



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

February 1, 2014

Hon. Mark Leno
Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Attn: Ms. Peggy Collins
Legislative Office Building
1020 N Street, Room 553
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Elaine M. Howle
California State Auditor
Bureau of State Audits
621 Capitol Mall, Suite 1200
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Semiannual report on judicial branch contracts as required under Public Contract Code section 19209

Dear Senator Leno and Ms. Howle:

Attached is the Judicial Council report required under Public Contract Code section 19209 on contract payments and contracts that were amended between vendors and judicial branch entities during the reporting period of July 1 through December 31, 2013. Judicial branch entities are the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, superior courts, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and the Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

As required by Public Contract Code section 19209, the reports include a listing of: (1) all vendors or contractors receiving payments from any judicial branch entity and the associated distinct contracts; and (2) for every vendor or contractor receiving more than one payment, the amount of the payment, type of service or good provided, and the judicial branch entity receiving

Hon. Mark Leno
Ms. Elaine M. Howle
February 1, 2014
Page 2

the good or service. The report also includes a list of all judicial branch entity contracts that were amended during the reporting period. This is the fifth semiannual report submitted under this reporting requirement. The operative date of the Judicial Branch Contract Law was October 1, 2011, and only contracts with payments or amendments after that date are required to be included in the report. This report and all future reports will cover the six-month period from or January 1 through June 30 or July 1 through December 31, as appropriate. The attachments to the report are:

- Attachment 1: Superior court reports:
 - a. Trial Court Contract Report, July 1–December 31, 2013
 - b. Trial Court Payment Report, July 1–December 31, 2013

- Attachment 2: Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, Judicial Council/AOC reports:
 - c. Contract Amendment Report, July 1–December 31, 2013
 - d. Payment Report, July 1–December 31, 2013

Note that the report does not include certain payments or contract amendment information that is statutorily restricted, subject to any statutory restrictions on disclosure to third parties, or excluded from reporting.

The report attachments are very large. To save resources, hard copies are not attached. They may be accessed at the following address www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, AOC Fiscal Services Office, at 916-263-1397.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Steven Jahr", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts

SJ/JJ

Attachments

Additional attachments located at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm

Hon. Mark Leno
Ms. Elaine M. Howle
February 1, 2014
Page 3

cc: Members of the Judicial Council
Members of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel
Gregory P. Schmidt, Secretary of the Senate
E. Dotson Wilson, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
Margie Estrada, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Darrell S. Steinberg
Fredericka McGee, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker John Pérez
Marvin Deon II, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Julie Salley-Gray, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Jolie Onodera, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee
Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Jody Patel, AOC Chief of Staff
Curt Soderlund, AOC Chief Administrative Officer
Curtis L. Child, AOC Chief Operating Officer
Cory T. Jasperson, Director, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs (OGA)
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, AOC Fiscal Services Office
Andi Liebenbaum, Senior Governmental Affairs Analyst, OGA
Pat Haggerty, Assistant Director, AOC Fiscal Services Office
John A. Judnick, Senior Manager, AOC Internal Audit Services Office
Doug Kauffroath, Senior Manager, Trial Court Administrative Services Office
AOC Office of Communications



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

Report title: *Semiannual Report on Contracts for the Judicial Branch for the Reporting Period July 1 through December 31, 2013*

Statutory citation: Public Contract Code section 19209


Date of report: February 1, 2014

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Public Contract Code section 19209. The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

The Judicial Branch Contract Law (JBCL), enacted March 24, 2011, requires the judicial branch entities to comply with the provisions of the Public Contract Code applicable to state agencies and departments related to the procurement of goods and services. The JBCL applies to all contracts initially entered into or amended by judicial branch entities on or after October 1, 2011.

The JBCL also requires the Judicial Council, beginning in 2012, to report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the State Auditor twice each year on contracting activities by judicial branch entities. The reports must contain specified information, including details about payments received by vendors and contractors and their associated contracts, contract amendments entered into by judicial branch entities with vendors or contractors, and the nature of the services or goods provided under the reported contracts and amendments. The reports do not include payments or contract amendment information that is statutorily restricted or excluded from reporting, information subject to any statutory restrictions on disclosure to third parties, or active litigation on capital cases.

This is the fifth semiannual report and covers July 1 through December 31, 2013. The report is approximately 660 pages (including attachments). Payments made in excess of \$650,000 to 64 vendors for \$155,902,648 account for approximately 76 percent of the total payments of \$204,652,508 for non-superior court judicial branch entities. There was \$137 million in payments made by the superior courts. The report lists 8,763 contracts totaling approximately \$231 million. There were 2,851 contracts with amendments totaling approximately \$42.4 million (approximately \$29.4 million for the superior courts). The full report can be accessed at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm. A printed copy of the report may be obtained by contacting Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, AOC Fiscal Services Office, at zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov.



Semiannual Report on
Contracts for the
Judicial Branch for
the Reporting Period
July 1 through
December 31, 2013

REPORT TO THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE
BUDGET COMMITTEE AND THE STATE
AUDITOR AS REQUIRED BY PUBLIC
CONTRACT CODE SECTION 19209

FEBRUARY 1, 2014



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

As of January 2, 2014

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye

Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. Sherrill A. Ellsworth

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Second Appellate District, Division Two

Hon. Noreen Evans

Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Stephen H. Baker

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta

Mr. James P. Fox

Attorney at Law (Retired)
California State Bar Association

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Third Appellate District

Hon. Richard Bloom

Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Teri L. Jackson

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Mr. Mark G. Bonino

Hayes, Scott, Bonino, Ellingson & McLay,
LLP

Hon. Douglas P. Miller

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Hon. James R. Brandlin

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Mary Ann O'Malley

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Ms. Angela J. Davis

Assistant United States Attorney
for the Central District of California

Mr. Mark P. Robinson, Jr.

Attorney at Law
Robinson Calcagnie Robinson
Shapiro Davis, Inc.

Hon. David De Alba

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Hon. David Rosenberg

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Yolo

Hon. Emilie H. Elias

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. David M. Rubin

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Hon. Dean T. Stout
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Inyo

Hon. Charles D. Wachob
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Placer

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Sue Alexander
Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Robert A. Glusman
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Butte

Hon. James E. Herman
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara

Hon. Morris D. Jacobson
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Brian L. McCabe
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Merced

Mr. Frank A. McGuire
Clerk of the California Supreme Court

Hon. Kenneth K. So
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Ms. Mary Beth Todd
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Sutter

Hon. Brian Walsh
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
COURTS**

Hon. Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts
and Secretary of the Judicial Council

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Hon. Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts

Mr. Curt Soderlund
Chief Administrative Officer
**JUDICIAL AND COURT
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION**

FISCAL SERVICES OFFICE
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic
Director

Ms. Jody Patel
Chief of Staff
**JUDICIAL COUNCIL AND
COURT LEADERSHIP SERVICES DIVISION**

INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES
Mr. John Judnick
*Senior Manager and
Primary Author of Report*

**Semiannual Report on Contracts for the Judicial Branch for the Reporting
Period July 1 through December 31, 2013:
Report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the State Auditor as
Required by Public Contract Code Section 19209**

February 1, 2014

Introduction

The Judicial Council submits this report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the California State Auditor (State Auditor) pursuant to Public Contract Code section 19209 to provide information related to procurement of contracts for the judicial branch. The report includes a list of vendors and contractors as required by Public Contract Code section 19209(b). The report further identifies the amount of payment(s) to the contractors and vendors, the types of services and goods provided, and the judicial branch entity or entities with which the contractors and vendors contracted to provide those goods and services. The report also includes a list of all contract amendments as required by Public Contract Code section 19209(c) and identifies the vendors and contractors, the types of services and goods provided under the contract, the nature of the amendments, the duration of the amendments, and the cost of the amendments. Judicial branch entities are the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal (COA), superior courts, Habeas Corpus Resource Center (HCRC), and Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

Because the operative date of the Judicial Branch Contract Law (JBCL) was October 1, 2011, only contracts entered into or amended after that date are included in this report. This report and all future reports are semiannual and cover the six-month periods from January 1 through June 30 and July 1 through December 31. This is the fifth semiannual report and covers the period July 1 through December 31, 2013.

Contracts Excluded From the Report

Public Contract Code section 19204(c) provides that the Judicial Branch Contract Law (JBCL) “does not apply to procurement and contracting by judicial branch entities that are related to trial court construction, including, but not limited to, the planning, design, construction, rehabilitation, renovation, replacement, lease, or acquisition of trial court facilities.” This section also states that the JBCL “shall apply to contracts for maintenance of all judicial branch facilities that are not under the operation and management of the Department of General Services.” Appropriate exclusions and inclusions based on the above subsections have been made in this report.

Also excluded from the report are the following contracts that are unique to the superior courts and are not subject to the JBCL:

- Contracts (often referred to as MOUs) between a superior court and the sheriff for court security services;

- Contracts between a court and a court reporter, when the court reporter provides services as an independent contractor; and
- Contracts between a court and a court interpreter, when the court interpreter provides services as an independent contractor.

An audit report issued by the State Auditor in March 2013 stated:

To ensure complete reports to the Legislature, the AOC should review and modify its methodology for excluding certain transactions from the semiannual report to ensure that the AOC is not inadvertently excluding legitimate procurements. Further, the AOC's methodology should ensure that all procurements or contracts—such as those related to court security, court reporters, and interpreters when such services result in payment by a judicial branch entity to a vendor or contractor—are included in the semiannual report unless specifically excluded by state law.

The State Auditor, however, also agreed in the audit report that the AOC had a valid argument for excluding from the semiannual report transactions relating to court security services provided by county sheriffs, services provided by independent contractor court reporters, and services provided by independent contractor court interpreters, from the substantive provisions of the JBCL. Nevertheless, the State Auditor's perspective was that the semiannual reporting requirements described in the Public Contract Code were intended to serve as a tool to aid the Legislature's budget oversight and to provide greater transparency for the public with regard to the judicial branch's contracting and procurement activities. As such, the State Auditor believed those transactions should be included in the semiannual report when such services resulted in payment to a vendor or contractor. To that end, the Judicial Council, at its December 2013 meeting, approved for inclusion in future semiannual reports, beginning with the reporting period starting January 1, 2014, payments to independent contractor court reporters, independent contractor interpreters, and sheriffs (but only to the limited extent a superior court might have an obligation to pay for certain services, given that the sheriff, and not the superior court, is generally responsible for the cost of court security under the Superior Court Security Act of 2012 (Gov. Code, § 69920 et seq.)). Thus, these types of transactions are not listed in this semiannual report, although payments for these services will be presented in future semiannual reports.

In December 2013, the State Auditor issued a subsequent audit report with additional recommendations related to the semiannual report, including the following recommendation to the Legislature:

To improve the usefulness of the Judicial Council's semiannual reports, the Legislature should amend the Judicial Branch Contract Law to require the Judicial Council to:

- Make the semiannual reports available in an electronic format that can be read by common database and spreadsheet software products that allow users to readily sort and filter data.

- Include new contracts and the complete history of contracts amended during the reporting period in its semiannual reports, including the date of the original contract; the original contract amount and duration; all subsequent contract amendments; and the date, amount, and duration of each such amendment.
- Include information on whether a contract was competitively bid, the justification if it was not competitively bid, and whether the contract was with a Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise. For information technology contracts, the Judicial Council should identify whether the contract was with a small business.

As the State Auditor acknowledged, these proposed amendments to the JBCL require statutory changes. The State Auditor further recommended that the AOC work with the Judicial Council to pursue cost-effective methods to implement the recommendations until a statutory requirement is enacted. Because substantial additional judicial branch staff time will be utilized to upload data that is now contained in physical files and is not currently in electronic format, and additional software licenses will be necessary to implement the recommended changes, the associated implementation costs will be considerable and will necessitate additional funding. If the Legislature concludes that the benefits of such additional reporting requirements outweigh the costs, and if sufficient funds are appropriated to offset the additional costs incurred so that the public's access to justice is not further impaired, the State Auditor's recommendations can be implemented. In the interim, the AOC will evaluate cost-effective methods so the Judicial Council can address the recommendations.

Format of the Report

The AOC Fiscal Services Office is responsible for preparing the portion of the report that relates to the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/AOC and extracts data for the report from the Oracle Financial System. The Trial Court Administrative Services Office (TCAS) is responsible for preparing the portion of the report that relates to the superior courts and extracts data for the report from the Phoenix Financial System. Because the AOC Fiscal Services Office and TCAS have different information management systems, the format and data elements of various portions of the report differ. The four portions of the report are listed below:

- Superior courts:
 1. Trial Court Contract Report
 2. Trial Court Payment Report
- Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/AOC:
 3. Contract Amendment Report
 4. Payment Report

The chart below explains the differences in the format of the reports and describes the data elements.

Judicial Branch Contract Reports			
Comparison of Required Data Elements to Report According to Pub. Contract Code Section 19209 with the Actual Reports			
Report	Required to be Reported by Statute	Data Element Column Heading	
		Superior Court Reports	Supreme Court, COA, HCRC, and JC/AOC Reports
Payment Report	<p>Vendors and contractors receiving any payment</p> <p>Report each distinct contract between the vendor or contractor and a judicial branch entity</p> <p>Identify the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. amount of payment to the contractor or vendor 2. type of service or good provided 3. judicial branch entity (JBE) or entities with which the vendor or contractor was contracted to provide that service or good. 	<p>Vendor Name Vendor ID</p> <p>Contract Number</p> <p>Total Payments Goods / Services</p> <p>JBE</p>	<p>Vendor Name</p> <p>PO/Contract</p> <p>Amount Payment Summary</p> <p>Entity Name</p>
Contract and Contract Amendment Report	<p>For all contract amendments made, identify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. vendor or contractor 2. type of service or good provided under the contract 3. nature of the amendment 4. duration of the amendment 5. cost of the amendment 	<p>JBE Amendment Number Contract Number Month Year</p> <p>Vendor Name Vendor ID Goods / Services Nature of Amendment Contract Duration Contract Value or Amendment</p>	<p>Entity Amendment Number Contract Number</p> <p>Vendor Name</p> <p>Type of Goods/Service Desc Nature of Amendment Duration (months) Cost of Amendment</p>

This semiannual report includes all the information required by statute. Portions of the report related to the superior courts contain items of information (vendor ID, month and year of amendment), as listed above, that are not required for the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/AOC.

The superior court information includes contracts that were entered into during the reporting period, even if no payments were made. This is additional information and is not required by the JBCL. The portion of the report related to the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/AOC does not include contracts for which no payment was made during the reporting period. The superior court report consolidates all payments to a vendor or contractor under one contract as one payment for the reporting period.

Statistics

On the pages that follow, four tables provide statistical information for the January 1 through June 30, 2013, reporting period:

Table 1 Overall Contract and Payment Statistics

Table 2 Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center and Judicial Council/AOC: Payment Statistics Summary

Table 3 Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center and Judicial Council/AOC: List of Vendors Receiving Payments In Excess of \$650,000 From the AOC

Table 4 Trial Court Payment Statistics: Goods and Services Detail Summary

Because of their size, the detailed reports, including any explanatory footnotes, are posted separately for access and review. They are:

1. Superior court reports:
 - a. Trial Court Contract Report, July 1–December 31, 2013
 - b. Trial Court Payment Report, July 1–December 31, 2013
2. Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, Judicial Council/AOC reports:
 - a. Contract Amendment Report, July 1–December 31, 2013
 - b. Payment Report, July 1–December 31, 2013

Table 1 Overall Contract and Payment Statistics Reporting Period: July 1 through December 31, 2013		
	Superior Courts	Supreme Court, COA, HCRC, JC/AOC
Payments:		
Number	11,735	4,116
Dollar amount	\$ 137,491,807	\$ 204,652,508
Number of associated contracts	6,683 *	1,307
Contracts:		
Original contracts	5,912	***
Value of original contracts	\$ 189,460,030	***
Contracts with amendments	2,776	75
Cost of amendments	\$ 29,363,089	\$ 13,022,318
Report pages:		
Payments	287	66
Contracts	292	***
Contracts with amendments	**	6
* Includes any new contracts without any associated payments during the period. ** Included in the payment and contracts reports as applicable. *** Includes only contracts with amendments as required by statute.		

Table 2 Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center and Judicial Council/AOC Payment Statistics Summary Reporting Period: July 1 through December 31, 2013			
	Vendors	Approx. # of Pages	Payments
Supreme Court	89	4	\$ 3,681,812
Courts of Appeal:			
1st District	32	1	1,539,233
2nd District	92	5	2,996,125
3rd District	64	3	1,191,117
4th District	96	5	3,994,158
5th District	69	3	1,159,833
6th District	55	2	1,635,142
Administrative Office of the Courts	763	42	188,105,172
Habeas Corpus Resource Center	47	2	349,916
TOTAL	1,307	66	\$ 204,652,508

Table 3, on the next page, provides summary information about the contract payments in excess of \$650,000 made by the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts. Payments in excess of \$650,000 to vendors, totaling \$155,902,648, account for approximately 76 percent of the total payments made by the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts. A total \$204,652,508 was paid to vendors by the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts (Table 2).

The Primary Purpose column in Table 3 provides a short description of the purpose of the payments made by the Administrative Office of the Courts. Table 3 lists 64 vendors that received payments in excess of \$650,000. These vendors account for approximately 76 percent of the AOC's total vendor payments. The primary categories listed in this table are:

Information services
Facilities
Grants
Dependency counsel
Supreme Court and Appellate Court payments for administrators

When analyzed, Table 3 shows that almost all of the contracts and associated payments are not for the benefit of, or to assist, the AOC but are for other judicial branch entities.

Table 4, Trial Court Payment Statistics: Goods and Services Detail Summary, on page 9, provides a summary of all payments for goods and services by the trial courts during this reporting period. The table shows that there were 11,735 payments representing nearly \$138 million. These payments were made through almost 6,700 purchase orders and contracts. Although "Office Expense" continues to be the largest category in terms of number of payments (1,786 or 15.2 percent of the total number of payments), it only represents 2.8 percent (\$3.87 million of the \$137.5 million total) of the total value of payments for the period. The Court Appointed Counsel service category is the highest value category at \$19.3 million (or 14 percent) of the \$137.5 million total, yet it represents only 4 percent or 495 of the 11,735 total payments.

There were 8,688 trial court contracts (2,776 amendments and 5,912 "original" contracts) on the system during the period. The amendments consist of:

- 1,887 that had an increase in contract value;
- 698 that had a decrease in contract value;
- 31 that had a change in goods or services;
- 18 that had a decrease in contract duration; and
- 142 that had an increase in contract duration.

Table 3
Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and Judicial Council/AOC
List of Vendors Receiving Payments In Excess of \$650,000 From the AOC
Reporting Period: July 1 through December 31, 2013

Vendor Name	Primary Purpose	Payment Type	Detailed Report Page #	Total Payments in Period To Vendors	
All Star Consulting Inc.	Consultants - IS	Consultants - Info. Systems	2	\$	917,436
Ascent Services Group	Consultants - IS	Consultants - Info. Systems	3		786,462
AT&T	Lan/Wan Equip	Various Telecomm.	3		3,459,279
Corvel Enterprise Comp, Inc.	Consultant/HR	Workers Compensation	12		884,902
EPI - Use America, Inc.	Consultants - IS	Consultants - Info. Systems	14		664,361
March Risk & Insurance Services	Consultants - Other	Insurance	23		702,056
Oracle America, Inc.	Systems - Database	Maintenance - Software	26		1,938,460
SAP Public Services, Inc.	Systems - Maintenance	Maintenance - Software	32		1,106,580
Science Applications Int'l Corporation	Data Center Services	Consultants - Info. Systems	33		8,730,982
Software Management Consultants, Inc.	Consultants - IS	Consultants - Info. Systems	34		760,666
Tibco Software, Inc.	Systems - Maintenance	Maintenance - Software	38		768,019
				\$	20,719,202
ABM Engineering Services	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	1	\$	13,700,951
Enovity, Inc.	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	14		7,034,259
Kern County	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	20		696,005
Key Government Finance, Inc.	Facilities	Maintenance - Hardware	21		2,075,497
Mitsubishi Electric & Electronics USA, Inc.	Facilities	Facility Mod./Imp. To Assets	24		951,504
Orange County Superior Court	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	27		1,988,235
Pride Industries One, Inc.	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	29		6,314,636
Riverside County Superior Court	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	30		1,296,312
San Bernardino County	Facilities	Facility Mod./Repairs & Rent	31		1,677,271
San Diego County	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	31		980,116
Ventura County	Facilities	Facility Mod./Maint./Repairs	40		1,744,255
				\$	38,459,040
Fresno County	Facilities	Rent & Maintenance	15		702,615
Green Valley Corporation	Facilities	Rent	17		1,364,408
Los Angeles County	Facilities	Rent & Maintenance	22		2,868,159
Symphony Tower, LLC (4th Dist.)	Facilities	Rent & Maintenance	50		1,100,882
				\$	6,036,063
Alameda Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	1	\$	1,361,681
Contra Costa Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants/misc.	11		1,569,512
Fresno County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	15		2,335,170
Kern County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	20		1,525,740
Los Angeles County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	23		6,487,262
Orange County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	27		2,384,333
Riverside County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	30		1,728,954
Sacramento County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	30		1,689,978
San Bernardino County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	31		3,141,910
San Diego County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	31		3,007,174
San Francisco County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	31		1,439,713
San Joaquin County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	31		836,068
Santa Barbara County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	32		712,869
Santa Clara County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	32		1,982,872
Solano County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	35		768,356
Sonoma County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	35		672,847
Stanislaus County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	35		1,011,106
State Bar of California	Grants	Grants and Consultants	37		11,297,574
Tulare County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	39		690,428
Ventura County Superior Court	Grants	Government Grants	40		900,407
				\$	45,543,955
Legal Aid Society of San Diego, Inc.	Legal	Legal Services- Low Income	22	\$	971,838
Neighborhood Legal Services	Legal	Legal Services - Low Income	26		659,671
				\$	1,631,509
Attorneys for Families & Children	Dependency	Private Counsel	4	\$	1,425,592
Children Law Center	Dependency	Private Counsel	9		10,619,658
Dependency Advocacy Center	Dependency	Private Counsel	13		1,039,273
Dependency Legal Group of San Diego	Dependency	Private Counsel	13		4,055,717
East Bay Children's Law Offices, Inc.	Dependency	Private Counsel	14		1,044,503
Juvenile Dependency Counselors	Dependency	Private Counsel	20		925,706
Law Foundation of Silicon Valley	Dependency	Private Counsel	22		1,096,208
Los Angeles Dependency Lawyers, Inc.	Dependency	Private Counsel	23		8,177,883
Wilson, Dale S.	Dependency	Private Counsel	41		1,227,482
				\$	29,612,023
Central Calif. Appellate Program (5th Dist.)	Court Counsel	Administrators	42	\$	873,900
First District Appellate Project	Court Counsel	Administrators	45		1,400,174
Appellate Defenders, Inc. (4th Dist.)	Court Counsel	Administrators	46		2,132,817
California Appellate Project (2nd Dist.)	Court Counsel	Administrators	53		2,022,435
Sixth District Appellate Program	Court Counsel	Administrators	59		795,540
California Appellate Project (Supreme)	Court Counsel	Administrators	60		2,858,397
Central Calif. Appellate Program (3rd Dist.)	Court Counsel	Administrators	63		774,968
				\$	10,858,230
Herbert L. Jamison & Co.	Insurance	Insurance	18		920,539
California Highway Patrol	Security - SC/Appellate	Security	7	\$	2,122,086
				\$	3,042,625
64 Vendors Receiving Payments Over \$650,000				\$	155,902,648
Total Payments to Vendors During Reporting Period				\$	204,652,508
					76%
					100%

Table 4
Trial Court Payment Statistics: Goods and Services Detail Summary
Reporting Period: July 1 through December 31, 2013

Goods/Services	Payments	Value	Contracts
ADVERTISING	104	89,177.71	23
BANKING AND INVESTMENT SERV	16	20,181.40	4
COLLECTION SERVICES	81	9,426,800.93	32
CONSULTING SERVICES - TEMP	87	700,604.95	72
CONTRACTED SERVICES	54	654,275.53	47
COUNTY-PROVIDED SERVICES	104	6,870,547.83	76
COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL CHA	495	19,257,521.31	152
COURT ORDERED PROFESSIONAL	580	3,705,144.71	78
DUES AND MEMBERSHIPS	135	126,066.36	13
EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	270	802,872.49	190
EQUIPMENT RENTAL/LEASE	258	2,731,001.35	197
EQUIPMENT REPAIRS	188	578,616.90	146
FEES/PERMITS	133	2,226,884.75	47
FREIGHT AND DRAYAGE	22	2,597.53	17
GENERAL CONSULTANT AND PROF	620	11,789,105.46	362
GENERAL EXPENSE	9	11,645.14	2
GENERAL EXPENSE - SERVICE	319	1,425,818.40	201
GROUNDS	33	141,873.20	22
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	7	48,075.69	2
INSURANCE	115	1,094,552.46	22
INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES	141	365,198.88	47
IT COMMERCIAL CONTRACT	175	7,516,486.34	135
IT INTER-JURISDICTIONAL CON	22	1,682,379.56	14
IT MAINTENANCE	415	6,681,075.19	343
IT OTHER	40	285,543.38	25
IT REPAIRS/SUPPLIES/LICENSE	406	6,554,691.02	303
JANITORIAL	188	6,432,046.30	120
JUROR COSTS	31	32,376.12	4
LABORATORY EXPENSE	36	52,722.84	9
LEGAL	137	1,512,417.37	91
LIBRARY PURCHASES AND SUBSC	485	5,062,438.74	245
MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLIES	264	1,879,063.36	182
MAJOR EQUIPMENT	93	2,970,826.03	81
MEDIATORS/ARBITRATORS	450	1,564,282.09	56
MEETINGS, CONFERENCES, EXHI	129	119,906.67	28
MINOR EQUIPMENT - UNDER \$5K	767	5,759,012.46	644
OFFICE EXPENSE	1,786	3,866,057.66	1,373
OTHER CONTRACT SERVICES	48	632,812.76	32
OTHER FACILITY COSTS - GOODS	90	111,683.64	56
OTHER FACILITY COSTS - SERV	67	194,791.11	42
OTHER ITEMS OF EXPENSE	4	1,957.10	1
OTHER TRAVEL EXPENSE	5	230.00	
PHOTOGRAPHY	7	50,684.73	6
POSTAGE	20	591,235.99	8
POSTAGE METER	83	1,019,036.47	44
PRINTING	583	3,494,522.90	461
RENT/LEASE	111	1,859,269.79	64
SECURITY	103	4,969,421.98	66
SHERIFF	359	707,759.49	11
STAMPS, STAMPED ENVELOPES,	233	3,371,303.25	103
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	474	5,733,001.14	249
TRAINING	201	373,451.22	54
UNIFORM ALLOWANCE	3	4,738.99	3
VEHICLE OPERATIONS	145	334,515.72	75
FACILITIES OPERATION	3	1,452.76	3
OVERTIME	1	50.00	
Grand Total	11,735	137,491,807.15	6,683

Report Information

Superior Courts

1. Trial Court Contract Report

The Phoenix Financial System is not configured to collect information about contracts in a manner that precisely matches the statutory reporting requirements. Below are some key factors to consider when reviewing the contract data related to the superior courts.

- The Trial Court Contract Report includes all contracts and amendments completed within the reporting period because including all contracts is more cost-effective than developing a report that includes distinct contracts for only the vendors who received more than one payment in the reporting period. *Vendor* is often used synonymously with *contractor* in the report.
- Goods/Services descriptions are determined by the general ledger account(s) entered in the system.
- The only amendment descriptions that can be reported are changes in the overall value or duration of an agreement, or changes in the goods/services provided.
- The Phoenix Financial System cannot distinguish between a true amendment and an error correction. Screens were built to allow superior courts to review transactions included in the report and exclude changes that were error corrections. This design feature affects the accuracy of the data based on a court's ability/availability to review its transactions.
- A single contract has multiple lines of data in the file. This is because there may be a one-to-many relationship between a contract and the goods/services on the contract, and if there are amendments, there can be a one-to-many relationship between a contract and the value or duration. Simple sorting by contract number and amendment number keeps these records together. They can also be sorted by court (JBE, *judicial branch entity*) or by vendor.

Contract Report Fields

The chart below contains a list of the report fields and their descriptions.

Field Name	Field Description
Month	Calendar month of the current transaction record .
Year	Calendar year that the current transaction record pertains to.
JBE	Judicial Branch Entity. Name of the superior court with the associated contract.
Vendor ID	Unique identifier for the vendor.
Vendor Name	Name of the vendor.
Contract	Unique identifier for the contract.

Number	
Field Name	Field Description
Amendment Number	Unique identifier for the version of the contract, whether it is the original or an amendment. This is a system-generated number across all contracts and, therefore, will not necessarily be consecutive within a contract.
Contract Value OR Amendment Value	When the transaction record is for the original amount of the contract, the value in this field refers to the known or estimated contract value when the contract first became effective. When the transaction record refers to a contract amendment value, the value will indicate the increase or decrease to the contract value.
Goods/Services	Description of the goods/services based on the general ledger accounts associated with the contract. Note that a single contract may require several lines to represent multiple goods and services. The goods/services are rolled up from subaccounts, so descriptions may appear to be duplicates but are really separate subaccounts in the rolled-up category.
Contract Duration	Contract duration is represented in months or a fraction thereof. When the transaction record refers to a contract amendment value, the value will indicate the increase or decrease to the contract duration.
Nature of Amendment	This field represents the type of amendment. Original: The original value, duration, and goods/services of the contract. Increase Contract Value: An increase from the original value of the contract. Decrease Contract Value: A decrease from the original value of the contract. Increase Contract Duration: An increase in the duration (or term) of the contract. For example, an increase of six months would be represented as 6.00. Decrease Contract Duration: A decrease in the duration (or term) of the contract. For example, a decrease of six months would be represented as -6.00. Change Goods/Services: A change (addition or deletion) in the goods/services provided under the contract.

2. Trial Court Payment Report

Below are some key factors to consider when reviewing the payment data.

- Goods/Services descriptions are determined by the general ledger account(s) entered in the system.
- A single payment may have multiple lines of data in the file if the payment is for multiple goods/services. Simple sorting by contract number keeps these records together. They can also be sorted by court (JBE) or by vendor.

The chart below contains a list of the report fields and their descriptions.

Field Name	Field Description
JBE	Name of the superior court making the payment.
Contract Number	Unique identifier for the contract under which the payment was made. If the payment was not associated with a contract, this field will be blank.
Goods/Services	Description of the goods/services based on the general ledger account associated with the payment. The goods/services are rolled up from subaccounts, so descriptions may appear to be duplicates but are really separate subaccounts in the rolled-up category.
Vendor ID	Unique identifier for the vendor.
Vendor Name	Name of the vendor.
Total Payments	Total payments to a vendor, reported by court, contract, and goods/services under the contract. Data can be sorted in various ways to obtain totals by court, vendor, contract, goods/services, etc.

Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, Judicial Council/AOC

General rules applicable to these portions of the report

Contract and payment information concerning active litigation on capital cases is not reported at the request of the Habeas Corpus Resource Center under statutory and work-product principles.

1. Contract Amendment Report

Exclusions and explanations in the Contract Amendment Report follow:

- Schedule changes that constitute an amendment to the contract indicate the cost of amendment as “0.00,” “n/a,” or “not applicable” because no additional cost was involved.
- “Change of cost and schedule of the work” has an associated cost. Cost changes result from any number of reasons, and there is no specificity for this data element in the Oracle Financial System. Further details related to the basis of the cost change require review of the individual contract.

2. Payment Report

Payments extracted from the Oracle Financial System were reviewed to determine whether they were contractual payments. Any payment types considered “non-contractual items” are excluded from the reporting, including:

- Payroll and other payments to state employees and judicial officers and the related benefits payments
- Assigned judges’ compensation

- Appellate court–appointed counsel panel attorney compensation claims (paid on court order)
- Most utilities
- Postage
- Travel reimbursements
- Settlement charges
- Trial court allocations

Some of the above payment types may be included in the superior court reports, such as utilities, postage, and travel reimbursements.

Attachments

Because of their size, the following attachments, including any explanatory footnotes, are posted separately for access and review.

1. Superior court reports:
 - a. Trial Court Contract Report, Reporting Period: July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013
 - b. Trial Court Payment Report, Reporting Period: July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013
2. Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, Judicial Council/AOC reports:
 - a. Contract Amendment Report, Reporting Period: July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013
 - b. Payment Report, Reporting Period: July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013