available to fund the various projects and programs. Attachment A displays an overview of FY 2010–2011 approved budget and estimated year-end resources and expenditures/encumbrances (columns A and B) and projected FY 2011–2012 resources and recommended allocations (columns C, D, and E) from the Modernization Fund, the Improvement Fund, the TCTF, and their combined totals.

The Modernization Fund receives revenue mainly from two sources (see Attachment B for FY 2010–2011 budget and year-end estimates and FY 2011–2012 projected revenues). The primary source is an annual appropriation of state General Fund monies, which is $18.709 million in FY 2011–2012. The other revenue source is interest earned on retained funds through the Surplus Money Investment Fund (SMIF), which for this fiscal year is projected to be $226,462. Including the beginning balance of $1.484 million and a transfer of $20.000 million to the TCTF, the total projected resources for the Modernization Fund in FY 2011–2012 is $20.419 million.

The Improvement Fund receives funding from a number of sources: a 1 percent transfer from the TCTF (Gov. Code, § 77209(b)); 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue (*id.,* § 77205) representing the state's 50 percent share of the fee, fine, and forfeiture revenue that exceeds each county's base Maintenance of Effort (revenue MOE) level from FY 1998–1999; interest earned on retained funds through the Surplus Money Investment Fund (SMIF); 2 percent Automation Fund (*id.,* § 68090.8(b)) revenues representing 2 percent of the fine, penalty, and forfeiture collections in criminal cases; and revenues from the sale of documents and royalties from publication of uniform jury instructions (see Attachment D for FY 2010–2011 budget and year-end estimates and FY 2011–2012 projected revenues). Including the beginning balance of $29.964 million, the total projected resources for the Improvement Fund in FY 2011–2012 is $78.427 million.

Recommended FY 2011–2012 Allocations for Projects and Programs. This section discusses the proposed special funds allocations for projects and programs excluding ongoing services to the trial courts and statewide technology infrastructure. Proposed allocations for statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts are discussed in recommendations 2, 3, and 4 of this report.

The TCBWG recommends that the Judicial Council approve these adjustments to previously approved allocations. Charts 1 and 2 below display, by category for each of the special funds, the amounts of allocations that were previously approved by the council, proposed adjustments to previously approved allocations, and the resulting total recommended allocations for FY 2011–2012.

Chart 1. Modernization Fund

Category	Previously Approved Allocations	Proposed Adjustment to Previously Approved Allocations	Total Recommended Allocations
II. Education and Developmental Programs	$2,460,005	($1,010,719)	$1,629,286
III. Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs	$6,912,160	($2,337,965)	$4,574,195
Total	**$9,552,165**	**($3,348,684)**	**$6,203,481**

Chart 2. Improvement Fund

Category	Previously Approved Allocations	Proposed Adjustment to Previously Approved Allocations	Total Recommended Allocations
I. Ongoing Statewide Programs (excluding Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to Trial Courts)	$15,525,409	($1,246,376)	$14,279,033
II. Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	$2,500,000	($1,200,000)	$1,300,000
III. Emergency Funding Reserve	$1,000,000	$0	$1,000,000
Total	**$19,025,409**	**($2,446,376)**	**$16,579,033**

Previously Approved Projects and Programs. The various projects and programs that were previously approved by the council and included in these recommendations are described below, by fund.

Modernization Fund. Projects and programs funded from the Modernization Fund fall under three categories.

Category I—Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts. The projects and programs related to statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts are discussed in recommendations 2, 3, and 4 (see Attachment C for the recommended allocation by project and program).

Category I— Education 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 that judges and court personnel 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. The planned allocations are separated into two major areas:

1. Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER)
   Mandated state judicial education programs include:
   - B.E. Witkin Judicial College of California
   - Family Law Assignment Education
   - Juvenile Law Assignment Education
   - Orientation for New Trial Court Judges

   Other recommended CJER programs include:
   - Criminal Law and Procedure Institute
   - Overview Courses
   - Winter Continuing Judicial Studies Program

   CJER programs related to court administration include:
   - Court Management Courses
   - Trial Court Faculty (Statewide Education Programs)
   - Train the Trainers—Faculty Development

   CJER programs for trial court staff include:
   - Court Clerk Training Institute
   - Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast)
   - Mid-level Management Conferences
   - Trial Court Judicial Attorney Institute

2. Other Educational and Developmental Programs
   - Budget-focused training and meetings, which will cover costs for meetings of the Trial Court Budget Working Group and other budget-related meetings that directly affect trial courts' operations.
   - Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) programs, which will cover the costs for the Youth Summit, for participants in the state's youth and peer courts; three regional trainings, mandatory trainings for child custody mediation, evaluation, and administration; an orientation video for court users of mandatory child custody mediation; and training content in online, video, and webinar formats.

- CFCC publications. Two efforts would receive partial funding: an orientation video for court users of mandatory child custody mediation, and maintenance of the *California Dependency Online Guide,* chief training and information resource used by 2,000 court-appointed attorneys in dependency proceedings across the state. Print copies of publications will be made available only online.
- Labor Relations Academy, which will cover the costs for one statewide academy to assist trial court professionals in understanding and effectively working in a labor environment.

Category III — Pilot Projects, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Programs. The allocations include the following projects and programs:

- Alternative Dispute Resolution Program, which will either directly support individual court programs or be used to develop materials for courts and litigants throughout the state. The project will help 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 will provide funding to the Superior Courts of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Counties for staff, including attorneys, who work in complex civil litigation departments.
- Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment, and Education, which will cover the costs of orientation workshops, video remote interpreting, audiovisual materials, and continuing education.
- Interactive Software—Self-Represented Litigant Electronic Forms, which will pay for interactive programs that can be used in every county to help litigants complete pleadings in workshop settings more quickly and accurately.
- Public Education and Outreach, which will cover the costs for matching federal-state grant funding for the JusticeCorps program of $1 million over three years.
- Ralph N. Kleps Award Program, which will cover the costs for local award ceremonies, the August 2011 Judicial Council presentation profiling the awardees, and the Kleps Committee meeting in early 2012 that will set the priorities and agenda for the next Kleps Award cycle.
- Trial Courts Performance and Accountability, which will cover the costs of the SB 56 Working Group meetings.

Improvement Fund. Projects and programs funded from the Improvement Fund fall under three categories:

Category I—Ongoing Statewide Programs. The projects or programs that are part of statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts are discussed in recommendations 2, 3, and 4 (see Attachment E for the recommended allocations by project or program). The other Category I projects and programs include the following:

- Domestic Violence Family Law Interpreter Program, which will provide grants to trial courts for providing interpreter services for litigants with limited English proficiency in general family law and domestic violence cases.
- Human Resources Legal Counsel for Trial Court Benefits, which will maintain a contract with outside counsel for the provision of legal advice for all trial court benefit-related issues and inquiries (e.g., immediate requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, cafeteria plan impacts, and early retiree reinsurance).
- Judicial Officer Assistance Program (JOAP), which will cover the costs for customized training courses, specific personal consultation, and services to judges, subordinate judicial officers, and assigned judges, including access to appropriate treatment, providers, and community resources.
- Judicial Performance Defense Insurance, which will pay for the trial court portion of a comprehensive loss prevention program that covers defense costs in proceedings related to Commission on Judicial Performance complaints, and through required ethics training, protects judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties and lowers the risk of conduct that could develop into complaints.
- Jury System Improvement Projects, which will utilize royalties from the publication of jury instructions to (1) support the meeting expenses of the Advisory Committees on Criminal and Civil Jury Instructions and (2) cover the expense of obtaining copyright protection for the official publication of the Judicial Council's criminal and civil jury instructions.
- Litigation Management Program, which will cover the costs of defending trial courts, judicial officers, and court employees, including costs of attorneys from the Attorney General's Office, private counsel, settlements, and judgments of civil claims 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.
- Self–Help Centers, which will provide grants to trial courts to maintain self-help centers in all 58 superior courts in California.
- Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support, which will cover the costs for the statewide self-help website, translations, and the development of materials for the courts on child custody and visitation to respond to recent legislation.
- Subscription Costs—*Judicial Conduct Reporter,* which will cover the annual cost of electronic subscriptions to the *Judicial Conduct Reporter*, a quarterly newsletter published by the American Judicature Society, and distributed to all judicial officers as part of AOC's ethics education program.
- Trial Court Security Grants, which will provide grants to trial courts for installing and maintaining security systems and equipment to ensure public safety within court facilities, and pay for a vendor to develop and deliver the training necessary for the courts to complete and maintain their own Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), as well as Emergency, Command and Control, and Pandemic Plans.

- Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program, which will pay for the attorney fees and related expenses to assist trial courts in numerous areas including business transactions, labor and employment, finance and taxation, and real estate.

Category II—Trial Court Projects and Model Programs. The projects and programs include the following:

- Audit Contract, which will cover the costs of court audits during the transition period under a new audit contract and offset the costs incurred by courts to contract with the external entity performing court financial audits.
- Human Resources Court Investigation, which will contract with an outside law firm to provide investigation services for highly sensitive employment matters requested by trial courts.
- Reimbursement to Trial Courts for Public Access, which will provide funding to reimburse trial courts for costs related to eligible staff time incurred between January 1, 2010, and December 31, 2011, in responding to requests for public access to judicial administrative records under rule 10.500.
- Workers' Compensation Program Reserve, which will provide funding to resolve outstanding liabilities with counties for workers' compensation tail claims from January 1, 2001, to June 30, 2003, related to court employees covered by the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program.

Category III—Emergency Funding Reserve. Required by Government Code section 77209(b), the funding is the set-aside of one-half of the 1 percent transfer from the TCTF to the Improvement Fund until March 15, 2012. This year, half of the amount of the transfer will be $9.848 million, with the funding reserved through March 15 to address unforeseen contingencies and financial emergencies at the trial courts.

Technical Allocation Adjustments in FY 2010–2011. At its December 14, 2010, business meeting, the Judicial Council delegated 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 were to be reported back to the council after the end of the fiscal year. One technical adjustment was approved by the Administrative Director and a second by E&P on June 17, 2011.

1. Self-Help Center Program (one-time rollover of $194,009 not expended in FY 2009–2010). Owing to a delay related to facility lease negotiations with the court's county, allocated funding could not be fully distributed to the Superior Court of Riverside County in FY 2009–2010. The funding was used to purchase: (a) tables, chairs, and library shelves for the workshop and reception areas; (b) 8 computers, a DVD player, and a television for instructional videos; (c) self-help books and brochures, communication hardware, and presentation equipment; and (d) workstation equipment for 11 staff and 3 justice partners.

2. Interim Case Management System (one-time funding of $674,628). A case management system (CMS) was deployed to the Superior Court of Nevada County as an interim solution to ensure stabilization of their CMS. The court's legacy CMS, used for criminal and civil case processing and cashiering for civil filings, was a 1980s-era mainframe application running on outdated hardware, operating systems, and software environments, and the county is no longer able to support the application. Based on analysis and review of the situation and alternatives, the court and AOC staff determined that the implementation of CourtView as an interim solution would provide the highest level of risk mitigation and benefit for the court and its users. This allocation was approved on behalf of the council by E&P.

Adjustments to Previously Approved Allocations. The TCBWG proposes adjustments to 43 previously approved allocations of projects and programs not related to statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts for a net reduction of $5.826 million ($3.349 million from the Modernization Fund and $2.447 million from the Improvement Fund). Column C of Attachments C and E displays the reduction and augmentation amount by individual project or program for the Modernization Fund and Improvement Fund, respectively. The reduction and augmentation amount as well as description and impact of each of the 43 projects or programs are discussed below, by fund.

Modernization Fund

1. B. E. Witkin Judicial College of California
   Reduction: $74,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The program would be shortened, thereby reducing lodging and meal costs. In addition, each court or individual judge will need to cover travel costs for judges. The impact of shortening of the program results in the elimination of 8 hours of education content that the CJER curriculum committees have identified as essential content for new judges and subordinate judicial officers. Also, there will be a greater negative impact for courts with multiple participants or for courts located farther from northern California, where the Judicial College is held.

2. Family Law Assignment Education
   Reduction: $40,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The Family Law Institute would be held every three years and not held in FY 2011–2012. This will reduce the available training for judicial officers in how to meet the goals of the Judicial Council and comply with new rules of court and legislation in family law. Judges working in a family law assignment are eager to be supported by CJER programming in this area. The funding for domestic violence education would be retained in order to continue to take advantage of and leverage CFCC's grant funding.

3. Juvenile Law Assignment Education
   Reduction: $8,000 (one-time)

Description and Impact: The institute would continue to be held every other year but with reduced funding available to cover the costs of lodging and group meals for 100 to 120 participants at the two-and-a-half-day program.

4. Orientation for New Trial Court Judges
   Reduction: $30,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The program would have one seminar leader, rather than two, and lunches would not be provided for three meetings. In addition, each participating court or individual judge would need to cover the costs of judges' travel. Since participants continue content discussions during lunch, some reduction in the education's effectiveness may result. Also, there will be a greater negative impact for courts with multiple participants or for courts located outside the San Francisco Bay Area.

5. Advanced Education for Experienced Judges
   Reduction: $30,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The program would be held every three years and would not be held in FY 2011–2012. An institute on advanced topics is extremely beneficial to participants and provides one of the few venues for experienced judges to meet and share learning and experience, so the continuation of this program, even though it will be held on a less frequent basis, is recommended.

6. Civil Law and Procedure Institute
   Reduction: $25,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The program would be held every three years and would not be held in FY 2011–2012. Continuing the offerings of this program, even on a less frequent basis, will have a significant impact on training judges and subordinate judicial officers in how to meet the goals of the Judicial Council and comply with new rules of court and legislation in civil law.

7. Cow County Judges Institute
   Reduction: $25,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The program would be held every three years and would not be held in FY 2011–2012. Given the minimal programming that CJER provides to rural court judges, offering a program every three years provides value.

8. Overview Courses
   Augmentation: $62,500 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The augmentation would fund courses to meet the increased demand for all assignments. Every newly elected or appointed judge and subordinate judicial officer is required by rule 10.462(c)(1)(B) to participate in an orientation course in the area of his or her primary assignment presented by the Education Division/CJER within one year of taking the oath of office. As a practical matter, the Education Division is the sole provider for these

assignment overview courses, which are heavily attended. The criminal assignment overview course consistently has a waiting list.

9. Probate and Mental Health Institute
   Reduction: $41,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The program would be held every three years and would not be held in FY 2011–2012. Reducing the frequency of offerings of this program may impact the training of judges, subordinate judicial officers, and probate attorneys in how to meet the goals of the Judicial Council and comply with new rules of court and legislation in probate law.

10. Statewide Fairness Conference
    Reduction: $30,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The program would be held every three years and would not be held in FY 2011–2012. This two-day conference focuses on issues and topics such as women of color and domestic violence; consequences of organizational change; the family structure and the criminal, juvenile, and family courts; and public trust and confidence.

11. Traffic Law Institute
    Reduction: $25,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The program would be held every three years and would not be held in FY 2011–2012. This course aids in the positive public perception of the courts as traffic assignments are high-volume courts, and it helps courts avoid differential application of the law, since some judicial officers who hear these cases would otherwise be less familiar with this area of the law.

12. Winter Continuing Judicial Studies Program
    Reduction: $74,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: In this fiscal year, plans were made to use these funds for regional judicial education programs for experienced judges. Under this reduction, the program would be able to hold approximately 18 different regional programs, reduced from the approximately 27 programs originally planned. Courses would be delivered and replicated in only two instead of all three regions in fiscal year 2011–2012. Delivery in the third region would be deferred to the following fiscal year.

13. California Judicial Administration Conference
    Reduction: $38,042 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The conference would not be held in FY 2011–2012. Funding covers the costs of group meals and lodging for participants at three regional presentations.

14. Court Management Courses
    Reduction: $62,000 (one-time)

Description and Impact: Funding for the PJ/CEO and supervising judges programs would be reduced to cover the level of attendance at these programs in FY 2010–2011. In addition, each participating court or individual judge will need to cover the costs of travel. Also, there will be a greater negative impact for courts with multiple participants or judges who must travel to the location where the course is held.

15. Fall Leadership Summit
    Reduction: $80,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The Education Division/CJER would be unable to support any Executive Office or branchwide program initiatives, and the proposed Court Security Conference would not be held in FY 2011–2012. The statewide Security Conference was identified as a high-level need by the Judicial Branch Leadership Development Curriculum Committee, and safety of the public, court staff, and judges is a priority for the courts and the AOC. It is the only statewide education program designed for court leadership that covers this important subject matter. Without this conference there may not be a statewide opportunity for court leaders and security subject matter experts to share best practices, tools, and strategies for maintaining safe courthouses.

16. Technical Assistance to Local Courts
    Reduction: $200,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The program would not be funded in FY 2011–2012. This further impacts the trial courts' ability to provide training for staff, especially in smaller courts. As funding for live programming has been cut for court staff, these grants have filled in gaps and encouraged courts to join with neighboring courts to make education available locally. Many courts will be unable to continue this practice if the funding is not provided.

17. Trial Court Faculty (Statewide Education Programs)
    Reduction: $10,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The reduction would be proportionally taken from reducing the costs of lodging, group meals, and travel for pro bono faculty teaching in-person trial court programs. In addition, some of the reductions would be offset by having some faculty serve as volunteers.

18. Train the Trainers—Faculty Development
    Reduction: $40,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The programs would be reduced throughout the fiscal year, thereby suspending some course-specific train-the-trainer programs that would ultimately reduce the number of faculty available to teach at CJER and locally sponsored events. In addition, some of the programs to support trial court staff would be canceled, leaving the courts to find other ways to develop their training capacity internally without CJER's support.

19. Court Clerk Training Institute
    Reduction: $63,000 (one-time)

Description and Impact: The courses would be offered at a regional office instead of a hotel conference center.

20. Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast)
    Reduction: $55,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: This reduction can be made from savings gained by contracting a lower rate for broadcast transmission and from reducing infrastructure construction costs. The reduction would reduce the ability to establish downlink sites in new court facilities or to relocate existing equipment during this fiscal year.

21. Mid-Management Conferences
    Reduction: $11,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The programs for court managers, supervisors, and lead staff would be shortened and would be presented two times a year rather than three. This may have a disproportionate impact on smaller courts, which have fewer resources to provide management training. With courts needing more trained personnel to step into leadership roles, the reduced frequency and duration of the programs could impact how courts prepare their staff for larger roles and responsibilities.

22. Trial Court Judicial Attorney Institute
    Augmentation: $50,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The augmentation would allow the program to continue to be offered every other year. For this particular audience, holding the program every three years may have a negative impact, as trial court attorneys participate in a two-year cycle of judicial education. Both the individual attorneys and the courts where they work would be impacted by the reduction in attorney education and training, and they would lose the opportunity to learn about advances in the law and the effective practice of trial judicial attorneys as well as the opportunity to learn from one another.

    Since the type of education that trial court judicial attorneys require is not provided by any other program, reducing the frequency of offerings could make it increasingly difficult for that audience to obtain and maintain the knowledge and skills required for them to effectively do their jobs. Although local training may be available at the larger courts, smaller courts are less likely to have the resources to provide any training to their judicial attorneys. In addition, courts that provide local training may only provide a maximum of four to five hours of training each year.

23. Budget-Focused Training and Meetings
    Reduction: $14,263 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: A reduction to this program will limit the number of in-person TCBWG meetings each year and may, depending on the level of the reduction, also impact focused reviews conducted by TCBWG subcommittees by limiting some of this work to

conference calls. With the proposed budget reduction, only one in-person meeting and a couple of conference calls will be held in each year. Additionally, the Finance Division is transitioning nearly all of its regular training activities (generally associated with technical budget development activities) to a web-based training format, which results in savings from reduced travel and other related costs.

24. CFCC Programs
    Reduction: $38,953 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The reduction would result in a 30-percent reduction in Youth Summit funds available for workshop costs, meals, and lodging for three days and limited scholarships for youth and youth court staff. There would also be reduced onsite training and live training events available to meet mandatory training requirements for child custody mediators, evaluators, and administrators. The reduction in the number of locations for live regional trainings will increase trainees' travel costs and time away from the office.

25. CFCC Publications
    Reduction: $101,961 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: Two efforts would each be funded at 50 percent as a result of this reduction: an orientation video for court users of mandatory child custody mediation; and maintenance of the *California Dependency Online Guide,* chief training and information resource used by 2000 court-appointed dependency attorneys across the state. Print copies of the following publications would available online only: *What's Happening in Court: An Activity Book for Children Who Are Going to Court in California; Dependency Quick Guide: A Dogbook for Attorneys Representing Children and Parents; Domestic Violence Bench Cards;* a book for children in dependency cases who are reunifying with their families; and statewide reports for the Family Resource Guidelines Project and Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care.

26. Labor Relations Academy
    Reduction: $7,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: During the academies and forums, labor relations experts from both the AOC and the courts share updates, best practices, and potential hazard areas with the participants. The reduction will limit the Human Resource Division's ability to provide regionally based two-to-four-day academies and one-day forums. With the remaining funding, staff can provide the program at only a single statewide location. Courts, which rely on the geographically based academies and forums to remain current on best practices and interact with labor relations subject matter experts, will have no fiscally responsible alternative. Courts with little or no in-house labor relations experts will be left to manage without assistance.

27. Alternative Dispute Resolution for Civil Cases
    Reduction: $1,665,000 (one-time)

Description and Impact: Thirteen civil mediation and settlement programs currently supported by the program would not be funded. To maintain these programs at current or even reduced levels, the courts would need to reallocate resources supporting other court functions or find other funding sources, either of which would be very difficult in the current fiscal environment.

In general, if these programs are reduced or eliminated, staff anticipates that individual courts will experience one or more of the following impacts and that, collectively, the courts will experience all of them:

- Reduction in the number of such cases resolved by agreement of the litigants;
- Longer court calendars and increased numbers of hearings and trials;
- Longer times from case filing to case disposition;
- Increased litigation costs for the parties; and
- Reduced litigant satisfaction with court services.

Disruption of the mediation and settlement programs will result in the loss of prior Judicial Council, court, and community investments in planning and establishing these programs. In addition, funding will not be available to implement any new programs in FY 2011–2012. Staff would work with the courts to determine how best to utilize available funds either to directly support individual court programs or to develop materials for courts and litigants throughout the state.

28. Branchwide Communication
Reduction: $80,000 (one-time)
Description and Impact: Most of the communications that were funded under this program are now available online or have very limited publication. As a result of this reduction, the *Pocket Directory of California Judicial Leaders,* which provides contact information for the Judicial Council, advisory committees, task forces, courts of appeal and superior courts, will not be published in FY 2011–2012.

29. Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment, and Education
Reduction: $174,615 (one-time)
Description and Impact: The proposed reduction would significantly reduce activities targeted to the outreach and the development of interpreters and would prevent the expansion of language access services. Recently targeted outreach and recruitment activities have resulted in a growing number of qualified individuals entering the court interpreter profession. Reducing these activities will reduce the pool of newly qualified spoken language and ASL interpreters available to the courts. Reducing the allocation for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) limits the expansion of the use of video remote technology to more courts. Without adequate funding, the pilot use of video remote technology for the provision of ASL interpreters cannot be leveraged to expand the scope of interpretive services available in courts statewide.

Additionally, a funding reduction will result in an inadequate number of workshops available for interpreters entering the profession. These workshops are essential in providing new interpreters with the appropriate orientation and ethics training needed for the job. These workshops must also be held in order for interpreters to meet the requirements of the California Rules of Court. A reduction in funds will limit the overall number of available workshops and will prevent the Court Interpreters Program from improving current orientation workshops for registered interpreters to support further skills development that would better prepare them to work with the courts effectively.

30. Interactive Software—Self-Represented Electronic Forms
    Reduction: $20,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The reduction will reduce and delay vendor upgrades to the ICAN! software as well as its availability to former users of EZLegalFile. ICAN!, developed by the Legal Aid Society of Orange County, is the only free software program available to assist litigants.

31. Public Education and Outreach
    Reduction: $234,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The *California on My Honor: Civics Institute for Teachers* would not be funded in FY 2011–2012. Sixty additional teachers per year from an estimated 15 jurisdictions will not be served by the institute and the workshops, which in turn will deny close to 20,000 students reached by these teachers access to information about the judicial branch that they would have received if the program had been funded. Also, no workshops in local jurisdictions would be offered, so another estimated 80 teachers will not have access to effective civic education resources. Further, suspending funding impairs the ability to leverage and continue to grow the civic teacher-leader base that has been developed over the years.

    The reduction will also disrupt collaboration with the California State University system. With an interruption of funding, the agreements now in place may not be reinstated in the future at such favorable terms.

32. Ralph N. Kleps Award Program
    Reduction: $34,500 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: A total of $30,000 in special funds budgeted to give local trial courts an opportunity to sustain and replicate award-winning programs would not be available. In addition, *Innovations in the California Courts* would not be printed. This high-profile publication disseminates information about the Kleps-awarded programs and statewide initiatives that arise from the Judicial Council's mission of advancing the consistent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice. The remaining funds would be used for local award ceremonies; the August 2011 Judicial Council presentation profiling the

awardees; and the Kleps Award Committee meeting in early 2012, which is used to set the priorities and agenda for the next Kleps Award cycle.

33. Self-Help Videos for the Website
    Reduction: $3,850 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The program would not be funded in FY 2011–2012. The reduction would reduce access to new information typically posted each year. Such material focuses on improving access to the courts, ability of court users to navigate the system, and greater public understanding of the work of the courts. Products also are informational resources that can assist court employees who work directly with the public. Efforts will be made to provide additional content on self-help web resources.

34. Trial Court Performance and Accountability
    Reduction: $126,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The Office of Court Research would have no funds for a data collection contract that draws on the substantive expertise of university faculty and employs students to conduct data collection. The data collection projects are developed to supplement the ongoing research agenda of the Office of Court Research and focus on topics related to trial court workload and performance. In addition, all data extraction work will be done in-house by staff, resulting in a substantial increase in staff workload and additional time to collect, extract, and evaluate data. Funds would be used to cover the costs of the SB 56 Working Group meetings.

Improvement Fund

35. Connecting with Constituencies
    Reduction: $260,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The program will not be funded in FY 2011–2012, interrupting the modernization and improvement of trial court websites, which benefit both the courts and the public. The Trial Court Web Resources project provides much-needed assistance and guidance to the trial courts, many of which do not have dedicated web services staff to undertake a redesign project of their own. With the growing number of self-represented litigants, the ability to communicate and deliver services over the web is critical. Well-functioning websites cut down on unnecessary calls and visits to the courts. Standardized visual designs and streamlined information architecture ensure that visitors to court websites can easily find the information and resources they are seeking.

36. Judicial Officer Assistance Program
    Reduction: $15,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: As a result of the reduction, Human Resources Division will not renew its contract with Managed Health Network and will need to solicit a new vendor through the RFP process to provide customized services while staying within budget. The RFP process will need to begin in August and a new vendor secured by December 1, 2011, to ensure uninterrupted coverage for bench officers.

37. Judicial Performance Defense Insurance
    Augmentation: $31,624 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The augmentation is necessary to fund the increased trial-court-related insurance premium resulting from a rise in claims in recent years. The AOC pays the premium for a master insurance policy for the defense of judicial officers in proceedings before the Commission on Judicial Performance. The program, which began in 1999, is open to all justices, judges, commissioners, referees, and hearing officers.

38. Jury System Improvement Projects
    Reduction: $50,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The Court and Community program would not be funded in FY 2011–2012. Courts in 16 jurisdictions may need to redesign their summonses, at additional expense to the courts, to include essential reporting instructions, such as information pertaining to security and basic jury trial instructions. In addition to the 16 jurisdictions that mail the brochure with the jury summons, most, if not all, jurisdictions provide the Court and Community pamphlet to jurors in jury assembly rooms across the state. Though this publication is also provided online, there may be a significant number of people who will not access this valuable educational resource. The statewide reach and numbers mailed annually make California juror summonses one of the largest direct mail pieces in the state.

39. Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support
    Reduction: $150,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The Statewide Conference on Self-Represented Litigants will not be held in June 2012. This event is generally attended by 300 court staff and partners who share information about best practices as well as learn about areas of the law that are of special concern to low-income self-represented litigants. The annual Family Law Conference, which is generally attended by 200 self-help staff and their legal services partners, will also be canceled for 2012. Given the many changes anticipated in family law in response to AB 939 and implementing rules and forms, the AOC will work to find other opportunities for training self-help center staff this year but will not be able to provide funding for trial court staff or their designated partners to attend those training sessions. Further, funding for technical assistance visits for trial court staff to travel to other courts and observe best practices will not be available this year. These visits were identified by court staff as a useful way for courts to see how to implement new procedures given the severe budget challenges they are facing.

    In addition, the development of an online parent education class will not be funded. Development of the online course was requested by courts that could no longer bear the costs of providing in-person parent education at the local level. An online, on-demand parenting class would increase participation by reducing parents' conflicts with work, school, child care, and other responsibilities and also save them the costs of travel and missed work. The online course would also save significant time for family court services

staff, supervised visitation programs, and family law courts. These classes provide information about reducing conflict, which, many courts report, translates into fewer custody filings and fewer mediation and court sessions.

40. Subscription Costs—*Judicial Conduct Reporter*
    Reduction: $3,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The program will fund only electronic subscriptions to the publication, resulting in a savings of $1,175. There are no adverse programmatic consequences to converting remaining AOC hard copy subscriptions to the electronic version of this publication.

41. Trial Court Security Grants
    Reduction: $800,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The primary impact of the reduction will be to delay addressing the security needs of the courts. Individual projects will need to be deferred to future fiscal years, causing delays in correcting inadequacies in security systems. This will impact safety and security of court personnel, bench officers, and the public until the specific inadequacies are addressed.

    In an effort to minimize the impact, the Office of Emergency Response and Security will be submitting a request to roll over funds from the prior fiscal year that were not expended as a result of the late enactment of the 2010 State Budget, which delayed the security assessment process. The rollover of these monies will fund three projects.

42. Audit Contract
    Reduction: $600,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The reduction will either (1) reduce the number of court audits during the transition period performed under a new audit contract, thereby impacting the goal of a four-year cycle or (2) reduce the amount available to offset the costs incurred by courts to contract with the external entity performing court financial audits.

43. Workers' Compensation Program Reserve
    Reduction: $600,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: Based on the estimated liabilities related to four counties that will be settled in FY 2011–2012, only $6 million is needed for this fiscal year. Program staff will be requesting a rollover of about $5.6 million in unexpended funds from FY 2010–2011.

Rollover Requests. Program and project staff are currently in the process of fiscal year-end closing and have not yet finalized the amounts for the programs and projects that they will request to roll over as available funding in FY 2011–2012. Rollover requests are planned to be submitted to the Judicial Council for review and approval at the August 2011 business meeting.

New Funding Requests. Staff currently have no recommended new funding requests for FY 2011–2012.

FY 2010–2011 Excess 50/50 Split Revenue Distributions. Government Code section77205(a) requires the council to determine an allocation of 50/50 excess 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 excess split revenues exceeded the FY 2002–2003 base would receive a pro rata share of a minimum of 20 percent of the total excess revenues. From FY 2004–2005 to FY 2007–2008, total 50/50 excess split revenues exceeded the total FY 2002–2003 base, and pro rata distributions were made to eligible courts from 20 percent of the excess revenue. In FY 2008–2009 and FY 2009–2010, the total 50/50 excess split revenues did not exceed the FY 2002–2003 amount. The 50/50 split revenue for FY 2010–2011 is not due from counties until August 15, 2011; therefore, it is not known at this time whether excess revenue will be available for distribution to the courts in FY 2011–2012.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

None.

Recommendation 2: Ongoing Services for Trial Courts

2. Approve allocation of $19.070 million for ongoing services for trial courts from the Modernization Fund ($0.755 million), the Improvement Fund ($10.122 million), and the TCTF ($8.193 million).

Rationale for Recommendation 2

The recommendation is consistent with judicial branch goals and the statutory purposes of the special funds and is intended to achieve various goals of the judicial branch as they apply to trial courts, including branchwide infrastructure for service excellence.

The Ongoing Services for Trial Courts category consists of programs, including AOC staff support, that provide services to the trial courts. Attachment H provides a list of all programs and the recommended allocations by fund source with a line number that corresponds with the bulleted numbers listed below. Appropriated General Fund monies support some of these statewide efforts and, for information purposes only, are displayed where applicable. See column F of Attachment H for the recommended allocation from special funds and column A for the allocation from the General Fund. The recommended allocation amounts already reflect any recommended adjustments discussed in the Adjustments to Planned Allocations section below.

Ongoing Services for Trial Courts
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$19,070,213 (includes reimbursements)
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$5,904,738

1. Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$6,758,577 (nonreimbursements)
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$8,193,019 (reimbursements)
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$5,627,002

Financial Services
The financial component of the Phoenix System, which provides timely information about fiscal needs while complying with policies, procedures, regulations, and standardized processes, enables courts to maintain control over expenditures. 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 System.

Human Resources Services
The human resources component of the Phoenix System leverages technology for human resources administration and in-house payroll processing, provides a customer service call center, standardizes processes and procedures, collects data at the source, provides central administrative processing, and provides Manager Self-Service (MSS) and Employee Self-Service (ESS) functions to the employees of the courts. To date, seven courts (Superior Courts of Lake, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, and Stanislaus Counties) are live on the module.

2. California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$164,208
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$277,736

CLETS access through the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), as provided via the California Department of Justice (DOJ), was first enabled during FY 2006–2007 by the implementation of hardware, software, and telecommunications services. Staffing support at the AOC for the program was maintained to continue the appropriate level of support for the project. Two new courts were added to CLETS during FY 2010–2011, bringing the total number of supported courts to seven. These courts are using the statewide network to access and update various California and federal databases, including the DOJ's California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS). Also added during FY 2010–2011 was CCPOR (California Courts Protective Order System) access to CARPOS via CLETS.

Funding in FY 2011–2012 will support continuous operations and expansion of the technical solution for CLETS access. This will include enhancements to the data exchange that supports the CCPOR submission of restraining and protective orders to the DOJ, a testing environment to eliminate the current impact on superior courts related to CCPOR deployment testing and training, and the addition of custom multi-database inquiry capabilities for greater efficiency for the courts.

3. Enhanced Collections
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$801,947
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$0

   The Enhanced Collections Unit, based out of the AOC Southern Regional Office, was established with the purpose of providing assistance, education, and training to courts and counties in their efforts to develop or improve collections programs, which also serve to increase trust and confidence in the justice system. Penal Code section 1463.010 requires the Judicial Council to submit an annual report to the Legislature on the performance of the statewide collection of court-ordered debt. The third annual report was submitted to the Legislature on December 30, 2010. A key finding is that the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt increased from $565 million to $605 million from the prior fiscal year, representing a $40 million increase, or 7 percent. Despite the increased collections, programs reported an increase in delinquent court-ordered debt from $5.5 billion at the end of FY 2008–2009 to $7 billion at the end of FY 2009–2010. As part of this effort, two websites with reference documents, tools, and resources were created and made available to the courts and counties. Pursuant to current legislation, efforts are under way to provide revised guidelines in the areas of cost recovery and discharge of accountability. As authorized under Vehicle Code section 42008, the unit is working with the courts and counties to develop and implement guidelines, provide materials, and assist with vendor selections for the upcoming one-time, mandatory infraction amnesty program that will offer eligible defendants the opportunity to make a payment of 50 percent of bail amounts and fine balances in full satisfaction of the debt, effective for a six-month period between January 1 and June 30, 2012.

4. Internal Audits
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$764,664
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$0

   Funding in FY 2011–2012 will support the branch's ongoing internal audit program. The internal audit program was initially approved by the Judicial Council in FY 2000–2001. Internal Audit Services conducts comprehensive audits (financial, operational, and compliance) encompassing court administration, cash controls, court revenues and expenditures, and general operations at each of the 58 trial courts approximately once every four years. 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.

5. Regional Office Assistance Group
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$1,740,862
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$0

Funding 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.

6. Treasury
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$228,230
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$0

   Funding in FY 2011–2012 will be used for ongoing costs associated with staff responsible for the accounting and distribution of civil fees collected by the trial courts. Staff receives monthly Uniform Civil Fees collection reporting data from all 58 trial courts, enters this reporting data into a financial systems application that calculates the statutory distributions, and executes the monthly cash distributions due to state and local agency recipients.

7. Trial Court Procurement
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$127,760
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$0

   Funding in FY 2011–2012 will support the continued statewide master agreement program being utilized by the trial courts. The program solicits agreements for goods and services commonly used by the courts, thus relieving the courts of the work involved in soliciting bids and proposals and negotiating and executing agreements on their own. It has been in place since 2005. The agreements have been widely used by the courts, and each year has seen increased participation by the trial courts. In addition, because of economies of scale associated with statewide agreements, these master agreements have resulted in pricing that is significantly below what most courts could receive on their own. Also, the master agreements provide for a consistent set of terms and conditions that better mitigate risk for the courts.

8. Trial Court Reengineering
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$290,946
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$0

   In FY 2011–2012, the Reengineering Unit will continue with its ongoing service to the trial courts and the judicial branch. With a kickoff date of July 2011, the unit will be collaborating with the Superior Court of Merced County on a reengineering project focusing on family law and traffic business processes. Additionally, the chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees (TCPJAC and CEAC) have requested the services of the unit to assist in promoting and supporting the concept of business process

reengineering for trial courts statewide. Given the magnitude of the budget reductions imposed on the judicial branch in FY 2011–2012, trial courts must now employ new strategies in order to continue to provide valuable services and access to justice for court constituents. Business process reengineering provides a methodology and structured process through which trial courts may look inward at longstanding operational processes and procedures with the goal of streamlining operations to achieve savings in staffing and resources. To encourage the use of business process reengineering, the Reengineering Unit will hold regional trainings on business process reengineering for trial courts across the state and, upon request, offer business process reengineering technical assistance to the trial courts. In addition, the unit will continue to assist small and medium-sized trial courts served by the AOC Northern/Central Regional Office on an as-needed basis to examine and identify **in**efficiencies in business processes.

Adjustments to Planned Allocations. The TCBWG proposes adjustments to three planned allocations of programs providing ongoing services to the trial courts for a net reduction of $1.158 million ($828,401 from the Modernization Fund and $329,114 from the Improvement Fund). Column C of Attachments C and E displays the reduction amount by individual project or program for the Modernization Fund and Improvement Fund, respectively. The reduction amounts by fund and their potential impacts on each of the three programs and projects are discussed below.

Modernization Fund

1. Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services
   Reduction: $828,401 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: At the projected FY 2011–2012 funding level, the Phoenix Program will continue to strive to provide system maintenance within existing resources. Every attempt will be made to reduce any negative impact to services provided to the trial courts on a daily basis. A reprioritization of maintenance and operations tasks will be conducted with an emphasis placed on ensuring that payroll services provided to court staff will continue with no interruption. Delays, however, will be unavoidable in all other areas, including issue research and resolution, court requests for system enhancements, interface monitoring, and reporting requirements. Phoenix Program staff will attempt to fill the gap in services by performing overtime and integrating automation wherever possible, but response times will be potentially prolonged by several months and even years.

Improvement Fund

2. California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)
   Reduction: $99,114 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: This program will be unable to fill one vacant position within the program, requiring all support to be provided by a single staff member, thereby impacting potential response times.

3. Trial Court Procurement
   Reduction: $230,000 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: This program will be unable to fund two positions within the program, requiring all support to be provided by a single staff member, thereby impacting potential response times.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

None.

Recommendations 3 and 4: Statewide Technology Infrastructure Allocations—Maintenance and Operations; Projects

3. Approve allocation of $65.544 million for statewide technology infrastructure maintenance and operations from the Modernization Fund ($11.698 million), the Improvement Fund ($22.004 million), and the TCTF ($31.842 million).

4. Approve allocation of $5.716 million for statewide technology infrastructure projects from the TCTF.

Rationale for Recommendations 3 and 4

The recommendations are consistent with judicial branch goals and the statutory purposes of the special funds and are intended to achieve various goals of the judicial branch as they apply to trial courts, including branchwide infrastructure for service excellence.

The statewide technology infrastructure projects, programs, and services are divided into two recommendations: (1) Maintenance and Operations and (2) Projects. The Maintenance and Operations category consists of maintenance and operations activities of large, branchwide initiatives, ongoing operations that are necessary for system maintenance, and AOC staff support for statewide technology infrastructure. The Projects category consists of the development and deployment of technology projects, including those that are part of large branchwide initiatives, smaller projects of interest to trial courts and the Judicial Council, and projects to improve the IT infrastructure that benefits trial courts.

This report recommends approval of a total of $109.370 million in allocations for these programs and projects in FY 2011–2012 ($11.698 million from the Modernization Fund, $22.004 million from the Improvement Fund, and $75.668 million from the TCTF). Attachment I provides a list of all programs and projects and the recommended allocations by fund source with a line number that corresponds with the bulleted numbers listed below. General Fund monies support some of these statewide efforts and, for information purposes only, are displayed where applicable. See column F of Attachment I for the recommended allocation from special funds and column A for the allocation from the General Fund. The recommended allocations already reflect any recommended adjustments discussed in the Adjustments to Planned Allocations section below.

Maintenance and Operations
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$65,544,083 (includes reimbursements)
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$1,951,676

1. California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Operations
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$8,419,203
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$448,244

   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 the CCMS Program Management Office (PMO), 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 used in the Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties. The CCMS Executive Committee, with the assistance of three advisory committees, provides comprehensive oversight of this program.

   CCMS uses 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.

   Maintenance and operations for CCMS were originally scheduled to begin during FY 2010–2011; however, owing to the change in the project schedule, it will begin in FY 2011–2012. The project team has been documenting changes and enhancements that will be required once the development of the core application and external components is completed.

   Based on the recommendation by the TCBWG, maintenance and operations activities including hosting will be minimized to the greatest extent possible. The PMO, in consultation with the CCMS Executive Committee, will determine the appropriate level of maintenance and support, prioritizing maintenance work needed to keep the application viable above any discretionary improvements.

   To mitigate the risks and potential consequences noted above, the PMO asks that the Judicial Council and the CCMS Executive Committee permit the PMO to perform additional analysis

resulting in additional strategies and alternatives for addressing the project budget that is approved by the Judicial Council.

Under the alternative strategy identified, funding in FY 2011–2012 will allow the following planned activities at reduced levels:

- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services at the vendor data center;
- Support and updates to data exchanges with justice partners;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services for testing, training, and production environments at the CCTC; and
- New releases of the products to address judicial branch requirements and legislative changes.

2. Civil, Mental Health, Small Claims, and Probate (V3) Case Management System
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$12,408,336 (nonreimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$1,379,591 (reimbursements)

   V3 continues to process 25 percent of civil cases statewide. All V3 courts (Superior Courts of Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, and Ventura Counties) are now using the latest version of V3, Release 10.03. E-filing was successfully deployed at the Orange County court at the end of FY 2009–2010. The Superior Courts of Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties continue to explore the possibility of deploying e-filing based on available funding.

   As was the case for the interim criminal and traffic case management system, technical support for the civil, small claims, probate and mental health case management system will begin to transition from Deloitte Consulting to the AOC ISD early in 2011. As with the transition by the criminal and traffic case management system to in-house support, after factoring in knowledge transfer costs and using parallel teams for several months during the transition, the PMO projects a savings of approximately $2.5 million through June 2014. During the FY 2011–2012, the transition from Deloitte to the AOC ISD will be completed. This transition will also build in-house functional and technical knowledge to be used for future technical support of CCMS. During FY 2011–2012, funding will support:

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

3. Criminal and Traffic (V2) Case Management System
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$6,054,763 (nonreimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$499,404 (reimbursements)

   V2 is a case management system for criminal and traffic cases. The Superior Court of Fresno County implemented V2 in July 2006, and its maintenance and support was successfully transitioned from Deloitte to the AOC in September 2009.

   During FY 2011–2012, 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.

4. California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$663,136
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$52,748

   CCPOR is a new system developed by the AOC and deployed to 22 California counties in 2010 and 2011. Among the remaining 36 superior courts, a number have indicated interest in CCPOR. Planning for the next phase of deployment is under way.

   CCPOR provides major improvements to victim safety and peace officer safety in domestic violence cases and cases involving violent crimes. CCPOR creates a statewide repository for restraining and protective orders (RPOs) that contains both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers. The registry provides judges with critical information necessary to prevent issuance of multiple protective orders with conflicting terms and conditions. It also provides law enforcement with complete images of these orders, including handwritten notes and enforcement warnings that are not captured by any other system. By creating a system that is shared by courts and their law enforcement partners CCPOR bridges communication gaps and improves interagency cooperation. These benefits work together to safeguard victims of crime and peace officers in the field.

   Currently 22 courts and their law enforcement partners depend on CCPOR for restraining and protective order processing. These counties would otherwise need to print and file the current 30,000-plus RPO files in CCPOR and revert to unreliable business processes. In addition, CCMS relies on CCPOR to transmit restraining and protective order information to the DOJ. Without the CCPOR systems, CCMS would incur additional costs for design and code changes and that project would be delayed.

CCPOR counties depend on the CCPOR system for operational cost savings and improvements to victim and officer safety. The courts have committed significant staff resources to train on and use the CCPOR system, in some cases deferring other vital projects, and have pressured their law enforcement partners to do the same because of the difference CCPOR makes in their counties.

5. California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$7,837,640 (nonreimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$1,806,573 (reimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$164,698

   CCTC provides consistent, high-quality hosting for the Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Systems and various case management systems and makes available an updated and robust infrastructure without interruption. 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 providing technical solutions statewide using a dual data center model that standardizes trial court application systems and operations for all trial courts.

6. Data Integration
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$4,824,977 (nonreimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$4,042 (reimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$435,187

   The Data Integration Program currently provides services that enable the efficient exchange of information between the courts and their integration partners. The funding for the Data Integration Program enables the technical infrastructure and support necessary to facilitate this integration.

   The technical infrastructure includes hardware and software hosted at the CCTC that comprises the Integrated Services Backbone (ISB). The ISB is a leveraged enterprise-class platform for exchanging information within the judicial branch and between the judicial branch and its integration partners.

   The technical infrastructure includes the Omnixx hardware and software hosted at the CCTC, which facilitates communications to the DOJ's CLETS infrastructure. This infrastructure is used by over 20 courts either directly via CLETS client workstations or via the CCPOR system to query or update information in DOJ systems. CCPOR is reliant on the Omnixx infrastructure to function.

The technical support provided by the Data Integration Program is necessary to ensure the hosted technical infrastructure is adequately maintained and enhanced. Technical support is provided in the following ways:

- Software maintenance is funded for the TIBCO products, which are the foundation of the ISB; the Omnixx product, which supports DOJ access through CLETS; and the DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products, which facilitate ad hoc Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) access for all hosted courts. For all of these products, the maintenance allows for product support that is necessary to obtain version upgrades, as well as vendor support for production issues and outages impacting courts;
- TIBCO services (professional services and direct consultants) maintain and enhance the ISB infrastructure and the production interfaces developed for it. They also support the Common Services that were developed primarily to support the CCMS data exchanges but that have now also been used for other non-CCMS production interfaces;
- Datamaxx services provide updates and enhancements for the Omnixx infrastructure as needed in support of CLETS access; and
- Concepts2000 services provide steady-state support for the DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products.

7. Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS) (Testing Tools)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$828,713

   ETMS is a program that develops and implements a suite of tools required by AOC software development teams. The tools consist of the 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), Subversion (a system to keep track of program versions during development), and CQ2SVN (a commercial product to link ClearQuest to Subversion).

8. Interim Case Management System (ICMS)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$5,152,306 (nonreimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$1,270,596 (reimbursements)
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$422,578

   The ICMS Unit provides program management support to 15 courts in 48 court locations and 2,100 users of the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system. Ten courts are hosted in the CCTC while five are hosted locally. The ICMS budget is used to fund program management oversight and technical expertise for the CCTC-hosted courts. This support includes maintenance and operational activities such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, disaster recovery services, CCTC infrastructure upgrades, and patch management. Locally hosted SJE courts utilize the ICMS program resources, as needed, for legislative updates and SJE support.

The ICMS funding also provides support resources for SJE interfaces, which include DMV, DOJ, and Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) interfaces in addition to the custom interfaces developed by Sustain, such as the FTB COD collections, IVR/IWR processing, issuance of warrants, traffic collections, FTA-FTP collections, and web portal interfaces. The ICMS budget funds the CCTC hosting costs for 10 courts and costs of maintenance and operations activities, such as upgrading the SJE application, implementing legislative updates, and production support tickets, for which there are no charge-backs to the courts.

In addition to the Sustain Program, ICMS resources are used to perform high-level assessments for courts that have failing legacy case management systems and to assist with identification of stabilization strategies while awaiting the deployment of CCMS.

9. Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy
   FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$5,957,966

   This program primarily funds the Oracle Branchwide License Agreement (BWLA), which includes four components: Enterprise Database, Advanced Security, BEA WebLogic Suite, and Identity Manager with additional options. These products are key components of current and future applications infrastructure throughout the branch, for both production and nonproduction environments. The licenses are available to and used by many applications that are hosted at local court facilities. The Oracle BWLA covers the entire branch with the covered products and provides unlimited use of licenses, which frees local courts from having to burden resources with complex software asset management and expensive annual maintenance renewals for the four components. Instead, local courts may access and install these Oracle products at no charge in any environment whenever needed without the expense of license administration.

10. Jury Technology Grants to Trial Courts
    FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$600,000

    The Jury Technology Grant Program solicits jury-related project proposals from the trial courts and prepares intrabranch agreements for those courts that are ultimately awarded grants. Examples of projects funded by these grants include (1) converting from one jury management system to another, (2) expanding jury system functionality by adding IVR/IWR or imaging, and (3) software/hardware upgrades for their existing systems. Since FY 2000–2001, 52 of the 58 trial courts have received funding from the Jury Technology Grant Program.

11. Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)
    FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$287,068
    FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$428,221

This program's purpose is to implement the Judicial Council's objectives for court e-business and e-filing initiatives by supporting the implementation of electronic filing of court documents, as well as electronic service of court documents, to all California superior courts and justice/integration partners.

SEBS provides a myriad of electronic services and related support for the trial courts in addition to statewide initiatives that create economies of scale for the local trial courts and the branch as a whole.

Benefits of the program and initiatives are:

- Develop a uniform, secure, standardized statewide portal platform to provide simple e-filing capability for courts statewide. This solution is easily extensible to support courts currently utilizing CCMS and e-filing service providers, in addition to non-CCMS trial courts with no e-filing or limited capabilities; and
- Create access to simple court processes and training statewide for court staff, thereby allowing staff to better focus on customer support.

12. Telecommunications Support
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$7,164,167

This program refreshes network technology and equipment that is about to become an end-of-life product. The program forecasts the budget by working with service integrators and hardware vendor road maps to identify technology requiring replacement.

The services provided as part of the program are as follows:

- AT&T, the primary integration vendor, provides individual court design and deployment services;
- Independent consultants working directly for the AOC, providing enterprise engineering oversight, design escalation, and program management for the branch;
- Procurement of end-of-life hardware;
- Procurement of court training credits in order for court IT staff to support their network infrastructure; and
- Deployment and support of the branch LAN management system, which provides an accurate inventory of all deployed network hardware in order to forecast future refresh cycles.

13. Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS)
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$385,602

This system supports distribution and mandated reporting of uniform civil fees collected by all 58 superior courts, with an average of $50 million distributed per month. In 2005, UCFS was originally intended to be a temporary application (6–12 months) until the required functionality was incorporated into Phoenix or CCMS. This application has been in place for six years and modified many times to keep up with changing legislation and business processes. The current UCFS funding is for two full-time contractors performing ongoing maintenance and support. UCFS was not allotted any staffing support and relies solely on contractors.

The expected benefits of the current funding include:

- Support for legislated and mandated changes to distribution rules to ensure accurate and timely civil fee distributions to appropriate entities within the mandated timeframes;
- Full support that provides a high level of system availability and reliability in order to help trial courts avoid penalties to state, county, court, and third parties for late reporting and distribution of funds;
- Support for upgrades to the existing technical architecture components (e.g., Oracle, Cold Fusion) to ensure a system architecture that is current and supportable by the system software vendors; and
- Support for system improvements to address changes to the business process.

Projects
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$5,715,993
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from General Fund—$0

14. California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Deployment
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$2,316,306

At the end of FY 2009–2010, deployment of CCMS-V4 began with three "early adopter" courts, the Superior Courts of San Diego, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties. The original intention was to validate the application in a production environment in a large-, medium-, and small–sized court, respectively. The AOC and Deloitte executed the Early Adopter Readiness & Assessment Statement of Work (SOW) and produced the deployment strategy and readiness and integration assessment for the three early adopter courts.

The CCMS team is focused on the first phase of deployment, which is the development of local configurations for the early adopter courts. This effort includes the standardization of operational processes and configurations to the extent possible, as well as the development of tools that will be used for future courts deploying CCMS. An SOW was negotiated to create a set of configuration process maps that will serve as a guide for stepping through system processes with the purpose of configuring the application for each court during deployment. Currently a number of deployment readiness tools are being evaluated by courts considering CCMS.

During FY 2011–2012, funding will support creating deployment-specific hosting environments for the application, developing standardized configurations, establishing a full-service CCMS training component through the AOC Education Division, and re-engaging predeployment activities with the early adopter courts. These activities are critical to keeping the deployment of CCMS on schedule. Recognizing the potential for funding interruptions as a result of budget shortfalls, the PMO has outlined several scenarios that protract the deployment of CCMS in the early adopter courts in order to implement immediate cost saving strategies.

The TCBWG recommendation would extend the deployment delay by one year and curtail, to the greatest extent possible, all application maintenance activities. This would also require a realignment of AOC staff serving the project, cancellation of some vendor and consultant contracts, and a proposal to the CCMS Executive Committee to suspend activities of the three CCMS advisory committees. The CCMS PMO will evaluate the work to be contracted to Deloitte to limit expenses, ensure that the activities support the new pace of deployments, and reduce, to the greatest extent possible, risk associated with any loss of CCMS application knowledge resulting from the loss of project staff. These actions are necessary to achieve meaningful savings over the six-month delay option.

As a consequence, restarting the project will be time consuming and costly and poses additional risks. A possible reinitiation of predeployment activities and project plans may be necessary as they will be almost three years old by the time deployments will have restarted. Under this scenario, local justice partners will have to reassign the staff they assigned to support CCMS deployments, and it is possible that these local county partners will withdraw from the project permanently.

To prepare for a project restart, the CCMS PMO is anticipating a reengagement time period during which the project would be readied for full effectiveness. During this time the project would be reassessed, staff reconstituted, and project participants reoriented. A reengagement time period would create additional project costs and would have to be weighed against any savings anticipated for a particular delay scenario.

To mitigate the risks and potential consequences noted above, the PMO asks that the Judicial Council and the CCMS Executive Committee permit the PMO to perform additional analysis with the goal of formulating additional strategies and alternatives for addressing the project budget that is approved by the Judicial Council.

The alternative recommended by staff and the CCMS Executive Committee to the TCBWG involves full deployment of all case types at the Superior Courts of Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties after a six-month pause. By delaying the initiation of most deployment activities for six months the AOC spreads the cost of deployments over three fiscal years, which would push deployments into FY 2013–2014. In the existing contract, Deloitte had

agreed to deploy CCMS in the Superior Court of Fresno County at no cost to the branch in consideration for the nine-month delay in delivering CCMS. As part of this strategy, those service credits would be used to deploy Superior Court of Ventura County instead of Superior Court of Fresno County, reducing the contract costs related to deployment.

While early adopter deployment would not be completed until FY 2013–2014, both courts would remain engaged in the process. The PMO anticipates that local justice partners will accept the delay and that the extra time may actually be helpful given the impact that budget reductions will have on county staff. This option avoids the loss of key staff and vendor/contractors as there will be some level of activity during the pause.

15. California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Development
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$3,399,687

In December 2009, during preliminary vendor testing of the CCMS core product, the AOC and the courts discovered numerous quality issues with the application code. As a result, the AOC required that a rigorous and extensive effort be introduced to verify that the application code met the requirements of the final functional design. These quality issues resulted in a project delay of completion of the core product previously anticipated for November 2010 to April 2011. Additional AOC, court, and vendor resources were dedicated to a comprehensive review process that involved comparison of developed code against the final functional design, a process that identified and resolved 50,000 issues prior to the move to vendor testing. The AOC and court subject matter experts were involved in the process and tested issue fixes in the application code to ensure readiness. The vendor is responsible for the costs associated with correcting the quality issues and any costs incurred by the branch as a result of the project's delay.

During FY 2011–2012, funding will support completion of the development of CCMS-V4, which began in June 2007. Funds were encumbered to complete the development vendor contract in previous fiscal years. Owing to the new project schedule and the resulting change in the CCMS application completion dates, certain costs for development resources (staffing, contractors, and hosting charges) that were forecasted as maintenance and operations expenses were reclassified and are now being reported as project costs. Because these costs are only being reclassified from one category of expense to another, the shift has no impact on the overall program budget.

16. CCMS Document Management System (DMS) Development and Deployment
FY 2011–2012 Allocation from special funds—$0

The need for a DMS has been identified by AOC divisions and trial and appellate courts. The former CCMS steering and oversight committees endorsed the need for a DMS to be integrated within CCMS. The Court Technology Advisory Committee recommended that a project to develop a DMS solution be undertaken. The AOC ISD has partnered with the

Superior Court of Santa Clara County to initiate a DMS pilot project targeted to provide input for the optimal DMS solution.

Under the TCBWG one-year pause recommendation, no costs would be incurred for the development and deployment of DMS.

Under the alternative strategy identified in the CCMS Deployment section, funding in FY 2011–2012 will allow the following planned activities:

- Strategy and plans for a DMS development environment for early adopter courts that do not have a DMS or seek to use a centralized service;
- Negotiation and procurement of DMS software and professional services;
- Establishment of CCTC hosting services;
- Implementation of the DMS development environment; and
- Development of the business case for full deployment.

Adjustments to Planned Allocations. This report proposes adjustments to 11 planned allocations of programs and projects related to statewide technology infrastructure for a net reduction of $13.607 million ($4.676 million from the Modernization Fund and $8.931 million from the Improvement Fund). Column C of Attachments C and E displays the reduction and augmentation amount by individual project or program for the Modernization Fund and Improvement Fund, respectively. The reduction amounts by fund and their potential impacts on each of the 11 programs and projects are discussed below.

Modernization Fund

1. CCIS Policy Deployments
   Reduction: $424,973 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: Currently none of the California courts has a IS security policy based on the branch framework. The reduction will suspend the CCIS policy program, thereby delaying the completion and distribution of the policy template to the trial courts. This will require most courts to continue to operate without written information security policies, creating security gaps in their system operations. As a result, court systems may be vulnerable to many types of exploitations—both technical and operational—and courts will be exposed to long-term outages that may prove costly— both monetarily and to the detriment of the public's confidence.

2. Courts Linked by Information and Knowledge (CLIK) System
   Reduction: $859,072 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The CLIK program was intended to replace the existing Themis system and rewrite the Contact and Position System (CAPS) used for communication to the judicial community. Themis also contains the Assigned Judges Tracking System (AJTS) used to identify available judges to assist courts with caseloads and submit applications and invoices for services.

Eliminating the CLIK program funding will suspend the development of the replacement system. There is a significant risk of interruptions because of the aging technical platform used to create Themis 10 years ago. In addition, the current system may not be able to respond to legislative, program, or business process changes, causing inefficiencies in business processes and causing some functionality to lose its effectiveness or become obsolete.

3. California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)
   Reduction: $369,000 (one-time)
   Transfer $663,136 from Modernization Fund to Improvement Fund (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The CCPOR program would need to delay the planned deployment of the system to 12–15 additional counties in FY 2011–2012, as well as to additional law enforcement partners from counties currently using the system. The program would also need to delay plans to enable optical character recognition of restraining and protective orders, which is targeted to speed up and improve accuracy of order entry. At the reduced funding level, the program would be able to support 100 percent of the hosting of the CCPOR system at the CCTC, support contracts for scanning software provided to the courts and law enforcement, and maintenance and expansion of the CCPOR software. These are required costs to keep the CCPOR system online at the most minimum level.

   Funding is proposed to be transferred to the Improvement Fund from the Modernization Fund in FY 2011–2012 in order for the total allocation in the Modernization Fund to be less than the $18.7 million appropriation. Equivalent reductions in planned expenditures from the Improvement Fund would allow this transfer to be accommodated.

4. Data Integration
   Reduction: $678,256 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The budget normally includes funds for general program-related change control through the fiscal year. This reduction would eliminate any funding for unanticipated data integration interface needs. If unanticipated needs occur, planned interfaces may require to be reprioritized to fit within the current budget.

5. Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy
   Transfer $5,957,966 from Modernization Fund to Improvement Fund (one-time)
   Description and Impact: Funding is proposed to be transferred to the Improvement Fund from the Modernization Fund in order for the total allocation in the Modernization Fund to be less than the $18.7 million appropriation. Equivalent reductions in planned expenditures from the Improvement Fund would allow this transfer to be accommodated.

6. Telecommunications Support
   Reduction: $6,600,000 (one-time)

Description and Impact: The funding reduction defers hardware refresh, which would result in increased costs in future years. Not completing the refresh cycle by FY 2015–2016 would delay the refresh of 500 network devices as they reach their end-of-life cycles. The 500 network devices are composed of 120 core network switches and 320 distribution closet switches to the workstations and security endpoint switches for external connectivity. These switches are the backbone of every court, providing connectivity to every court user; case management, financial, e-mail, and other court systems; justice partners; and the public. Without refresh of these switches, court operations reliant on applications hosted at the CCTC can be impacted if they fail.

The courts can either purchase these switches proactively on their own or risk waiting until a failure occurs. The procurement cycle for the smaller closet switches is 21 business days. The cycle for the larger core switches can be up to 60 days. This does not include installation and configuration. The courts would experience an outage for the duration of that time, until the hardware is replaced. The closet switches will impact between 24 and 48 end devices. A core switch will impact an entire court location.

7. Uniform Civil Filing Fees
   Transfer $385,602 from Modernization Fund to Improvement Fund (one-time)
   Description and Impact: Funding is proposed to be transferred to the Improvement Fund from the Modernization Fund in FY 2011–2012 in order for the total allocation in the Modernization Fund to be less than the $18.7 million appropriation. Equivalent reductions in planned expenditures from the Improvement Fund would allow this transfer to be accommodated.

Improvement Fund

8. E-Forms Project (Smart Forms)
   Reduction: $331,437 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The project will not be funded in FY 2011–2012. E-forms provide features and technology to help address existing problems related to forms. While there are many benefits that can be realized with the use of e-forms, the two most prominent are (1) the ability to build intelligence into forms for validation and calculations and (2) the ability to retain data entered on the form in a format that may be readily integrated with the court's case management system. This project provides comprehensive and accessible e-filing services to self-represented litigants and all those who use forms to file matters in court. It also will result in statewide standardization and aid in the furtherance of Judicial Council form use.

9. Statewide Electronic Filing Portal (branch-owned)
   Reduction: $55,122 (one-time)
   Description and Impact: The project will not be funded in FY 2011–2012. The overarching objective of the e-filing portal initiative was to offer a statewide portal that would minimize cost barriers and inconsistencies that otherwise prohibit or limit participation in e-filing by

self-represented litigants and some government agencies. A branch portal is envisioned to provide 24/7 statewide e-filing access for all court filers and specifically self-represented litigants and government filers. The portal will provide a single point of connectivity for electronic filing service providers and a standardized interface for electronic filing throughout the state.

10. California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) Operations
    Reduction: $3,689,550 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: Suspension of funding will defer hardware refresh, Oracle EIdM, and the Federated Security Model.

    - Deferring this hardware refresh project will impact service levels and availability of nonproduction environments if hardware fails in FY 2011–2012. In addition, hardware replacement parts will be difficult to purchase, thereby extending the downtime of the service.
    - If the EIdM is deferred, the AOC will need to renew the Siteminder licenses for another year (approximately $48,000). The EIdM would be covered under the AOC Oracle branchwide licenses.
    - Deferring the Federated Security Model project would prohibit the courts from using a single sign-on tool, thereby requiring that the AOC continue to use Siteminder.

11. Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)
    Reduction: $600,000 (one-time)
    Description and Impact: The support projects relating to justice partner outreach and e-filing will not be able to continue at the level needed. This will result in limited and inconsistent public access to e-filing throughout the state and prevent the branch from finalizing and implementing e-filing standards.

    In addition, realization of these benefits by the trial and appellate courts and the branch as a whole will be delayed, with the following potential results:

    - Lack of standardization and governance ability: The Judicial Council will lose its ability as a governing body to propagate and implement new standards without a significant investment in cost and time by all parties.
    - Use of many third party solutions: The courts will be cluttered with several third party solutions, making it difficult and expensive for the courts and the branch to make future transitions.
    - Lack of an effective solution for all case types, not just civil: The risk of third parties handling sensitive criminal case documents cannot be eliminated without a portal and centralized document management system (DMS) capability.
    - Longer time for transitioning to new technology, standards, and processes: A portal solution provides forward and backward compatibility (support for various formats: CCMS, NIEM, 2GEFS), enabling quicker transition to CCMS or interim systems.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

None.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

Once approved, program staff will prepare the appropriate documents such as requests for proposals, standard agreements, and memoranda of understanding to implement these projects.

Recommendation 5: Delegation of Technical Adjustment Authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts

5. 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 to the council after the end of the fiscal year.

Previous council action

Government Code sections 77209(g) and 77213(b) allow the Judicial Council, with appropriate guidelines, to delegate the administration of the Improvement Fund and the Modernization Fund, respectively, to the Administrative Director of the Courts. 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 I and II to any other category.

Rationale for Recommendation 5

This standard technical delegation to the Administrative Director is 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 requiring the Administrative Director to return to the council during the fiscal year to seek authority to amend these allocations, having the authority delegated in advance will facilitate allocation of 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.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

No specific alternatives were considered, other than returning to the council each time technical adjustments need to be made or if unanticipated costs arise. This approach would likely cause delays in providing necessary funding to the courts, programs, or projects involved.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Overview of Special Funds
2. Attachment B: Modernization Fund Summary
3. Attachment C: Modernization Fund Detail
4. Attachment D: Trial Court Improvement Fund Summary
5. Attachment E: Trial Court Improvement Fund Detail
6. Attachment F: Trial Court Trust Fund Summary
7. Attachment G: Trial Court Trust Fund Detail
8. Attachment H: Ongoing Services for Trial Courts by Fund Source
9. Attachment I: Statewide Technology Infrastructure by Fund Source
10. Attachment J: TCBWG Modernization Fund Subcommittee Recommended Adjustments

Overview of Special Funds
FY 2010-2011 Budget and Year-End Estimate and
FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation

(amount in dollars)

I. Modernization Fund	FY 2010-11 Budget	FY 2010-11 Year-End Estimate	FY 2011-12 Budget		
			Projected Resources and Previously Approved Allocation	Adjustments	Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocations
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E
Adjusted Beginning Balance	30,933,026	30,933,026	1,483,783	-	1,483,783
Revenues and Transfers	7,380,951	7,362,686	18,935,462	-	18,935,462
Total Resources	**38,313,977**	**38,295,712**	**20,419,245**	**-**	**20,419,245**
All Other Projects and Programs	9,214,365	8,560,114	9,552,165	(3,348,684)	6,203,481
Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services	28,813,416	28,251,815	29,219,989	(16,766,406)	12,453,583
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	**38,027,781**	**36,811,929**	**38,772,154**	**(20,115,091)**	**18,657,064**
Ending Fund Balance	**286,196**	**1,483,783**	**(18,352,910)**		**1,762,181**

II. Improvement Fund	FY 2010-11 Budget	FY 2010-11 Year-End Estimate	FY 2011-12 Budget		
			Projected Resources and Previously Approved Allocation	Adjustments	Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E
Adjusted Beginning Balance	20,674,512	23,640,979	29,964,452	-	29,964,452
Revenues and Transfers	57,396,950	55,123,545	47,008,752	-	47,008,752
Total Resources	**78,071,462**	**78,764,524**	**76,973,204**	**-**	**76,973,204**
Projects and Programs	24,010,853	15,733,475	18,025,409	(2,446,376)	15,579,033
Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services	38,959,966	32,204,827	31,792,264	2,001,481	33,793,745
Emergency Funding Reserve (reserved until March 15)			9,848,315	-	9,848,315
Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve	1,000,000	-	1,000,000		1,000,000
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	**63,970,819**	**47,938,302**	**50,817,673**	**(444,895)**	**50,372,778**
Prorata	862,000	861,770	861,770	-	861,770
Ending Fund Balance	**13,238,643**	**29,964,452**	**25,293,761**		**25,738,656**

III. Trial Court Trust Fund	FY 2010-11 Budget	FY 2010-11 Year-End Estimate	FY 2011-12 Budget		
			Projected Resources and Previously Approved Allocation	Adjustments	Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocations
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E
Adjusted Beginning Balance	107,997,315	104,403,251	56,423,141	-	56,423,141
Revenues and Transfers	3,017,930,045	3,006,357,558	2,381,051,352	-	2,381,051,352
Total Resources	**3,125,927,361**	**3,110,760,809**	**2,437,474,493**	**-**	**2,437,474,493**
Projects and Programs	2,970,034,542	2,985,043,172	2,368,167,148	-	2,368,167,148
Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services	96,602,668	69,294,496	40,035,527	5,715,993	45,751,520
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	**3,066,637,210**	**3,054,337,668**	**2,408,202,675**	**5,715,993**	**2,413,918,668**
Ending Fund Balance	**59,290,151**	**56,423,141**	**29,271,818**		**23,555,825**

IV. Combined *(Modernization Fund, Improvement Fund, and TCTF)*	**FY 2010-11 Budget**	**FY 2010-11 Year-End Estimate**	**FY 2011-12 Budget**		
			Projected Resources and Previously Approved Allocation	**Adjustments**	**Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation**
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E
Adjusted Beginning Balance	159,604,853	158,977,256	87,871,376	-	87,871,376
Revenues and Transfers	3,082,707,946	3,068,843,789	2,446,995,566	-	2,446,995,566
Total Resources	**3,242,312,800**	**3,227,821,045**	**2,534,866,942**	**-**	**2,534,866,942**
Court Operations	3,003,259,760	3,009,336,761	2,395,744,722	(5,795,060)	2,389,949,662
Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services	164,376,050	129,751,138	101,047,780	(9,048,932)	91,998,848
Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve	1,000,000	-	1,000,000	-	1,000,000
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	**3,168,635,810**	**3,139,087,899**	**2,497,792,503**	**(14,843,993)**	**2,482,948,510**
Prorata	862,000	861,770	861,770	-	861,770
Ending Fund Balance	**72,814,990**	**87,871,376**	**36,212,669**		**51,056,662**

Modernization Fund
Summary of FY 2010-2011 Budget and Year-End Estimates and FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation
(amount in dollars)

	FY 2010-11 Budget	FY 2010-11 Year-End Estimate	FY 2011-12 Budget		
			Projected Resources / Previously Approved Allocation	Adjustment	Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E
Adjusted Beginning Balance	**30,933,026**	**30,933,026**	**1,483,783**	**-**	**1,483,783**
Revenues and Transfers					
Income from Surplus Money Investment Fund	271,951	253,321	226,462	-	226,462
Other Revenues and Charges	-	365	-	-	-
State General Fund Transfer	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	-	38,709,000
Transfer To Trial Court Trust Fund	(31,600,000)	(31,600,000)	(20,000,000)	-	(20,000,000)
Total, Revenues and Transfers	**7,380,951**	**7,362,686**	**18,935,462**	**-**	**18,935,462**
Total Resources	**38,313,977**	**38,295,712**	**20,419,245**	**-**	**20,419,245**
Expenditures and Encumbrances					
Category 1 - Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	28,813,416	28,251,815	29,219,989	(16,766,406)	12,453,583
Category 2 - Education / Developmental Programs	2,567,005	2,154,892	2,640,005	(1,010,719)	1,629,286
Category 3 - Pilot, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects	6,647,360	6,405,222	6,912,160	(2,337,965)	4,574,195
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	**38,027,781**	**36,811,929**	**38,772,154**	**(20,115,091)**	**18,657,064**
Ending Fund Balance	**286,196**	**1,483,783**	**(18,352,910)**		**1,762,181**

Attachment B

Modernization Fund
FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program
(amount in dollars)

Line #	Project and Program Description	Term of Funding	Previously Approved/ Planned Allocation	Recommended	
				Adjustment	Total Allocation
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
1	**Category 1 - Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**				
2	**(1) Projects**				
3	CCIS Policy Deployments	One-Time	424,973	(424,973)	-
4	Courts Linked by Information and Knowledge (CLIK) Syste	One-Time	859,072	(859,072)	-
5	**(2) Ongoing Programs and Services**				
6	***A. Statewide Technology Infrastructure***				
7	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	Ongoing	1,032,136	(1,032,136)	-
8	Data Integration	Ongoing	5,212,132	(678,256)	**4,533,876**
9	Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy	Ongoing	5,957,966	(5,957,966)	-
10	Telecommunications Support	Ongoing	13,764,167	(6,600,000)	**7,164,167**
11	Uniform Civil Fees	Ongoing	385,602	(385,602)	-
12	**Subtotal, Statewide Technology Infrastructure**		**27,636,048**	**(15,938,005)**	**11,698,043**
13	***B. Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts***				
14	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	Ongoing	1,583,941	(828,401)	**755,540**
15	**Subtotal, Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**		**1,583,941**	**(828,401)**	**755,540**
16	**Total, Category 1**		**29,219,989**	**(16,766,406)**	**12,453,583**
17	**Category 2 - Education and Developmental Programs**				
18	**(1) Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER)**				
19	*I. Mandated state judicial education programs*				
20	B.E. Witkin Judicial College of California	Ongoing	264,000	(74,000)	**190,000**
21	Family Law Assignment Education	Ongoing	65,000	(40,000)	**25,000**
22	Juvenile Law Assignment Education	Ongoing	33,000	(8,000)	**25,000**
23	Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	Ongoing	105,000	(30,000)	**75,000**
24	*Subtotal*		*467,000*	*(152,000)*	***315,000***
25	*II. Other recommended judicial education programs*				
26	Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	Ongoing	30,000	(30,000)	-
27	Civil Law and Procedure Institute	Ongoing	25,000	(25,000)	-
28	Cow County Judges Institute	Ongoing	25,000	(25,000)	-
29	Criminal Law and Procedure Institute	Ongoing	25,000	-	**25,000**
30	Overview Courses	Ongoing	192,500	62,500	**255,000**
31	Probate and Mental Health Institute	Ongoing	41,000	(41,000)	-
32	Statewide Fairness Conference	Ongoing	30,000	(30,000)	-
33	Traffic Law Institute	Every other year	25,000	(25,000)	-
34	Winter Continuing Judicial Studies Program	Ongoing	115,000	(74,000)	**41,000**
35	*Subtotal*		*508,500*	*(187,500)*	***321,000***
36	*III. Programs related to court administration*				
37	California Judicial Administration Conference	Every other year	38,042	(38,042)	-
38	Court Management Courses	Ongoing	140,000	(62,000)	**78,000**
39	Fall Leadership Summit	Every other year	80,000	(80,000)	-

Modernization Fund
FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program
(amount in dollars)

Line #	Project and Program Description	Term of Funding	Previously Approved/ Planned Allocation	Recommended	
				Adjustment	Total Allocation
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
40	Technical Assistance to Local Courts	Ongoing	200,000	(200,000)	**-**
41	Trial Court Faculty (Statewide Education Programs)	Ongoing	300,000	(10,000)	**290,000**
42	Train the Trainers - Faculty Development	Ongoing	120,000	(40,000)	**80,000**
43	*Subtotal*		*878,042*	*(430,042)*	***448,000***
44	*IV. Programs for trial court staff*				
45	Court Clerk Training Institute	Ongoing	168,000	(63,000)	**105,000**
46	Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast)	Ongoing	275,000	(55,000)	**220,000**
47	Mid-level Management Conferences	Ongoing	35,000	(11,000)	**24,000**
48	Trial Court Judicial Attorney Institute	Every other year	-	50,000	**50,000**
49	*Subtotal*		*478,000*	*(79,000)*	***399,000***
50	**Total, CJER**		**2,331,542**	**(848,542)**	**1,483,000**
51	**(2) Other Educational and Developmental Programs**				
52	Budget Focused Training and Meetings (TCBWG)	Ongoing	27,272	(14,263)	**13,009**
53	CFCC Programs	Ongoing	129,226	(38,953)	**90,273**
54	CFCC Publications	Ongoing	121,961	(101,961)	**20,000**
55	Labor Relations Academy	Ongoing	30,004	(7,000)	**23,004**
56	**Total, Other**		**308,463**	**(162,177)**	**146,286**
57	**Total, Category 2**		**2,640,005**	**(1,010,719)**	**1,629,286**
58	**Category 3 - Pilot, Special Initiatives, and Ongoing Projects**				
59	Alternative Dispute Resolution for Civil Cases	Ongoing	1,740,000	(1,665,000)	**75,000**
60	Branchwide Communication	Ongoing	80,000	(80,000)	**-**
61	Complex Civil Litigation	Ongoing	4,001,010	-	**4,001,010**
62	Court Interpreter Testing, Recruitment and Education	Ongoing	315,000	(174,615)	**140,385**
63	Interactive Software - Self-rep Electronic Forms	Ongoing	60,000	(20,000)	**40,000**
64	Public Education and Outreach	Ongoing	511,800	(234,000)	**277,800**
65	Ralph N. Kleps Award Program	Ongoing	54,500	(34,500)	**20,000**
66	Self-help Videos for the Website	Ongoing	3,850	(3,850)	**-**
67	Trial Court Performance and Accountability	Ongoing	146,000	(126,000)	**20,000**
68	**Total, Category 3**		**6,912,160**	**(2,337,965)**	**4,574,195**
69	**Total, All Categories**		**38,772,154**	**(20,115,091)**	**18,657,064**

Trial Court Improvement Fund
Summary of FY 2010-11 Budget and Year-End Estimate and FY 2011-12 Recommended Allocation
(amount in dollars)

	FY 2010-11 Budget	FY 2010-11 Year-End Estimate	FY 2011-12 Budget		
			Projected Resources / Previously Approved Allocation	Adjustment	Total Projected Resources and Recommended Allocation
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E
Adjusted Beginning Balance [1]	**20,674,512**	**23,640,979**	**29,964,452**	**-**	**29,964,452**
Revenues					
50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	40,846,821	40,846,821	40,846,821	-	40,846,821
2% Automation Fund	17,629,673	17,405,180	17,405,180	-	17,405,180
Income from Surplus Money Investment Fund	174,351	125,439	112,156	-	112,156
Royalties from Publications	510,965	510,965	510,965	-	510,965
Other Revenues and Charges [2]	2,566,000	566,000	-	-	-
Subtotal, Revenues	**61,727,810**	**59,454,405**	**58,875,122**	**-**	**58,875,122**
Transfers and Adjustments					
1% Transfer from Trial Court Trust Fund	27,232,140	27,232,140	19,696,630	-	19,696,630
Transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund	(31,563,000)	(31,563,000)	(31,563,000)	-	(31,563,000)
Subtotal, Transfers and Adjustments	**(4,330,860)**	**(4,330,860)**	**(11,866,370)**	**-**	**(11,866,370)**
Total Resources	**78,071,462**	**78,764,524**	**76,973,204**	**-**	**76,973,204**
Expenditures and Encumbrances					
Category 1 - Ongoing Statewide Programs (excluding statewide technology infrastructure and ongoing services to the trial courts)	15,415,409	14,546,537	15,525,409	(1,246,376)	14,279,033
Category 2 - Trial Court Projects and Model Programs	8,595,443	1,186,938	2,500,000	(1,200,000)	1,300,000
Category 3 - Emergency Funding Reserve (reserved until March 15)	13,616,070	-	9,848,315	-	9,848,315
Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve [3]	1,000,000	-	1,000,000	-	1,000,000
Subtotal, Local Assistance	**25,010,852**	**15,733,475**	**19,025,409**	**(2,446,376)**	**16,579,033**
Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Local Assistance	30,860,366	24,441,182	23,498,533	2,488,720	25,987,253
Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Administrative Support	8,099,600	7,763,645	8,293,731	(487,239)	7,806,492
Subtotal, Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	**38,959,966**	**32,204,827**	**31,792,264**	**2,001,481**	**33,793,745**
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	**63,970,818**	**47,938,302**	**50,817,673**	**(444,895)**	**50,372,778**
Prorata	862,000	861,770	861,770	-	861,770
Ending Fund Balance	**13,238,643**	**29,964,452**	**25,293,761**		**25,738,656**

Note:

1) FY 2010-11 Adjusted Beginning Balance - the difference of $2,966,467 between the budget and year-end estimate is due to under-accrual of revenue.

2) Estimated other revenues and charges for FY 2010-11 includes loan repayments from two superior courts and an estimated transfer fund from Bank of America's "trial court benefit account". However, the $2.0 million transfer from BofA account was not completed by the end of June 2011.

3) Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve - Reflects the anticipated funding need of the trial courts to address urgent needs.

Trial Court Improvement Fund
FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program

(amount in dollars)

Line #	Project and Program Description	Term of Funding	Previously Approved/ Planned Allocation	Recommended	
				Adjustment	Total Allocation
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
1	**Category 1 - Ongoing Statewide Programs**				
2	***(1) Non-Statewide Administrative and Technology Infrastructure***				
3	Connecting with Constituencies	Ongoing	260,000	(260,000)	**-**
4	Domestic Violence Family Law Interpreter Program	Ongoing	1,750,000	-	**1,750,000**
5	HR Legal Counsel for Trial Court Benefits	Ongoing	80,000	-	**80,000**
6	Judicial Officer Assistance Program (JOAP)	Ongoing	100,000	(15,000)	**85,000**
7	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	Ongoing	762,299	31,624	**793,923**
8	Jury System Improvement Projects	Funding from actual receipts	68,000	(50,000)	**18,000**
9	Litigation Management Program	Ongoing	4,500,000	-	**4,500,000**
10	Self-Help Center	Ongoing	5,000,000	-	**5,000,000**
11	Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	Ongoing	300,000	(150,000)	**150,000**
12	Subscription Costs - Judicial Conduct Reporter	Ongoing	20,110	(3,000)	**17,110**
13	Trial Court Security Grants	Ongoing	2,000,000	(800,000)	**1,200,000**
14	Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program	Ongoing	685,000	-	**685,000**
15	***Subtotal, Non-Technology***		**15,525,409**	**(1,246,376)**	**14,279,033**
16	***(2) Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts***				
17	**I. Projects (Local Assistance)**				
18	E-Forms Project (Smart Forms)	One-Time	331,437	(331,437)	**-**
19	Statewide Electronic Filing Portal (Branch-owned Portal)	One-Time	55,122	(55,122)	**-**
20	**Subtotal, Projects**		**386,559**	**(386,559)**	**-**
21	**II. Ongoing Programs and Services**				
22	**(I) Ongoing Programs and Services (Local Assistance)**				
23	***A. Local Assistance Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure***				
24	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	Ongoing	-	663,136	**663,136**
25	California Court Technology Center (CCTC)	Ongoing	11,527,190	(3,689,550)	**7,837,640**
26	Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools)	Ongoing	828,713	-	**828,713**
27	Interim Case Management System (ICMS)	Ongoing	5,152,306	-	**5,152,306**
28	Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy	Ongoing	-	5,957,966	**5,957,966**
29	Jury Technology Grants to Trial Courts	Ongoing	600,000	-	**600,000**
30	Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)	Ongoing	441,875	(441,875)	**-**
31	Uniform Civil Fees	Ongoing	-	385,602	**385,602**
32	**Subtotal, Local Assistance Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure**		**18,936,643**	**2,488,720**	**21,425,363**
33	***B. Local Assistance Related to Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts***				
34	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	Ongoing	4,561,890	-	**4,561,890**
35	**Subtotal, Local Assistance Related to Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**		**4,561,890**	**-**	**4,561,890**
36	**(II) Ongoing Programs and Services (Administrative Support)**				
37	***A. Support Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure***				
38	California Court Technology Center (CCTC)	Ongoing	1,668,559	-	**1,668,559**
39	Data Integration	Ongoing	291,101	-	**291,101**
40	Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)	Ongoing	445,193	(158,125)	**287,068**
41	**Subtotal, Support Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure**		**2,404,853**	**(158,125)**	**2,246,728**
42	***B. Support Related to Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts***				
43	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System	Ongoing	263,322	(99,114)	**164,208**
44	Enhanced Collections	Ongoing	801,947	-	**801,947**
45	Internal Audits	Ongoing	764,664	-	**764,664**
46	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	Ongoing	1,441,147	-	**1,441,147**

Trial Court Improvement Fund
FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program

(amount in dollars)

Line #	Project and Program Description	Term of Funding	Previously Approved/ Planned Allocation	Recommended	
				Adjustment	Total Allocation
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
47	Regional Office Assistance Group	Ongoing	1,740,862	-	**1,740,862**
48	Treasury	Ongoing	228,230	-	**228,230**
49	Trial Court Procurement	Ongoing	357,760	(230,000)	**127,760**
50	Trial Court Re-engineering	Ongoing	290,946		**290,946**
51	**Subtotal, Support Related to Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**		**5,888,878**	**(329,114)**	**5,559,764**
52	**Total, Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services Support**		**8,293,731**	**(487,239)**	**7,806,492**
53	**Total, Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services Local Assistance**		**23,498,533**	**2,488,720**	**25,987,253**
54	**Total, Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**		**31,792,264**	**2,001,481**	**33,793,745**
55	**Total, Category 1**		**47,317,673**	**755,105**	**48,072,778**
56	**Category 2 - Trial Court Projects and Model Programs**				
57	Audit Contract	Ongoing	750,000	(600,000)	**150,000**
58	Human Resources - Court Investigation	Ends in 12-13	50,000	-	**50,000**
59	Reimbursement to Trial Court for Public Access	Ends in 11-12	700,000	-	**700,000**
60	Workers' Compensation Program Reserve	Ongoing rollover	1,000,000	(600,000)	**400,000**
62	**Total, Category 2**		**2,500,000**	**(1,200,000)**	**1,300,000**
63	**Category 3 - Emergency Funding Reserve**				
64	1/2 of 1% transfer from TCTF (Reserved until March 15)		9,848,315	-	**9,848,315**
65	Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve [1)]		1,000,000	-	**1,000,000**
66	**Total, Category 3**		**1,000,000**	**-**	**1,000,000**
67	**Total, All Categories**		**50,817,673**	**(444,895)**	**50,372,778**

Note:

1) Planned Use of Emergency Funding Reserve - Reflects the anticipated funding need of the trial courts to address urgent needs.

Trial Court Trust Fund
Summary of FY 2010-2011 Budget and Year-End Estimate and FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation
(amount in dollars)

	FY 2010-11 Budget	FY 2010-11 Year-End Estimate	FY 2011-12 Budget		
			Projected Resources / Allocations	Adjustment	Total Projected Resources and Appropriation or Allocation
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E
Adjusted Beginning Balance [1]	**107,997,315**	**104,403,251**	**56,423,141**		**56,423,141**
Revenues					
County Maintenance of Effort Obligations	659,050,504	658,019,178	658,019,178		658,019,178
Civil Filing Fees	395,288,397	380,417,160	390,897,214		390,897,214
Criminal Security Fee	152,335,250	150,129,779	160,366,380		160,366,380
Civil Assessment	130,590,576	137,984,742	137,984,742		137,984,742
Miscellaneous Revenue [2]	2,143,690	1,824,613	1,824,613		1,824,613
Income from Surplus Money Investment Fund	214,418	267,532	267,532		267,532
Subtotal, Revenues	**1,339,622,835**	**1,328,643,005**	**1,349,359,660**	**-**	**1,349,359,660**
Transfers and Adjustments					
Transfer from General Fund	1,561,890,000	1,561,890,000	1,294,125,000		1,294,125,000
Transfer from Trial Court Improvement Fund	31,563,000	31,563,000	31,563,000		31,563,000
1% Transfer to Trial Court Improvement Fund	(27,232,140)	(27,232,140)	(19,696,630)		(19,696,630)
Transfer to Judicial Branch Worker's Compensation Fund	(17,726,650)	(17,685,678)	(17,685,678)		(17,685,678)
Other Transfers [3]	129,813,000	129,179,371	(256,614,000)		(256,614,000)
Subtotal, Transfers and Adjustments	**1,678,307,210**	**1,677,714,553**	**1,031,691,692**	**-**	**1,031,691,692**
Total Resources	**3,125,927,361**	**3,110,760,809**	**2,437,474,493**	**-**	**2,437,474,493**
Expenditures and Encumbrances					
Program 30 - Judicial Council (excluding statewide administrative and technology infrastructure support)	341,137	314,742	314,742	-	314,742
Program 45.10 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (excluding statewide administrative and technology infrastructure)	2,539,773,387	2,553,300,968	1,932,296,002		1,932,296,002
Program 45.25 - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	299,874,723	302,188,274	306,393,310		306,393,310
Program 45.35 - Assigned Judges	26,547,000	26,123,094	26,047,000		26,047,000
Program 45.45 - Court Interpreters	92,794,000	92,794,000	92,794,000		92,794,000
Program 45.55 - Grants	10,704,295	10,322,094	10,322,094		10,322,094
Subtotal, Non-Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services	**2,970,034,542**	**2,985,043,172**	**2,368,167,148**	**-**	**2,368,167,148**
Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Support	16,046,921	14,183,434	11,691,057	2,801,677	14,492,734
Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts - Local Assistance	80,555,747	55,111,062	28,344,470	2,914,316	31,258,786
Subtotal, Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts	**96,602,668**	**69,294,496**	**40,035,527**	**5,715,993**	**45,751,520**
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances	**3,066,637,210**	**3,054,337,668**	**2,408,202,675**	**5,715,993**	**2,413,918,668**
Ending Fund Balance	**59,290,151**	**56,423,141**	**29,271,818**		**23,555,825**

Note:

1) Adjusted Beginning Balance - the difference of $3,594,064 between the budget and actual is due to over-accrual of FY 2009-2010 revenue.

2) Miscellaneous Revenue - Includes revenue from Sanctions, Contempt Fines, Other Agencies, Escheat, Late R/A Penalty, Jury Sanction Contempt, Penalty under remit, and Misc. Returned from Local, Agency, refund to Reverted Appropriation-MOU grant return by Court.

3) Other Transfers - Includes transfers from Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund, State Court Facilities Construction Fund (SCFCF), and the Immediate and Critical Needs Account SCFCF.

Trial Court Trust Fund
FY 2011-2012 Recommended Allocation by Project/Program

(amount in dollars)

Line #	Project and Program Description	Term of Funding	Previously Approved/ Planned Allocation	Recommended	
				Adjustment	Total Allocation
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
1	**Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**				
2	**I. Projects**				
3	California Court Case Management System (CCMS) Development	One-Time	-	1,246,995	**1,246,995**
3	CCMS Deployment	One-Time	-	1,667,321	**1,667,321**
4	CCMS Document Management System (DMS) Development and Deployment	One-Time	-	-	**-**
5	**Subtotal, Projects**		**-**	**2,914,316**	**2,914,316**
6	**II. Ongoing Programs and Services (Local Assistance)**				
7	CCMS Operations	Ongoing	6,349,133	-	**6,349,133**
8	California Court Technology Center (CCTC) (Reimbursement)	Ongoing	1,806,573	-	**1,806,573**
9	Civil, Mental Health, Small Claims, & Probate (V3) Case Management System	Ongoing	11,270,659	-	**11,270,659**
10	Civil, Mental Health, Small Claims, & Probate (V3) Case Management System (Reimbursement)	Ongoing	1,379,591	-	**1,379,591**
11	Criminal & Traffic (V2) Case Management System	Ongoing	5,764,472	-	**5,764,472**
12	Criminal & Traffic (V2) Case Management System (Reimbursement)	Ongoing	499,404	-	**499,404**
13	Data Integration (Reimbursement)	Ongoing	4,042	-	**4,042**
14	Interim Case Management System (ICMS) (Reimbursement)	Ongoing	1,270,596	-	**1,270,596**
15	**Subtotal, Ongoing Programs and Services (Local Assistance)**		**28,344,470**	**-**	**28,344,470**
16	**III. Ongoing Programs and Services (Support)**				
17	***A. Support Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure***				
18	CCMS Development	One-Time	-	2,152,692	**2,152,692**
19	CCMS Deployment	One-Time	-	648,985	**648,985**
20	CCMS Operations	Ongoing	2,070,070	-	**2,070,070**
21	Civil, Mental Health, Small Claims, & Probate (V3) Case Management System	Ongoing	1,137,677	-	**1,137,677**
22	Criminal & Traffic (V2) Case Management System	Ongoing	290,291	-	**290,291**
23	**Subtotal, Support Related to Statewide Technology Infrastructure**		**3,498,038**	**2,801,677**	**6,299,715**
24	***B. Support Related to Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts***				
25	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services (Reimbursement)	Ongoing	8,193,019	-	**8,193,019**
26	**Subtotal, Support Related to Ongoing Services to the Trial Courts**		**8,193,019**	**-**	**8,193,019**
27	**Total, Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services Support**		**11,691,057**	**2,801,677**	**14,492,734**
28	**Total, Statewide Tech. Infrastructure and Ongoing Services Local Assistance**		**28,344,470**	**2,914,316**	**31,258,786**
29	**Total, Statewide Technology Infrastructure and Ongoing Services**		**40,035,527**	**5,715,993**	**45,751,520**

FY 2011-2012 ONGOING SERVICES FOR TRIAL COURTS

(amount in dollars)

Line #	Program Description	General Fund	Trial Court Improvement Fund	Trial Court Trust Fund	Judicial Administration Efficiency & Modernization Fund	Total Allocations	Recommended Allocation from Special Funds
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F
1	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	$ 5,627,002	$ 6,003,037	$ -	$ 755,540	$ 12,385,579	**$ 6,758,577**
1b	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services (Reimbursement)	$ -	$ -	$ 8,193,019	$ -	$ 8,193,019	**$ 8,193,019**
2	California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System	$ 277,736	$ 164,208	$ -	$ -	$ 441,944	**$ 164,208**
3	Enhanced Collections	$ -	$ 801,947	$ -	$ -	$ 801,947	**$ 801,947**
4	Internal Audits	$ -	$ 764,664	$ -	$ -	$ 764,664	**$ 764,664**
5	Regional Office Assistance Group	$ -	$ 1,740,862	$ -	$ -	$ 1,740,862	**$ 1,740,862**
6	Treasury	$ -	$ 228,230	$ -	$ -	$ 228,230	**$ 228,230**
7	Trial Court Procurement	$ -	$ 127,760	$ -	$ -	$ 127,760	**$ 127,760**
8	Trial Court Re-engineering	$ -	$ 290,946	$ -	$ -	$ 290,946	**$ 290,946**
		----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
	Total	**$ 5,904,738**	**$ 10,121,654**	**$ 8,193,019**	**$ 755,540**	**$ 24,974,951**	**$ 19,070,213**

Attachment H

FY 2011-2012 STATEWIDE TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE

(amount in dollars)

Line #	Project and Program Description	General Fund	Trial Court Improvement Fund	Trial Court Trust Fund	Judicial Administration Efficiency & Modernization Fund	Total Allocations	Recommended Allocation from Special Funds
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F
	Maintenance & Operations:						
1	CCMS V4 Operations	$ 448,244	$ -	$ 8,419,203	$ -	$ 8,867,447	**$ 8,419,203**
2	Civil, Mental Health, Small Claims, & Probate (V3) Case Management System	$ -	$ -	$ 12,408,336	$ -	$ 12,408,336	**$ 12,408,336**
2b	Civil, Mental Health, Small Claims, & Probate (V3) Case Management System (Reimbursement)	$ -	$ -	$ 1,379,591	$ -	$ 1,379,591	**$ 1,379,591**
3	Criminal & Traffic (V2) Case Management System	$ -	$ -	$ 6,054,763	$ -	$ 6,054,763	**$ 6,054,763**
3b	Criminal & Traffic (V2) Case Management System (Reimbursement)	$ -	$ -	$ 499,404	$ -	$ 499,404	**$ 499,404**
4	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	$ 52,748	$ 663,136	$ -	$ -	$ 715,884	**$ 663,136**
5	California Court Technology Center (CCTC)	$ 164,698	$ 7,837,640	$ -	$ -	$ 8,002,338	**$ 7,837,640**
5b	California Court Technology Center (CCTC) (Reimbursement)	$ -	$ -	$ 1,806,573	$ -	$ 1,806,573	**$ 1,806,573**
6	Data Integration	$ 435,187	$ 291,101	$ -	$ 4,533,876	$ 5,260,164	**$ 4,824,977**
6b	Data Integration (Reimbursement)	$ -	$ -	$ 4,042	$ -	$ 4,042	**$ 4,042**
7	Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools)	$ -	$ 828,713	$ -	$ -	$ 828,713	**$ 828,713**
8	Interim Case Management System (ICMS)	$ 422,578	$ 5,152,306	$ -	$ -	$ 5,574,884	**$ 5,152,306**
8b	Interim Case Management System (ICMS) (Reimbursement)	$ -	$ -	$ 1,270,596	$ -	$ 1,270,596	**$ 1,270,596**
9	Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy	$ -	$ 5,957,966	$ -	$ -	$ 5,957,966	**$ 5,957,966**
10	Jury Technology Grants to Trial Courts	$ -	$ 600,000	$ -	$ -	$ 600,000	**$ 600,000**
11	Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)	$ 428,221	$ 287,068	$ -	$ -	$ 715,289	**$ 287,068**
12	Telecommunications Support	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 7,164,167	$ 7,164,167	**$ 7,164,167**
13	Uniform Civil Fees	$ -	$ 385,602	$ -	$ -	$ 385,602	**$ 385,602**
14	**Subtotal, Maintenance & Operations**	**$ 1,951,676**	**$ 22,003,532**	**$ 31,842,508**	**$ 11,698,043**	**$ 67,495,759**	$ 65,544,083
	Projects:						
15	California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 Deployment	$ -	$ -	$ 2,316,306	$ -	$ 2,316,306	**$ 2,316,306**
16	CCMS V4 Development	$ -	$ -	$ 3,399,687	$ -	$ 3,399,687	**$ 3,399,687**
17	CCMS Document Management System (DMS) Development and Deployment	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**
	Subtotal, Projects	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 5,715,993**	**$ -**	**$ 5,715,993**	$ 5,715,993
	Total	**$ 1,951,676**	**$ 22,003,532**	**$ 37,558,501**	**$ 11,698,043**	**$ 73,211,752**	$ 71,260,076

Attachment I

TCBWG Modernization Fund Subcommittee
Modernization Fund and Improvement Fund Recommended Adjustments and Budgets for FY 2011-2012

#	Program/Project Title	FY 2011-12 Baseline	Subcommittee Recommended Adjustment	Additional Staff Recommended Adjustments	Total Recommended Adjustment	Transfer of Program Funding	Recommended FY 2011-12 Budget
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1	**Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund**						
2	CCIS Policy deployments	**424,973**	(424,973)	-	**(424,973)**	-	**-**
3	CA Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	**1,032,136**	(369,000)	-	**(369,000)**	(663,136)	**-**
4	CLIK System	**859,072**	(859,072)	-	**(859,072)**	-	**-**
5	Data Integration	**5,740,587**	(678,256)	(528,455)	**(1,206,711)**	-	**4,533,876**
6	Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy	**5,957,966**	-	-	**-**	(5,957,966)	**-**
7	Telecommunications Support	**13,764,167**	(6,600,000)	-	**(6,600,000)**	-	**7,164,167**
8	Uniform Civil Fees	**385,602**	-	-	**-**	(385,602)	**-**
9	Unallocated Special Funds Reduction - Technology	**-**	-	-	**-**	-	**-**
10	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	**1,583,941**	(828,401)	-	**(828,401)**	-	**755,540**
11	B.E. Witkin Judicial College of California	**264,000**	(74,000)	-	**(74,000)**	-	**190,000**
12	Family Law Assignment Education	**65,000**	(40,000)	-	**(40,000)**	-	**25,000**
13	Juvenile Law Assignment Education	**33,000**	(8,000)	-	**(8,000)**	-	**25,000**
14	Orientation for New Trial Court Judges	**105,000**	(30,000)	-	**(30,000)**	-	**75,000**
15	Advanced Education for Experienced Judges	**30,000**	(30,000)	-	**(30,000)**	-	**-**
16	Civil Law and Procedure Institute	**25,000**	(25,000)	-	**(25,000)**	-	**-**
17	Cow County Judges Institute	**25,000**	(25,000)	-	**(25,000)**	-	**-**
18	Criminal Law & Procedure Institute	**25,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**25,000**
19	Overview Courses	**192,500**	62,500	-	**62,500**	-	**255,000**
20	Probate and Mental Health Institute	**41,000**	(41,000)	-	**(41,000)**	-	**-**
21	Statewide Fairness Conference	**30,000**	(30,000)	-	**(30,000)**	-	**-**
22	Traffic Law Institute	**25,000**	(25,000)	-	**(25,000)**	-	**-**
23	Winter Continuing Judicial Studies Program	**115,000**	(44,000)	(30,000)	**(74,000)**	-	**41,000**
24	CA Judicial Administration Conf.	**38,042**	(38,042)	-	**(38,042)**	-	**-**
25	Court Management Course	**140,000**	(62,000)	-	**(62,000)**	-	**78,000**
26	Fall Leadership Summit	**80,000**	(80,000)	-	**(80,000)**	-	**-**
27	Technical Assistance to Local Courts	**200,000**	(200,000)	-	**(200,000)**	-	**-**
28	Trial Court Faculty - Statewide Education Programs	**300,000**	(10,000)	-	**(10,000)**	-	**290,000**
29	Train the Trainers - Faculty Development	**120,000**	(40,000)	-	**(40,000)**	-	**80,000**
30	Court Clerk Training Institute	**168,000**	(63,000)	-	**(63,000)**	-	**105,000**
31	Distance Learning (Satellite Broadcast)	**275,000**	(55,000)	-	**(55,000)**	-	**220,000**
32	Mid-level Management Conferences	**35,000**	(11,000)	-	**(11,000)**	-	**24,000**
33	Trial Court Judicial Attorney Institute	**-**	50,000	-	**50,000**	-	**50,000**
34	Budget Focused Training/Meetings	**27,272**	(14,263)	-	**(14,263)**	-	**13,009**
35	CFCC Programs	**129,226**	(38,953)	-	**(38,953)**	-	**90,273**
36	CFCC Publications	**121,961**	(101,961)	-	**(101,961)**	-	**20,000**
37	Labor Relations Academy	**30,004**	(7,000)	-	**(7,000)**	-	**23,004**
38	Alternative Dispute Resolution	**1,740,000**	(1,665,000)	-	**(1,665,000)**	-	**75,000**
39	Branchwide Communications	**80,000**	(80,000)	-	**(80,000)**	-	**-**
40	Complex Civil Litigation Program	**4,001,010**	-	-	**-**	-	**4,001,010**
41	Court Interpreter Recruitment, Testing/Education	**315,000**	(174,615)	-	**(174,615)**	-	**140,385**
42	Interactive Software - Self-rep Forms	**60,000**	(20,000)	-	**(20,000)**	-	**40,000**
43	Public Education and Outreach	**511,800**	(234,000)	-	**(234,000)**	-	**277,800**
44	Ralph N. Kleps Award Program	**54,500**	(34,500)	-	**(34,500)**	-	**20,000**
45	Self-help Videos for the Website	**3,850**	(3,850)	-	**(3,850)**	-	**-**
46	TC Performance & Accountability	**146,000**	(126,000)	-	**(126,000)**	-	**20,000**
47	***Subtotal, Modernization Fund***	***39,300,610***	***(13,078,386)***	***(558,455)***	***(13,636,841)***	***(7,006,704)***	***18,657,064***

#	Program/Project Title	FY 2011-12 Baseline	Subcommittee Recommended Adjustment	Additional Staff Recommended Adjustments	Total Recommended Adjustment	Transfer of Program Funding	Recommended FY 2011-12 Budget
		A	B	C	D	E	F
48	**Trial Court Improvement Fund**						
49	Connecting with Constituencies	**260,000**	(260,000)	-	**(260,000)**	-	**-**
50	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	**1,750,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**1,750,000**
51	HR Legal Counsel for Trial Court Benefits	**80,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**80,000**
52	Judicial Officer Assistance Program (JOAP)	**100,000**	(15,000)	-	**(15,000)**	-	**85,000**
53	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	**762,299**	-	-	**-**	-	**762,299**
54	Jury System Improvement	**50,000**	(50,000)	-	**(50,000)**	-	**-**
55	Jury System Improvement	**18,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**18,000**
56	Litigation Management Program	**4,500,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**4,500,000**
57	Self-Help Centers	**5,000,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**5,000,000**
58	Self-Represented Litigants—Statewide Support	**300,000**	(150,000)	-	**(150,000)**	-	**150,000**
59	Subscription—Judicial Conduct Reporter	**20,110**	(3,000)	-	**(3,000)**	-	**17,110**
60	Trial Court Security Grants	**2,000,000**	(500,000)	(300,000)	**(800,000)**	-	**1,200,000**
61	TC Transactional Assistance Program	**685,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**685,000**
62	CA Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	**-**	-	-	**-**	663,136	**663,136**
63	E-Forms Project (Smart Forms)	**331,437**	(331,437)	-	**(331,437)**	-	**-**
64	Statewide Electronic Filing Portal (Branch-owned ePortal)	**55,122**	(55,122)	-	**(55,122)**	-	**-**
65	CA Courts Technology Center Operations	**11,229,958**	(3,689,550)	-	**(3,689,550)**	-	**7,540,408**
66	Data Integration	**291,101**	-	-	**-**	-	**291,101**
67	Enterprise Test Management Suite	**828,713**	-	-	**-**	-	**828,713**
68	Interim Case Management System (ICMS)	**5,152,306**	-	-	**-**	-	**5,152,306**
69	Judicial Branch Enterprise Licensing and Policy	**-**	-	-	**-**	5,957,966	**5,957,966**
70	Jury Technology Grants to Trial Courts	**600,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**600,000**
71	Statewide Electronic Business Services (SEBS)	**887,068**	(600,000)	-	**(600,000)**	-	**287,068**
72	Telecommunications	**297,232**	-	-	**-**	-	**297,232**
73	Uniform Civil Fees	**-**	-	-	**-**	385,602	**385,602**
74	Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services	**6,003,037**	-	-	**-**	-	**6,003,037**
75	CA Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)	**263,322**	-	(99,114)	**(99,114)**	-	**164,208**
76	Enhanced Collections	**801,947**	-	-	**-**	-	**801,947**
77	Internal Audit Services - Contract and Staff Support	**1,514,664**	(500,000)	(100,000)	**(600,000)**	-	**914,664**
78	Regional Office Assistance Group	**1,740,862**	-	-	**-**	-	**1,740,862**
79	Treasury - Cash Management	**228,230**	-	-	**-**	-	**228,230**
80	Trial Court Procurement Services	**357,760**	(230,000)	-	**(230,000)**	-	**127,760**
81	Trial Court Re-engineering	**290,946**	-	-	**-**	-	**290,946**
82	Trial Court Investigations	**50,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**50,000**
83	Trial Court Reimbursement for Public Access	**700,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**700,000**
84	Workers' Compensation Reserve	**1,000,000**	(500,000)	(100,000)	**(600,000)**	-	**400,000**
85	Emergency Funding Reserve for Superior Courts	**1,000,000**	-	-	**-**	-	**1,000,000**
86	***Subtotal, Improvement Fund***	***49,149,114***	***(6,884,109)***	***(599,114)***	***(7,483,223)***	***7,006,704***	***48,672,595***
87	**Total, Modernization Fund and Improvement Fund**	**88,449,723**	**(19,962,495)**	**(1,157,569)**	**(21,120,064)**	**-**	**67,329,659**