



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR MARCH 22, 2017

Meeting Contents

Agenda	2
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the October 26, 2016 Meeting	4
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – 2018-2019 Initial Funding Requests (Action Required)	6



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET
COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jbbc.htm
JBBC@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: March 22, 2017
Time: 1:00 PM
Location: San Francisco, CA
Public Call-In Number 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 6677064

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the October 26, 2016, Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Public Comment

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least one hour prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments

should be e-mailed to JBBC@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Lucy Fogarty. Only written comments received by 10:00 am on March 21, 2017 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS X-X)

Item 1

2018-2019 Initial Funding Requests (Action Required)

Review of 2018-2019 Initial Funding Requests.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. David M. Rubin, Chair

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jbbc.htm
JBBC@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

October 26, 2016

2:00 pm to 6:00 pm

The Superior Court of San Diego, 220 West Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101

Advisory Body Members Present:

Hon. David B. Rubin (Chair), Hon. James M. Humes, (Vice-Chair), Hon. Marla O. Anderson, Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Hon. Gary Nadler (Phone), Hon. Dean T. Stout, Ms. Kimberly Flener, and Ms. Audra Ibarra

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Others Present:

Ms. Jody Patel, Ms. Millicent Tidwell, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, and Ms. Lucy Fogarty,

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm, took roll call and advised no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed and approved the minutes of the September 28, 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Budget Change Proposal Process (Action Required)

Annual Process for budget change proposal preparation, approval, and submission.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. James M. Humes, Vice-Chair

Action: The Judicial Branch Budget Committee unanimously approved the recommendation from the Budget Change Proposal Subcommittee regarding establishing a process for BCP preparation, approval, and submission. The recommendation will be presented to the Judicial Council for consideration. For purposes of clarity, the timeframes given are for BCPs for fiscal year 2018-2019 but would apply for all fiscal years thereafter.

#	Timeframe	Description
1	October 2016 – March 2017	Initial Funding Requests (IFRs) are submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) by Judicial Council advisory bodies and other requesting entities. The JBBC reviews the IFRs and determines which IFRs should be developed into Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) or BCP concepts as necessary for further advisory committee consideration.

#	Timeframe	Description
2	April 2017 – June 2017	IFRs are developed into BCPs and all applicable advisory bodies, as identified in the original IFR, are given the opportunity as time permits to provide input. Advisory bodies prioritize BCPs within their purview for submission to JBBC for its review.
3	No later than two weeks in advance of the July 2017 Judicial Council meeting	The JBBC reviews unsuccessful BCPs from the prior fiscal year and suggests which old BCPs should be included as part of the new budget year package (2018-2019). The JBBC will organize and prioritize all BCPs for further review.
4	July 2017	The BCPs are presented to the Judicial Council for final prioritization and approval.
5	August 2017	Judicial Council staff completes the drafting of all BCP documents required by the Department of Finance and submits them to the JBBC for review.
6	1 st Week of September 2017	BCPs are signed by the Administrative Director and submitted to the Department of Finance on the date determined by the Department of Finance.

Item 2

Court Innovations Grant Program (Closed Session)

Update regarding Innovations Grant Program.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Jody Patel, Chief of Staff, Judicial Council

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:40 pm.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

**Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting
2018-19 Initial Funding Requests**

March 22, 2017

Number of Requests	IFR Tracking #	Requesting Entity	Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate	Fund Source	Previous Submittal	JCC Committee	Comments
1	IFR-18-14	Appellate Courts	Appellate Court Judicial Workload	Funding for two additional appellate court justices and their necessary chambers staff for Division Two of the Fourth Appellate District to meet substantial and growing workload demands.	10.0	TBD	GF	Y	APJAC CACCA A&E JBBC	This request was submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which was denied.
2	IFR-18-15	Appellate Courts	Appellate Court Security	Funding to support security services provided by the California Highway Patrol Judicial Protection Section at the Courts of Appeal.	0.0	TBD	GF	Y	CSAC APJAC CACCA A&E JBBC	This request was submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which was denied.
3	IFR-18-16	Appellate Courts	Supreme Court and Appellate Courts - California Court Appointed Counsel Projects, San Francisco	Funding to support an increase in the contracts with the five Court of Appeal Court-Appointed Counsel Projects and the Supreme Court Court-Appointed Counsel Project, San Francisco (CAP-SF).	0.0	TBD	GF	Y	APJAC CACCA A&E JBBC	We received partial approval in the 2017-18 Proposed Governor's Budget. The 2017-18 request included 10 years of cost increases; however, the Governor's Budget included only 3 years of those cost increases. This BCP may either request funding for the remaining 7 years not funded in 2017-18, plus the difference between 2016-17 and 2017-18 or may just request funding for the difference between 2016-17 and 2017-18.
4	IFR-18-17	Appellate Courts	Appellate Court Facility Maintenance Program	Funding to perform an in-depth building assessment of the two state-owned, court managed appellate court facilities and to establish and support an Appellate Court Facility Maintenance Program.	0.0	\$1.3 million	GF	Y	APJAC CACCA A&E TCFMAC JBBC	This request was submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which was denied.
5	IFR-18-04	BAP	Upgrade Phoenix system	Funding to upgrade the Phoenix Program to continue to provide improved administrative infrastructure for the Trial Courts. The request includes funding for migration, consulting, software licensing, and software maintenance.	3.0	\$7.9 million	GF	N	JCTC TCBAC A&E JBBC	
6	IFR-18-06	CFCC	Self-Help Centers in Trial Courts	Funding to support self-help centers in trial court facilities, primarily for attorney and qualified paralegal staff at each court and will encourage cooperative projects across county lines such as increased technology, sharing of bilingual resources to provide services as cost-effectively as possible.	0.0	\$22.0 million	GF	N	TCPJAC FAMJUV CEAC ACPAF JBBC	This request was approved by respective subcommittees/advisory committees for submission to the Department of Finance in 2017-18; however, the Judicial Council did not approve the request to move forward as the Branch received \$25 million in innovative grant funding, of which, \$8 million was specifically identified to support Self-Help, Family, and Juvenile courts.
7	IFR-18-23	CFCC	Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) in Juvenile Dependency Court	Funding to support the court-appointed special advocates grants program. CASA programs are nonprofit organizations which provide trained volunteers who are assigned by a juvenile court judge to a child in foster care.	0.0	\$0.5 million	GF	N	TCBAC FAMJUV JBBC	
8	IFR-18-07	CJER	Judicial Officer Orientation Program	Funding to support costs of faculty and trial court participants at required education courses. These courses are for newly appointed or elected judges, newly hired subordinate judicial officers, and judges and judicial officers assigned to adjudicate a substantive law assignment in which they have not worked before.	0.0	\$0.8 million	GF	Y	GC-CJER A&E TCPJAC JBBC	This request was submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget and was combined into one BCP request titled, <u>General Fund Support of Statewide Programs and Services</u> . The BCP was denied.

**Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting
2018-19 Initial Funding Requests**

March 22, 2017

Number of Requests	IFR Tracking #	Requesting Entity	Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate	Fund Source	Previous Submittal	JCC Committee	Comments
9	IFR-18-09	COSSO	Implementation of Language Access Plan	Funding for the implementation and support of the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts (adopted by the Judicial Council on January 22, 2015). Specific priorities in this request include: Increase court interpreter reimbursement fund, signage, Administrative Infrastructure support, and maintenance of the online Language Access Toolkit.	2.0	\$7.0 million to \$12.0 million	GF	Y	CIAP LAPTF TCBAC A&E JBBC	A similar request was submitted in 2017-18; however, only one portion of the BCP was approved: 2.0 positions and \$352,000 IMF to support the Video Remote Interpreting spoken language pilot. The 2016 Budget Act included \$7 million General Fund to expand interpreter services into all civil proceedings.
10	IFR-18-19	HCRC	Habeas Corpus Resource Center	Funding to create four case teams to provide legal representation to inmates on California's death row.	34.0	TBD	GF	Y	HCRC-BD JBBC	
11	IFR-18-03	IT	Replace Case Management Systems	Funding to support the replacement of outdated, no longer supported case management systems.	0.0	TBD	GF	Y	JCTC TCBAC JBBC	This request will support case management system replacement in specific counties. Previous requests for CCMS V3 and Sustain Justice Edition Case Management Replacement in specific counties were included in the 2016 Budget Act and included in the 2017-18 Proposed Governor's Budget, respectively.
12	IFR-18-24	IT	Digitizing Paper and Filmed Case Files	Funding to digitize paper and filmed case files for the Superior and Appellate Courts. Electronic case files will eliminate the need for physical storage facilities and would allow for greater public access and convenience.	0.0	\$20.0 million to \$25.0 million		N	TCBAC ITAC A&E JCTC JBBC	
13	IFR-18-25	IT	Shift costs to operate the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) from the State Improvement and Modernization Fund to the General Fund	Funding to shift the costs to operate the CCPOR from the IMF to the GF. This request will also include the costs to expand the program (currently in 43 counties and their respective law enforcement agencies plus 13 tribal courts with read-only access). CCPOR is a statewide repository of protective orders containing both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers.	0.0	\$1.0 million	GF	N	TCBAC ITAC A&E JCTC JBBC	
14	IFR-18-26	IT	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Solution	Funding to support implementation of a branch-branded SRL E-Services website that optimizes and leverages existing branch, local court, and vendor resources to offer branch wide SRL e-capabilities such as facilitating interactive FAQ, triage functionality, document assembly providing guidance to SRLs submitting court documents, and interoperates with the impending branch wide e-filing solution.	TBD	TBD	GF	N	TCBAC ITAC A&E JCTC JBBC	
15	IFR-18-27	IT	Deploy an Identity Management solution for the Judicial Branch	Funding to deploy an Identity Management solution that will provide a unique username and password to every judicial branch employee and judicial officer, attorneys, members of the public, and justice partners who access judicial branch computer systems and electronic services.	TBD	TBD	GF	N	TCBAC ITAC A&E JCTC JBBC	

**Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting
2018-19 Initial Funding Requests**

March 22, 2017

Number of Requests	IFR Tracking #	Requesting Entity	Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate	Fund Source	Previous Submittal	JCC Committee	Comments
16	IFR-18-08	Judicial Council	Programs supporting trial courts statewide	Funding to shift costs supporting programs that provide services to trial courts statewide currently funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) to the General Fund.	0.0	TBD	GF	Y	TCBAC A&E JBBC	This was submitted in 2017-18 and was combined into one BCP request titled, <u>General Fund Support of Statewide Programs and Services</u> . The BCP was denied; however, the 2016 Budget Act provided \$8.7 million General Fund to shift costs associated with the Phoenix Financial System from the IMF. This request would shift the remaining costs associated with programs that directly support trial courts from the IMF to the GF.
17	IFR-18-02	LSO	Judicial Branch Litigation Management Program	Funding to enable the centralization of the Litigation Management Program pool to provide for the defense and indemnification of all Judicial Branch entities.	0.0	\$5.8 million	GF	Y	A&E TCBAC LMC JBBC	This was submitted in 2017-18 and was combined into one BCP request titled, <u>General Fund Support of Statewide Programs and Services</u> . The BCP was denied.
18	IFR-18-05	REFM Cap Programs	Security system and equipment maintenance and replacement for Trial Courts	Funding to provided dedicated funding to address security system maintenance and allow for replacement and refreshing of obsolete systems.	0.0	\$3.0 million	GF	Y	TCFMAC CSAC TCBAC JBBC	This request was included as part of the <u>Trial Court Facilities Operations Cost Adjustment</u> BCP for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which was denied.
19	IFR-18-20	REFM Cap Programs	Trial Court Facilities Operations Costs	Funding to support trial court facilities operations costs, including liability insurance needs, ongoing rent and utilities; and, provide routine maintenance at a level that will prevent deterioration and preserve assets.	0.0	TBD	GF	Y	TCFMAC TCBAC A&E JBBC	This request will incorporate (1) Risk Management (Insurance/Litigation Costs), (2) Increased Operations Costs for New/Renovated Facilities, and (3) Ongoing Trial Court Facilities Operations Costs into one BCP request. Requests 2 and 3 were submitted separately for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which were denied. Request 1 was not approved by the Judicial Council to be submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget.
20	IFR-18-10	Trial Courts	Stabilization of Civil Assessment Revenue	Funding to replace the civil assessment revenues currently deposited into the TCTF with General Fund. Deposit civil assessment revenues, including the \$48.3 million in MOE buyout, into the General Fund instead of the TCTF and instead, provide a General Fund amount TBD into the TCTF to replace the civil assessment revenues that will be paid into the General Fund.	0.0	\$146.8 million to \$154.7 million	GF	Y	TCBAC JBBC	The buyout of the \$48.3 million MOE obligation payment was included in the <u>Support for Trial Court Operations</u> BCP submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which was denied.
21	IFR-18-12	Trial Courts	New Judgeships	Funding for 10 of the 50 trial court judgeships authorized by the Legislature in FY 2007-08 (AB 159, Chapter 722, Statutes of 2007).	0.0	\$8.3 million to \$15.4 million	GF	Y	TCBAC JBBC	This BCP was submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which was denied.
22	IFR-18-13	Trial Courts	Support for Trial Court Operations	Funding to (1) support continued progress to 100 percent of the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), (2) discretionary funding not allocated via WAFM (rising cost of operations), (3) trial court employee compensation, (4) chaptered legislation without appropriation, and (5) address the structural imbalance in the Trial Court Trust Fund.	0.0	TBD	GF	Y	TCBAC JBBC	Items #1 and #3 were included in the <u>Support for Trial Court Operations</u> BCP submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget, which was denied. Several bills were signed by the Governor in August 2017 which increased workload to the trial courts; however, the legislation did not include funding to support the workload. BCPs for the chaptered legislation and voter approved initiatives were submitted to the Department of Finance, but were ultimately denied.

**Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting
2018-19 Initial Funding Requests**

March 22, 2017

Number of Requests	IFR Tracking #	Requesting Entity	Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate	Fund Source	Previous Submittal	JCC Committee	Comments
23	IFR-18-11a IFR-18-11b IFR-18-11c IFR-18-11d	Trial Courts	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Funding to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload to fund adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317.	0.0	\$22.0 million to \$88.2 million	GF	Y	TCBAC FAMJUV JBBC	Although no BCP was submitted, the 2015 Budget Act included \$22 million specifically for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel. This funding was added during the legislative process. A BCP was submitted in 2017-18 for an additional \$22 million, which was denied.
			Internal Committees			\$294.8 million to \$385.9 million				
		JCTC	Judicial Council Technology Committee							
		LMC	Litigation Management Committee							
			Advisory Committees							
		A & E	Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability & Efficiency for the Judicial Branch							
		CIAP	Court Interpreters Advisory Panel							
		TCBAC	Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee							
		TCFMAC	Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee							
		LAPTF	Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force							
		APJAC	Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee							
		TCPJAC	Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee							
		CEAC	Court Executives Advisory Committee							
		FAMJUV	Family & Juvenile Law Advisory Committee							
		ITAC	Information Technology Advisory Committee							
		GC-CJER	Governing Committee of CJER							
		HCRC-BD	Habeas Corpus Resource Center Board of Directors							
		ACPAF	Advisory Committee on Providing Access & Fairness							
		CACCA	Court of Appeal Clerks							

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Courts of Appeal

Contact: Bob Lowney

Budget Services Liaison: Madelynn McClain

Date Prepared: 3/6/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-14

A. Working Title: Appellate Court Judicial Workload

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to shift for two new justices and necessary chambers staff to meet the substantial and growing workload demands in Division 2 of the Fourth Appellate District Court of Appeal. The workload in Division 2 is continuing to increase and the existing justices cannot handle the volume of cases. Based on information from the last three years for which data is available, Division 2 has an annual average of 1,190 appeals becoming fully briefed. After applying the weighted case formula, Division 2 receives 117 cases per justice, far exceeding all of the other divisions and far in excess of the optimal number of weighted cases per justice, which is 89. Adding two justices would reduce the weighted workload and would prevent cases from being transferred from one division to another, which would pose a hardship for litigants who would bear the expense and burden of traveling to a distant division. It would also allow local issues to be decided in the geographic area where the dispute arose.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the costs to support two new justices and necessary chambers staff is unknown; however, the costs identified in the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget were \$2.6 million. This BCP was denied.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Securing adequate judicial resources for the courts to timely and efficiently hear the matters that come before them supports the first four goals of the Judicial Branch's Strategic Plan: Goal I: Access, Fairness, and Diversity; Goal II: Independence and Accountability, Goal III: Modernization of Management and Administration, and Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public. The extremely high number of cases per justice becoming fully briefed in Division 2 results in delays in having appeals decided and results in disparate treatment of litigants, denying the state's fundamental principal of equal access to justice.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee
- Court of Appeal Clerks
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as it makes decisions on the preparation, development, and implementation of the Courts of Appeal budget.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Courts of Appeal

Contact: Bob Lowney

Budget Services Liaison: Madelynn McClain

Date Prepared: 3/6/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-15

A. Working Title: Appellate Court Security

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support 7 California Highway Patrol Judicial Protection Section (CHP-JPS) officers at specified appellate court locations during normal business hours. CHP-JPS's primary mission is to provide security and protection for the California Supreme Court, the California Courts of Appeal, its personnel and facilities throughout the State. Currently, Judicial Council of California has a reimbursable contract with CHP-JPS to provide security services for appellate courts which include but are not limited to, bailiff duties during oral argument; outreach oral argument away from an appellate court's location; training conferences; Supreme Court's rotational oral argument in San Francisco, Sacramento, and Los Angeles.

Currently, CHP-JPS deploys officers to nine separate physical appellate court locations. With the exception of the San Francisco and Los Angeles offices, only 1 CHP Officer is assigned to each of the remaining appellate court locations in Sacramento, Fresno, San Jose, Ventura, Santa Ana, Riverside, and San Diego. If the court officer in one of these seven locations is required to leave their post for any approved reasons, the only line of defense and/or security is an unarmed contracted security guard. The potential for lapse or lessening of security is magnified by an increase in active shooter attacks and incidents of workplace violence, especially at government facilities, a rise in instances of credible threats to Justices and appellate court staff, and general crime in the vicinity of each facility.

In addition to the one CHP officer assigned to each of the 7 Courts of Appeal, additional borrowed CHP officer coverage is provided at all appellate courts for:

- Oral argument, one officer is required to sit inside the courtroom and one officer is providing security outside the courtroom
- Specific events at the appellate court which present a greater than normal threat to occupant safety (protests, combative litigants, known threats, etc.)
- The assigned officer is required to attend mandatory Department or POST training
- The assigned officer is on scheduled vacation/leave
- The assigned officer is appearing in another court (subpoena)

CHP-JPS officers assigned to San Francisco or Los Angeles are borrowed to provide the additional coverage when available or the court uses local CHP area staff, as necessary. Utilizing local and borrowed CHP staff results in additional costs because the court is required to reimburse CHP for overtime, mileage, and travel expenses in addition to the officer's salary and benefit costs. Additionally, local CHP area staff are generally not

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

familiar with court building layout, justices, staff, and protective service assignments, which could result in security lapse.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the staffing costs for additional CHP officers to perform these services is unknown; however, the costs identified in the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget were \$1.2 million ongoing and \$21,000 one-time. Salary and benefits for one CHP officer are approximately \$193,000 annually. This BCP was denied.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The existence of adequate and consistent CHP-JPS security coverage in the appellate courts during working hours is imperative and would enhance security for the seven locations which only have one CHP-JPS officer assigned to them. There are other pending BCP requests that affect the Judicial Council and Courts of Appeal; however, this is the only request that addresses security in the appellate courts.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Court Security Advisory Committee
- Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee
- Court of Appeal Clerks
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that A&E and the Court Security Advisory Committee take on a joint lead advisory role. A&E must review and approve the proposal as it affects the development, preparation, and administration of the Judicial Council budget and the Court Security Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Courts of Appeal

Contact: Bob Lowney

Budget Services Liaison: Madelynn McClain

Date Prepared: 3/6/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-16

A. Working Title: Appellate Court Appointed Counsel Projects

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support increased costs for contractual services in the Supreme Court's Court-Appointed Counsel Project (CAP-SF) and the Courts of Appeal Court Appointed Counsel Project Offices (Projects). The requested funding will aid CAP-SF and the Projects in meeting their obligations to ensure justice through competent and qualified defense counsel for indigent defendants. Prior to 2017-18, CAP-SF and the Projects had not received an increase to their contracts since 2007-08; however, the 2017-18 Governor's Budget proposes to provide \$1.041 million General Fund (\$255,000 for CAP-SF and \$786,000 for the Projects) to support three years increased costs for contractual services.

CAP-SF serves as a legal resource center for private counsel appointed in capital appeals, habeas corpus, and clemency proceedings as well as providing direct representation in some of these matters. CAP-SF provides individual case services to appointed attorneys, provides training, and litigation resource material. In addition, CAP-SF assists unrepresented death row inmates by collecting and preserving records and evidence for later post-conviction use and by providing advocacy needed before counsel is appointed.

California's Court-Appointed Counsel Program fulfills the constitutional mandate of providing adequate representation for indigent appellants in the Courts of Appeal on non-capital cases. The objectives of California's appellate court-appointed counsel system are to: (1) ensure the right of indigent clients to receive the effective assistance of appointed appellate counsel as guaranteed to them by the U.S. Constitution; and (2) provide the Courts of Appeal with useful briefings and arguments that allow the Courts to perform its function efficiently and effectively.

C. Estimated Costs: Until a decision has been made by the Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee on the time period for which funding will be requested, the amount necessary to support cost increases for contractual services is unknown. Assuming that the Governor's Budget proposal is included in the 2017 Budget Act, the Committee has two funding request options: (1) request funding for the remaining 7 years not provided in the 2017-18 Governor's Budget or (2) request funding for only the one year increase between 2017-18 and 2018-19. The Judicial Council submitted a BCP for \$3.5 million to cover cost increases for 10 years (from 2007-08 through 2017-18), of which, the Governor included \$1.041 million in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget to cover cost increases for three years. If the Governor's proposal is not included in the 2017 Budget Act, the Committee may wish to request funding to cover 11 years of cost increases (2007-08 through 2018-19).

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The 6th Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the effective assistance of counsel in criminal proceedings as a fundamental part of our judicial system. The State's courts are required to provide counsel to indigent defendants and must do so in all appeals that may come before them. The mission of the California

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

judiciary is to “in a fair, accessible, effective and efficient manner, resolve disputes arising under the law... protect the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitutions of California and the United States.” Goal I of the Strategic Plan, Access, Fairness, and Diversity, states that “California’s courts will treat everyone in a fair and just manner.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee
- Court of Appeal Clerks
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as it makes decisions on the preparation, development, and implementation of the Courts of Appeal budget.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Courts of Appeal
Contact: Bob Lowney
Budget Services Liaison: Madelynn McClain

Date Prepared: 3/6/2017
Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-17

A. Working Title: Appellate Court Facility Maintenance Program

B. Description of Funding Request: A \$1.3 million General Fund augmentation (\$24,000 one-time in 2018-19 and \$1.234 million in 2018-19 and ongoing) to perform an in-depth building assessment of the two state-owned, court managed appellate court facilities and to establish and support an Appellate Court Facility Maintenance Program which will include preventative and demand maintenance and minor facility modifications in all appellate court facilities. Preventative maintenance provides that equipment is regularly inspected and maintained before a break down occurs and demand maintenance addresses unique, unforeseen events. Minor facility modifications include projects that restore or improves the designed level of function of a facility or facility. The appellate courts occupy a total of just over 500,000 square feet of space in 9 facilities. Of the 9 locations, 4 are state owned facilities managed by the Department of General Services (DGS), 2 are state-owned, court managed facilities, and 3 are in leased space.

Appellate Court	Location	Type of Facility	Square Footage Occupied
First District	San Francisco	State-owned, DGS managed	83,000
Second District	Los Angeles	State-owned, DGS managed	119,000
	Ventura	Leased space	23,000
Third District	Sacramento	State-owned, DGS managed	56,000
Fourth District	San Diego	Leased space	50,000
	Riverside	State-owned, DGS managed	35,000
	Santa Ana	State-owned, court managed	52,000
Fifth District	Fresno	State-owned, court managed	51,000
Sixth District	San Jose	Leased space	39,000

In the past 10 years, there have been significant investments in new appellate court facilities; however, no ongoing funding was provided for a facility maintenance program. Any repairs or improvements must be paid out of the appellate courts general operating budget, which is already strained due to previous budget reductions. With limited funding, only the most urgently needed and/or safety-related projects can proceed, leaving unaddressed system replacements, including roofs, mechanical and electrical systems, etc., that often result in more costly repairs in future years. This request will create a Facility Maintenance Program to take a proactive approach towards identifying, maintaining, and funding critical building needs in the Appellate Courts. The first step will be to perform an assessment of the two state-owned, court managed facilities and provide \$1.234 million (\$2 per square foot for DGS managed space and \$4.12/sf for court managed space, as identified by industry standards) for preventative and demand maintenance and minor facility modifications. Once the assessment is completed, future requests will be submitted to support life-cycle replacement of certain items, like equipment, that has reached the end of its useful life. Further, as bonds are retired on the remaining

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

state-owned, DGS managed facilities, an assessment will need to be performed to determine the available remaining life-cycle of major building components.

- C. Estimated Costs:** An ongoing General Fund augmentation of \$1.234 million for preventative and demand maintenance and minor facility modifications and a one-time \$24,000 General Fund augmentation to perform an in-depth building assessment of the Santa Ana and Fresno facilities. At this time, staff support within the Real Estate and Facilities Management Office is sufficient to address the additional workload associated with this request. As future facilities come under Judicial Branch management, additional staffing resources may be necessary.
- D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** California's courts are aging, and continued lack of investment in facility maintenance will lead to continued deterioration of buildings and other basic building components, leading to the inability of the appellate courts to discharge duties required by statute.

While this request seeks a General Fund augmentation, there may be direction given to utilize Appellate Court Trust Fund (ACTF) resources; however, due to declining revenues, the ACTF may be unable to support an ongoing augmentation.

Additionally, it is important to note that in 2008-09 a BCP approved by the Department of Finance for the one-time moving (\$1.628m ACTF) and ongoing operations and maintenance costs (\$70,000 in year 1, \$415,000 ongoing GF) was included in the Governor's Budget for the new Fourth Appellate, Santa Ana facility. The operations and maintenance costs were based on the then-DGS estimated cost per square foot of \$10.80, less the existing operations and maintenance resources in the Fourth District's budget. Operations and maintenance funding covers a wide variety of items such as, utilities, insurance, and building repairs. However, during budget negotiations, funding for the move was approved, but the operations and maintenance funding was deferred and would be considered in future fiscal years. To date, the Judicial Branch has not submitted another request for these costs.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Court of Appeal Clerks
- Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

- F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** Budget Services proposes that Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee take the lead advisory role as it provides ongoing oversight of the judicial branch program that manages renovations, facilities operations, maintenance, and real estate for trial courts throughout the state.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Branch Accounting and Procurement

Contact: Doug Kauffroath

Date Prepared: 3/2/17

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-04

A. Working Title: Phoenix System Required Updates

B. Description of Funding Request: An augmentation of \$7.9 million General Fund in 2018-19, \$7.6 million in 2019-20, and \$6.3 million in 2020-21 and ongoing to update and expand the Phoenix System to improve the administrative infrastructure supporting trial courts. This request will also provide funding to the Judicial Council to support 3.0 positions to be phased in over three years. The Phoenix System is the financial and procurement system for the 58 trial courts, and the payroll system for 12 trial courts. This request will update the Phoenix system to stay ahead of the end-of-life of the current on-premise version of SAP, and add functional requirements requested by the trial courts. The last major upgrade of the Phoenix system was completed in 2008-09. The Program is nearing the end of support on its current platform, and there aren't sufficient resources available to improve it to a more efficient and desired state. It is necessary to update the current technology and advisable to invest in new functionality that the trial courts require according to recent studies of their needs. These studies included review of past requirements and requests, a comprehensive stakeholder survey, and requirement workshops with key stakeholders across the state.

C. Estimated Costs: \$7.9 million General Fund in 2018-19, \$7.6 million in 2019-20, and \$6.3 million in 2020-21 to support the migration to and hosting of the Phoenix SAP on a modern database appliance in the cloud and add functionality requested by the trial courts. This request also includes funding for 3.0 positions (to be phased in over three years) to provide adequate support of the new functionality.

Currently, approximately \$3.6 million is expended annually from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) to support the Phoenix Program. This request will eliminate the expenditures from the IMF and request General Fund for the costs to update and expand the Phoenix Program, as well as the ongoing maintenance/hosting of the system to the General Fund (which is currently funded from the IMF). If this request is approved, the system update will result in annual maintenance/hosting savings of approximately \$265,000. The table below indicates the requested General Fund amounts by fiscal year.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

General Fund Request:

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
Requested Positions	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0
Ongoing Expenses	3,642,000	4,809,000	5,698,000	5,698,000
1-Time Expenses	4,287,000	2,818,000	620,000	7,725,000
Total	7,929,000	7,626,828	6,318,172	

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The Phoenix system is the enterprise financial and procurement system for all 58 Trial Courts, and the payroll system for 12 courts, and as such requires constant maintenance and further innovation to adequately support the administrative needs of the courts, and the branch as a whole. The Phoenix Program has enjoyed great success and continues to receive positive feedback across the state as a valued partner of the courts and good steward of public resources.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as JCTC must review and approve all technology related requests. The Phoenix Program, although more broadly serves an administrative function, is also a technology provider, as it encompasses the deployment and maintenance of the Phoenix Financial, Procurement, and HR Payroll System.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Contact: Bonnie Hough

Date Prepared: 3/2/17

Budget Services Liaison: Kris Errecart

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-06

A. Working Title: Support of Self-Help Services in the Trial Courts

B. Description of Funding Request: An augmentation of \$22.0 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support self-help centers in trial court facilities. The Judicial Council and California's trial courts have long worked to improve services for the more than 4.3 million people who represent themselves in the state's courts each year. These services recognize that not only is access to justice improved for the public by providing resources – but court efficiency is improved as well.

Court self-help centers serve more than 1.2 million people per year. However, funding for these programs has remained stagnant statewide, and in many counties, funding has been cut in response to the state's budget challenges. It is clear that to meet the gap between those people representing themselves and those getting basic assistance and information to manage that representation, we will need to develop new service delivery methods.

Self-help centers are a valuable method for providing services to people who need access to legal education and information and for improving the quality of justice for litigants. They facilitate a litigant's ability to participate effectively in the legal process, improve court efficiency and help the court design systems to better serve self-represented litigants, promote public trust and confidence in the court system, meet a great need for service in their community, and have the capacity to meet the needs of many non-English speakers. Fully-functioning self-help centers provide real cost savings to courts by reducing the number of court hearings and staff time at the public counter.

This proposal would provide funding to fill gaps in services while encouraging the use of innovative practices for providing assistance. These innovations will include expanded use of technology including videoconferencing, chatbots and enhanced on-line resources. It will also enable centers to provide more settlement assistance to enable litigants resolve their matters without needing a court hearing. It will also allow centers to address all matters in which self-represented litigants come to court as well as to address new issues coming into self-help centers. These new issues are posed by special populations such as immigrants, veterans and persons needing to address fees and fines. This expansion will not only make existing services more effective, but will allow access to justice for persons who cannot access in-person self-help centers due to physical, geographical or transportation challenges, and would allow increased services for those who cannot get to court during normal work hours.

C. Estimated Costs: Proposed ongoing augmentation of \$22 million General Fund to support self-help centers in trial court facilities. The total need, based on a 2006 survey, to support self-help centers in all trial court facilities is \$44 million. Currently, \$11.2 million is allocated for self-help centers and this request represents approximately 67 percent of the \$32.8 million remaining need. This request will allocate \$22 million for attorney and qualified paralegal staff at each court and will encourage cooperative projects across county lines such as increased technology, sharing of bilingual resources to provide services as cost-effectively as possible. The 2016 Budget Act included \$25 million for

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Court Innovation Grants, of which, \$8 million was for self-help, family law and juvenile projects. The models developed by the self-help projects funded through those grants will be shared throughout the state in order to encourage efficiencies.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Self-help services have proven to be a cost-effective way for the branch to ensure that judicial officers get the information they need to make informed decisions that litigants are prepared for hearings, and that cases can be successfully concluded. These pilot projects and regular reports of their innovations would encourage the work of the trial courts to provide services to self-represented litigants as effectively and efficiently as possible in a variety of case types. It would allow for local innovation which would be evaluated and results disseminated so that other courts could build on that knowledge to provide enhanced services throughout the state. A cost benefit study of self-help programs indicates that self-help services provide real cost savings to courts. The study further noted that there were significant savings to the public as well.¹

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee
- Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
- Court Executives Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Providing Access & Fairness
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Committee on Providing Access and Fairness take on the lead advisory role as it is charged with developing resources for services for self-represented litigants and a number of committee members have strong background in self-help centers and services.

¹ *The Benefits and Costs of Programs to Assist Self-Represented Litigants: Results from Limited Data Gathering Conducted by Six Trial Courts in California's San Joaquin Valley*, prepared by John Greacen, May 3, 2009, found at: http://www.courts.ca.gov/partners/documents/Greacen_benefit_cost_final_report.pdf

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Contact: Don Will

Date Prepared: 3/1/2017

Budget Services Liaison: Kris Errecart

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-23

A. Working Title: Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) in Juvenile Dependency Court

B. Description of Funding Request: A \$500,000 General Fund augmentation beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support the court-appointed special advocates grants program. CASA programs are nonprofit organizations which provide trained volunteers who are assigned by a juvenile court judge to a child in foster care. The program is well-utilized by the juvenile courts, with nearly all programs unable to meet all of the requests for volunteer assignments made by the courts. The number of volunteers that CASA's are able to provide can serve only about 12 percent of the total dependency population or 20 percent of the out-of-home foster care population. Since all CASA volunteers must be supervised by professional staff, growth of CASA programs to meet the full need of the courts is limited by the programs' ability to pay professional staff. The 2006 Budget Act provided an additional \$64,000 (3 percent) specifically to the CASA grants program. Since then, CASA programs have expanded from 39 to 50 courts, and have increased the number of children they serve by approximately 35 percent, from 8,000 to 11,000. With approximately 55,000 children in court-supervised out-of-home foster care, this represents an unmet need of 44,000 children or 80 percent. Increasing the Judicial Council grant program by \$500,000 will allow programs to increase their volunteer supervisor hours and serve up to 20 percent more children statewide.

C. Estimated Costs: A General Fund augmentation of \$500,000 to support the court-appointed special advocates grant program. If approved, this augmentation would provide a total of \$2.713 million for CASA programs, which represents 29 percent of the funding need.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The CASA grants program is a statutory responsibility for the Judicial Council. Legislation (AB 4445, Stats. 1988, ch. 723) amended Welfare and Institutions Code to require the Judicial Council to establish guidelines encouraging the development of local CASA programs that assist abused and neglected children who are the subject of judicial proceedings. The legislation also called for the establishment of a CASA grant program to be administered by the Judicial Council and required CASA programs to provide local matching—or in-kind funds—equal to program funding received from the Judicial Council. The California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care recommended in 2009 that every child in dependency court be assigned a CASA volunteer.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

- F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** Budget Services proposes that the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as it is designated by the Executive and Planning Committee to formulate the methodology for the Judicial Council CASA grants programs.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Center for Judicial Education and Research

Requesting Entity Contact: Gavin Lane

Date Prepared: 3/2/17

Budget Services Liaison: Madelynn McClain

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-07

A. Working Title: Judicial Officer Orientation Programs

B. Description of Funding Request: An augmentation of \$787,000 General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support education courses (identified in Rules of Court 10.451 – 10.459 and 10.462-10.468) for newly appointed or elected judges, newly hired subordinate judicial officers (SJOs), and judges and SJOs assigned to a court with a substantive law assignment in which they have not worked before (e.g. reassigned from a Criminal Law Court to a Family Law Court). Additionally, this request proposes provisional language to provide additional augmentation authority during the fiscal year (upon approval of the Department of Finance) to the extent existing resources are insufficient to support the number of judges/SJOs requiring orientation education and training. This request will shift a portion of the funding currently provided from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) to the General Fund. The cost estimate for this proposal is based on 104 judicial officers, which is derived from the average attendance of new judicial officers at the Judicial College over the past 25 years. When the current Governor leaves office, CJER expects 2018-19 and 2019-20 to have a much higher-than-average attendance, consistent with the past levels of appointments by outgoing governors. Attendance at the Judicial College has ranged between 54 and 142 judges over the past 25 years. Further, accelerating costs for lodging when the economy is strong compound this issue, particularly in the Bay Area and Sacramento where the majority of education is provided. Stable funding is required to provide these orientation courses.

CJER orients both new judges and subordinate judicial officers to the bench and their judicial assignments, as well as experienced judicial officers who are starting or returning to an assignment. Newly appointed, elected, or hired judges and SJOs must attend the New Judge Orientation and the B.E. Witkin Judicial College, as well as an orientation course in their primary assignment area. Additionally judicial officers must subsequently be oriented to a new type of primary assignment when they are assigned to that type of court for the first time. Currently, \$1.202 million allocated from the IMF to CJER must support not only the required statewide orientation courses for trial court judicial officers, but must also provide continuing statewide education to presiding judges, experienced trial court bench officers, court executives, managers and court staff. This proposal will reduce the amount needed annually from the IMF to \$599,000 to support education for these groups and will bring the total statewide training budget to \$1.386 million (\$599,000 IMF/\$787,000 GF). Shifting IMF expenditures to the General Fund will assist with the long term solvency of the IMF as well as provide a stable funding source necessary to ensure that newly appointed or elected judges and SJOs have access to the education courses required for them to be prepared to perform the duties entrusted them by the people of California.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

C. Estimated Costs: \$787,000 General Fund for direct costs to support faculty (consisting primarily of trained judges but also a small number of paid subject matter experts), and participants consisting of trial court judicial officers. Estimated costs based on 104 participants annually for the New Judge Orientation and B.E. Witkin Judicial College and 327 participants annually for the various Primary Assignment Orientation Courses.

The CJER IMF budget, intended to enable consistent statewide education, was originally associated with the historic change to state trial court funding and provided via several BCPs in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Once encompassing \$3.6 million, and reduced and redirected by more than 60 percent to a current level of \$1.2 million, CJER’s IMF budget is no longer sufficient to meet the education needs identified by the CJER Governing Committee, the Judicial Council Advisory Committee charged with implementing the Council’s Strategic Plan (Education is Goal 5 of the Judicial Council’s Strategic Plan). The largest portion of this budget by far funds required orientation for judicial officers new to the bench and new to their substantive law assignment. As the IMF funding was reduced or redirected over time, it became insufficient to support experienced judge education. Consequently, more than 50 percent of experienced judge education programming has been eliminated in recent years due to these funding constraints.

	Participants	Faculty	Total
New Judge Orientation	\$104,000	\$45,000	\$149,000
B.E. Witkin Judicial College	\$260,000	\$65,000	\$325,000
Primary Assignment Orientation	\$260,000	\$53,000	\$313,000
Total	\$624,000	\$163,000	\$787,000

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: There are no other requests that affect CJER or the branch’s education needs. This request is consistent with a previously approved 2016-17 Budget Change Proposal which shifted costs for the Phoenix Program from the IMF to the General Fund. Orientation of judicial officers to their new role on the bench and to their substantive law assignments is a critical function of the judicial branch. It is required to ensure the fair administration of justice, to meet the diverse needs of the public and to enhance the trust and confidence of the people of California in their courts.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Governing Committee of Center for Judicial Education and Research
- Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

- F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** Budget Services proposes that the Governing Committee for CJER take on the lead advisory role as the CJER Governing Committee recommends policy and direction for judicial branch education for approval by the Judicial Council.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Court Operations Services

Requesting Entity Contact: Olivia Lawrence

Budget Services Liaison: Kris Errecart

Date Prepared: 3/2/17

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-09

A. Working Title: Advancing the Implementation of the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) and 2.0 positions beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing. The funding will implement the following provisions of the Language Access Plan (LAP): 1) expanding interpreter services into all civil proceedings; 2) establishing a grant program for signage in courthouses in multiple languages; 3) establishing a grant program for infrastructure support and non-video remote interpreting equipment in support of courts' language access expansion efforts; 4) maintenance of the branch's online Language Access Toolkit; and 5) staff to administer the grant programs and maintain the online Language Access Toolkit. These efforts support the implementation of the Judicial Council's *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*, adopted January 2015.

The LAP consists of eight goals and 75 recommendations, including priorities in three phases. The Judicial Council and the courts are working to implement these recommendations in the courts over the 5-year period from 2015-2020. The LAP also aligns with the United States Department of Justice's recommendations for California to expand its language access efforts. Further, it also aligns with recent legislation in California (Assembly Bill 1657; Stats. 2014, ch. 721) that sets priorities for the provision of court interpreters in civil proceedings. No funds were secured with the adoption of the LAP.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the cost to implement the four LAP provisions identified above is unknown; however, the Court Operations Services Office estimates the range will be between \$7 million to \$12 million and 2.0 positions to support the provisions. The 2016 Budget Act included \$7.0 million specifically to support expansion of interpreter services into all civil proceedings.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* supports Goal I of the Judicial Council's 2006-2016 strategic plan—Access, Fairness, and Diversity—which sets forth that:

- All persons will have equal access to the courts and court proceedings and programs;
- Court procedures will be fair and understandable to court users; and
- Members of the judicial branch community will strive to understand and be responsive to the needs of court users from diverse cultural backgrounds.

The LAP also aligns with the 2008-2011 operational plan for the judicial branch, which identifies additional objectives, including:

- Increase qualified interpreter services in mandated court proceedings and seek to expand services to additional court venues; and
- Increase the availability of language access services to all court users.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Further, the LAP also aligns with the Chief Justice's Access 3D framework and enhances equal access by serving people of all languages, abilities, and needs, in keeping with California's diversity.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Court Interpreters Advisory Panel
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force take on the lead advisory role as it is responsible for developing the necessary systems for monitoring compliance with the council's January 2015 *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Habeas Corpus Resource Center

Contact: Louis Stanford

Budget Services Liaison: Madelynn McClain

Date Prepared: 3/6/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-19

A. Working Title: Habeas Corpus Resource Center Case Team Staffing

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to create four additional case teams to provide legal representation to inmates on California's death row and an amendment to Government Code § 68661. Additional office and storage space would be required. This proposal is necessary to reduce the increasing backlog of inmates on California's death row who have the right to counsel in state post-conviction proceedings, but currently must wait as long as 20 years for appointment of an attorney. Such undue delays in appointment of counsel substantially increase both the litigation costs of each case and the incarceration costs associated with the delay in providing a substantial number of condemned inmates relief from their death judgments.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the cost to support four additional case teams is unknown; however, the costs identified in the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget were \$3.4 million in 2017-18, \$5.0 million in 2018-19, and \$5.5 million in 2019-20 and ongoing. This request also included 34.0 positions to be phased in over two years. This BCP was denied.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: The delays in appointment of state habeas counsel have now ballooned to 358 inmates on death row without habeas counsel. The average delay in appointment of counsel is about 10 years, while the California Supreme Court is now appointing counsel in cases with judgments dating back 20 years. The 6th Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the effective assistance of counsel in criminal proceedings as a fundamental part of our judicial system. The State's courts are required to provide counsel to indigent defendants and must do so in all appeals that may come before them. The mission of the California judiciary is to "in a fair, accessible, effective and efficient manner, resolve disputes arising under the law... protect the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitutions of California and the United States." Goal I of the Strategic Plan, Access, Fairness, and Diversity, states that "California's courts will treat everyone in a fair and just manner."

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Habeas Corpus Resource Center Board of Directors
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the HCRC Board of Directors take on the lead advisory role as it makes decisions on budget and operations affecting the HCRC.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Virginia Sanders-Hinds, JCIT

Date Prepared: 3/2/17

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-03

A. Working Title: Case Management System Replacement

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) to replace outdated and/or no longer supported case management systems with a vendor-supplied case management system.

Many courts still have outdated and/or unsupported applications developed with older technology that do not have the capabilities of a modern case management system such as a document management system or e-filing capability. Obtaining funding to replace these outdated and/or unsupported case management systems with a modern case management system is the next step towards the first goal in the *Court Technology Strategic Plan* (Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court). Previously, the Judicial Council Technology Committee and Judicial Council staff have worked with the V3 and SJE courts on a path forward to replace their case management systems. This initiative will address the needs of courts who continue to operate with outdated legacy systems.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the cost to replace the case management system for courts with outdated and no longer supported case management systems is unknown. There are approximately 18 courts which have outdated systems. The listing of courts must be finalized, then the courts must determine which replacement case management system best meets their needs. It is expected that by late-April 2018, the courts will be identified. The courts will then need to determine the case management system and provide cost estimates for the request. The 2016 Budget Act included \$25.0 million over three years to replace CCMS V3 in four courts and the 2017-18 Governor's Budget proposes \$5.0 million over two years to replace SJE in nine courts.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Building a foundation for "Promoting the Digital Court" by implementing modern and supportable case management systems was approved as the highest priority in the *Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan*. The courts that had means through reserves and other funding moved forward, making use of master service agreements or requests for proposal. Approximately 40 of the 58 courts are in the process or have completed new case management system deployments for some or all of their case types. The Judicial Council has worked with the V3 and the Sustain Justice Edition courts on Budget Change Proposals for their case management system replacement.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

- F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Robert Oyung, JCIT

Date Prepared: 3/9/2017

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-24

A. Working Title: Digitizing paper and filmed case files for the Superior and Appellate Courts

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to digitize paper and filmed case files for the Superior and Appellate Courts. Many courts are still operating with paper case files and often historical files are stored on deteriorating microfilm and microfiche. As the courts migrate from older legacy case management systems, they can take advantage of electronic documents and electronic document processing, but they need a mechanism to convert existing paper and filmed case files into electronic format. Utilizing paper and filmed case files is very labor intensive and off-site storage is expensive. Furthermore, existing microfilm and microfiche records are subject to physical deterioration and the devices to view the media are quickly becoming obsolete. Electronic case files will eliminate the need for physical storage facilities and would allow for greater public access and convenience. The request would allow for a vendor to prepare the physical documents for conversion, scanning into electronic digital format, and also for providing quality assurance that the documents were converted accurately. The proposed approach would enable “back scanning” of all existing files and be used to increase the capacity of a court’s electronic storage infrastructure to hold all the converted documents and to purchase scanning devices to convert any new incoming paper documents to electronic format.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the cost to digitize paper and filmed case files is unknown; however, it is estimated to be approximately \$20 - \$25 million. A detailed inventory and Request for Proposal must be issued to determine the precise costs. There are at least 15 courts which have a need for digitizing paper and film documents. The listing of courts must be finalized, then the courts must determine the number of files needed to digitize. It is expected that by December 2017, the courts and volumes will be identified.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: “Promoting the Digital Court” and “Optimizing Branch Resources” are two of the goals in *Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan* that digitizing paper and film documents support. A document management system is the second highest priority of “Promoting the Digital Court” following a modern case management system. Digitizing paper and filmed case files also supports the trial courts. (Please refer to benefits above.) This request will also enable the courts to better utilize their modern case management systems, including the V3 and the Sustain Justice Edition courts which the Judicial Council worked with on Budget Change Proposals for their case management system replacement.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as the JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Robert Oyung

Date Prepared: 3/9/2017

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-25

A. Working Title: Deploy and maintain California Courts Protective Order Registry for the Superior Courts.

B. Description of Funding Request: An estimated \$1.0 million General Fund augmentation beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to deploy the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) program to the five remaining courts that have not yet implemented CCPOR and maintain the annual operations of the program. CCPOR provides statewide management of restraining and protective orders. Registry data and scanned images of orders can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers across the state. Currently, CCPOR serves 43 courts and their respective law enforcement agencies plus 13 tribal courts with read-only access. We expect 10 more courts to be implemented in FY17/18. The program delivers support for deployment, onboarding, enhancements, defect fixes, legislative changes, and modifications required by the Department of Justice. Program Benefits:

- Places critical public safety information at fingertips of courts and law enforcement;
- Provides 24/7 secure access to Registry data from participating superior courts;
- Enables users to search orders by name, case number, and other criteria;
- Facilitates protective order sharing between courts;
- Provides automated exchange to the California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS);
- Integrates with court case management systems utilizing the data exchange DSP917;
- Provides shared access to law enforcement agencies and the California Department of Justice.

Currently, the CCPOR program is funded from the dwindling Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) which is not structurally suited to fund the ongoing operations of this program. Ongoing BCP funding will provide a stable source of funding to ensure that this critical public safety program can be sustained.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the estimated cost to implement the five remaining courts and provide ongoing maintenance for all the courts is approximately \$1.0 million annually.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: “Promoting the Digital Court” and “Optimizing Branch Resources” are two of the goals in *Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan* that CCPOR support. CCPOR eliminates manual paper-based processes and enables court staff to be better utilized.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as the JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Virginia Sanders-Hinds

Date Prepared: 3/9/2017

Budget Services Liaison: MaryJo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-26

A. Working Title: Self Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Solution

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) to support implementation of a branchwide Self-represented litigants (SRLs) E-Services website that optimizes and leverages existing branch, local court, and vendor resources to offer SRL e-capabilities such as facilitating interactive FAQ, triage functionality, document assembly providing guidance to SRLs submitting court documents, and interoperates with the impending branchwide e-filing solution.

Currently, there are a myriad of solutions and approaches to providing SRL e-services throughout the state; and also many courts with minimal online support services. The SRL E-Services Workstream, a collaborative judicial branch initiative, has been tasked with developing a comprehensive set of business and functional requirements that will shape the future of court-sponsored online self-help e-services. The Self-Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Solution/Portal will encompass providing more robust information and instruction for SRLs, in addition to numerous service enhancements such as instructional videos, online chat, user/site registration, and integration with document assembly and e-filing.

SRLs are an increasingly large segment of the population that our courts serve, particularly in case types such as family law. Self-represented parties often have extreme difficulty in identifying the pleading forms they require, completing them accurately and legibly, and filing them in a timely manner. Self-help resources vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and have suffered from recent budget cuts. Restrictions on the filing hours in many courts have placed significant additional burdens on both court personnel and on litigants.

The SRL E-Services initiative will envision and define a digital services strategy for SRLs that will take advantage of both existing and available branch resources to provide more convenience to the public, and provide tangible benefits and cost efficiencies to the courts. The initiative will develop a comprehensive set of business and technical requirements intended to deliver increased online assistance, greater integration of self-help resources, and greater self-reliance for those hoping to resolve legal problems without representation.

A central access point for SRLs (and for community organizations that assist them) will provide consistent information resources and can utilize already developed question-and-answer interview processes, “smart” Judicial Council forms, and document assembly tools to create complete, accurate, and legible form sets. Those forms can then be electronically filed with those courts that have the ability to accept the filings, or electronically delivered to those courts without e-filing capacity, using current branch infrastructure.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

- C. Estimated Costs:** At this time, the cost to develop and implement a statewide e-services litigant portal/website solution is unknown. To achieve a cost estimate the workstream team will be validating litigant and court requirements; identifying existing technology and infrastructure solutions that can be leveraged or shared; identify and gather information (through a request for information—planned for the Spring of 2017) resources to assist litigants; identify pilot project participant courts; develop a request for proposal for an e-services solution to identify costs; and develop a plan for a scalable statewide prototype.
- D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** Contributing to the “Promoting the Digital Court” by implementing an integrated, statewide e-services solution was approved as a key priority in the *Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan* and further detailed as an approved initiative to pursue in the *Tactical Plan for Technology (2014-2016)* and remains in the proposed *2017-2018* update to the plan). No other similar requests are known, at this time.
- E. Required Review/Approvals:**
- Judicial Council Technology Committee
 - Information Technology Advisory Committee
 - Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
 - Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
 - Judicial Branch Budget Committee
- F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** Budget Services proposes that the Information Technology Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as the ITAC promotes, coordinates, and acts as executive sponsor for projects and initiatives that apply technology to the work of the courts. Further, ITAC’s Self-Represented Litigants E-Services Workstream is specifically tasked with developing the requirements for a statewide SRL e-services solution; and is on track for completion in December 2017.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council Information Technology Office

Contact: Robert Oyung

Date Prepared: 3/9/2017

Budget Services Liaison: Mary Jo Ejercito

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-27

A. Working Title: Deploy an Identity Management solution for the Judicial Branch

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) to deploy an Identity Management solution that will provide a unique username and password to every judicial branch employee and judicial officer, attorneys, members of the public, and justice partners who access judicial branch computer systems and electronic services.

An Identity Management solution is the foundation that allows the judicial branch to uniquely identify an individual who is accessing judicial branch electronic systems. Currently, each court has a local identity management system to secure its systems but those usernames and passwords cannot be used across courts. For attorneys, their bar number is a unique identifier but there is no associated password with that number and so cannot be used for secure access to systems. For the public, there is no way to uniquely identify them today and in fact, at times it is difficult to determine if cases with similar participant names are the same or different person.

Assigning a unique identifier to everyone will enable an entirely new set of electronic services. For example, the ability for a member of the public to login once to a portal and pay for any outstanding fines or fees from any court within the state and view all of their case files across different courts. An attorney could use their unique login to be notified if there are any actions or changes to any case that they have open at any court across the state from the superior courts to the Supreme Court. Judges and court staff could use their unique login to securely access systems without needing to memorize multiple usernames and passwords. Justice partners could securely access court systems to view information that only they are authorized to do so.

Note that changes to existing case management systems and other platforms would be necessary to take advantage of the Identity Management solution but it is the Identity Management solution that would enable much of this new functionality. The increased access to justice would be significant.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the cost to implement an identity management system are unknown. A project has been launched that will assess the technologies and options resulting in an request for proposal during the 2017-18 fiscal year with small pilot that year and an anticipated wide spread implementation in 2018-19.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: “Promoting the Digital Court” and “Optimizing Infrastructure” are two of the goals in *Court Technology Governance and Strategic Plan* that Identity Management support. Identity Management will enable an entirely new set of capabilities to improve court operations and dramatically increase access to justice for the public. Identity Management has been identified as a key component for the e-filing workstream initiative currently in progress and sponsored by the Information Technology Advisory Committee as one of its major programs in the published Tactical Plan for Technology.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Judicial Council Technology Committee
- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Judicial Council Technology Committee take on the lead advisory role as the JCTC oversees the council's policies concerning technology and is responsible in partnership with the courts for coordinating with the Administrative Director and all internal committees, advisory committees, commissions, working groups, task forces, justice partners and stakeholders on technological issues relating to the branch and the courts.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council

Contact: Lucy Fogarty

Budget Services Liaison: Madelynn McClain

Date Prepared: 3/2/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-08

- A. Working Title:** General Fund Support of Statewide Programs and Services
- B. Description of Funding Request:** A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to shift funding of all Judicial Council staff related costs funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) to the General Fund. These positions support a variety of programs that provide services to the trial courts statewide. The 2016 Budget Act included \$8.7 million General Fund to support the Judicial Council's IMF-related state operations costs of the Phoenix Financial System utilized by the trial courts for financial and human resources management assistance. This request, if approved, will shift all staffing costs related to the programs providing services to the trial courts from the IMF to the General Fund.
- C. Estimated Costs:** At this time, the staffing costs to perform these services in 2017-18 is unknown as the Judicial Council has not yet approved the IMF expenditures; however, the costs identified in the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) submitted for the 2017-18 Governor's Budget were \$6.9 million. This BCP was denied.
- D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** This proposal for an ongoing General Fund augmentation to support all JCC staff costs associated with the IMF would ensure that costs related to statewide operations of the Judicial Branch are funded from the General Fund rather than from the IMF, and would provide the necessary funds to serve the branch's needs.
- E. Required Review/Approvals:**
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
 - Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
 - Judicial Branch Budget Committee
- F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** Budget Services proposes that the Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch as it makes recommendations on any BCPs for funding that impacts the Judicial Council's budget.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Legal Services

Contact: Eric Schnurpfeil

Budget Services Liaison: Lucy Chin

Date Prepared: 03/02/17

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-02

A. Working Title: Judicial Branch Litigation Management Program

B. Description of Funding Request: A \$5.8 million General Fund augmentation beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support the defense and indemnification of all Judicial Branch entities for government claims and litigation. The request will also propose provisional language to allow the Judicial Council one additional year to encumber funds, beyond existing Budget Act authority, which will provide greater flexibility to schedule contract payments. Approximately \$5.4 million is traditionally budgeted annually from the General Fund and the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) (see detail below). Shifting IMF expenditures to the General Fund will assist with the long term solvency of the IMF as well as centralize the Litigation Management Program into a consolidated pool of available funds to be used for all entities of the Judicial Branch.

C. Estimated Costs: \$5.8 million General Fund. This request will (1) consolidate the current expenditures from the following fund sources, adding to the existing \$200,000 General Fund allocation, and (2) increase the total amount of the consolidated fund by \$439,000 to allow for increases in litigation costs over the period since these funds were *initially* established at the following levels:

\$200,000 – General Fund

\$4,500,000 – IMF, Trial Court Litigation Management Fund¹

\$661,000 – IMF, Trial Court Transactions Assistance Program²

\$5,361,000 Total

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Litigation funding is currently divided into three categories: (1) Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Judicial Council litigation and related risk reduction expenditures (General Fund), (2) trial court litigation and related risk reduction expenditures (IMF-Trial Court Litigation Management), and (3) trial court transactional assistance to pay for counsel for labor arbitrations, proceedings before the Public Employment Relations Board, as well as for outside counsel in specialized areas of the law and other risk reduction expenditures (IMF-Trial Court Transactions Assistance Program). There are no other requests that affect the Litigation Management Program or the branch's litigation needs. This request is consistent with a previously approved 2016-17 Governor's Budget BCP which shifted costs for the Phoenix Program from the IMF to the General Fund. Consolidating funding and broadening the use of the

¹ The \$4,500,000 historically allocated to the Litigation Management Program from IMF starting in 2000 was reduced to \$4,000,000 for FY15-16 and \$4,160,000 FY 16-17. The reduced amount was insufficient to cover litigation expenditures for the trial courts for FY15-16, and Legal Services was required to request additional fund transfers to LMP, as well as to the \$200,000 General Fund allocation. Current demands may result in similar action in FY 2016-17.

² For FY13-14, the allocation to the Trial Court Transactions Assistance Program from IMF was reduced to \$451,000 from the previous \$685,000 in FY12-13 and remained at that reduced level until March 2016, when it became clear that the funds would be insufficient to cover expenditures for the trial court arbitrations and PERB matters; transfers from ROAG savings and other funds have supplemented the funding for FY15-16, for a total of \$669,048. FY 16-17 allocation is \$651,000.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

funds allows the Judicial Council to effectively manage resources and better serve the branch's litigation needs.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Litigation Management Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Litigation Management Committee take on the lead advisory role as it makes decisions on use of litigation funding for the Judicial Branch.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: REFM/Security Operations unit

Contact: Ed Ellestad/Vickie Akers

Budget Services Liaison: Michele Allan

Date Prepared: 3/2/17

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-05

A. Working Title: Statewide Security Systems and Equipment - Maintenance and Replacement

B. Description of Funding Request: A \$3.0 million General Fund augmentation beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to refresh, maintain and replace security equipment including aging camera, access control, and duress alarm systems. Security systems, which include security cameras, electronic access control, duress alarms, online continuity, security and emergency planning tool (COOP) and intrusion alarms, are vital components in ensuring the safety and security of the public, judicial officers, and court personnel. Many trial court facilities have aging or inadequate security systems.

Currently, long term planning for repairs, maintenance and refreshing of security systems cannot be accomplished due to a lack of funding. The current run to fail approach results in costly, piecemeal repairs and exponentially adds to the long term costs to address the needs of security equipment.

This request would provide ongoing dedicated funding to address not only maintenance and repairs statewide, but would allow for replacement and refreshing of systems and equipment that have failed and or become obsolete. In addition, funding would be used to provide system maintenance of the web based COOP planning tool, as well as on-site training for courts to develop, improve and exercise their emergency plans.

C. Estimated Costs: Estimated costs of \$3.0 million to refresh, maintain and replace security equipment including aging camera, access control, duress alarm, and intrusion alarm systems. This augmentation will also provide for maintenance, training and necessary upgrades to the web based COOP planning tool used by the Judicial Council and the courts. No positions are included as part of this funding request. In FY 2015-16, \$300,000 was redirected from the Court Facilities Trust Fund (CFTF) routine maintenance allocation for the maintenance of a portion of the security systems. This allowed for the most basic repairs to be made on a portion of the systems. A one-time allocation of approximately \$250,000 was made available for the same purpose in again FY 2016-17. These one-time allocations do not adequately provide for all of the courts, leading to the deferment of necessary repairs. This will ultimately have an adverse effect on court security, including the safety of all users. In addition, technological advances in recent years have resulted in analog video components of many currently installed systems no longer being supported or available, making piecemeal repairs more difficult, costly, or impossible to perform.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Prior to FY 2015-16, approximately \$1.2 million was expended annually from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Funds (IMF) to support already installed security systems statewide. This request for \$3.0 million will support the maintenance of security equipment statewide, including inherited systems, and those systems in new construction projects coming out of warranty.

Due to the structural imbalance in the IMF, expenditure reductions were necessary; therefore, funding for the repair and maintenance of security was eliminated. Since then, small amounts have been allocated on a one-time basis from the CFTF; however, the CFTF is unable to support any future expenditures for security. This funding request will support a statewide security systems replacement

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

and maintenance program, which is essential to safe and secure court operations. Previous Budget Change Proposals were submitted to the Department of Finance for this purpose but were denied.

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee
- Court Security Advisory Committee
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Court Security Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as it makes recommendations to the council for improving court security, including personal security and emergency response planning.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Real Estate and Facilities Management

Contact: Jagan Singh

Date Prepared: 2/28/2017

Budget Services Liaison: Michele Allan

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-20

A. Working Title: Trial Court Facilities Operations Costs

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to be transferred to the Court Facilities Trust Fund (CFTF) to support trial court facilities operations costs.

The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 provided for the transfer of court facilities from the counties to the state and also stipulated that the counties provide a County Facility Payment (CFP) based on the historical costs of operating each transferred facility. The CFP was not intended to provide for inflationary cost increases beyond the date of transfer. Additionally, CFPs do not support the growth in square footage resulting from newly constructed trial court facilities, which remains unfunded, and the costs associated with maintaining those facilities has been absorbed within existing resources.

SB 1732 states that “ongoing operations and maintenance of court facilities that are in excess of the county facility payment be provided by the state.” AB 1806 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 2006) authorizes a cost of living increase against the CFP from the General Fund, based on the state appropriations limit (SAL) year-to-year- percentage change. Due to the State’s General Fund shortfall, the SAL adjustment was suspended for FY 2009–2010 and to date, has not been reinstated.

The additional funds will augment the CFPs provided by counties and fund the growth of square footage due to newly constructed trial court facilities, providing ongoing necessary resources to support trial court facilities operations costs, which include risk management needs (insurance/litigation), utility needs, routine maintenance needs, and rent needs.

C. Estimated Costs: At this time, the cost of this proposal has not yet been determined; however, the Judicial Council submitted two separate Budget Change Proposals (BCP) for the 2017-18 Governor’s Budget in support of trial court facilities costs, which were denied:

- 1) A request for \$22.5 million, ongoing, for facility operations cost adjustment to CFPs.
- 2) A request for \$8.5 million, ongoing, to support unfunded facility costs due to the growth in square footage resulting from newly constructed trial court facilities.

A third BCP request for \$3.1 million to support Insurance Risk Management was submitted to the Judicial Council for approval and submission to the Department of Finance; however, the council did not approve this request to move forward. The council indicated that, given current state policy to self-insure facilities, except in cases where it is required—such as for bond funded facilities or if required by contract—this request would require the state to hold trial court facilities to a different standard than all other state-owned buildings. Additionally, the CFP required by statute provide a limited source of funds for transferred facilities with which to make payments required by contract.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

The BCP request for the 2018-19 Governor's Budget will combine all three items into one request as they affect trial court operations cost.

- D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** This request is to fund trial court facilities and is a need for the Judicial Branch and directly supports Goals VI, VII, of the Judicial Council's Strategic Plan as follows:
- a. Goal VI, Branch wide Infrastructure for Service Excellence states "Infrastructure improvements needed to better serve the public include (1) acquisition, construction, renovation, and maintenance of adequate facilities." This goal seeks to provide fully functional facilities that are safe and secure for conducting court business for all court users.
 - b. Goal VII, Consistent with the Judicial Council's legislative priority to advocate for investment in our justice system to preserve access to justice for all Californians, the branch must make every effort to achieve greater financial independence and flexibility for funding the court system at a level of sufficiency.
- E. Required Review/Approvals:**
- Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee
 - Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch
 - Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
 - Judicial Branch Budget Committee
- F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee:** Budget Services proposes that the Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as it provides ongoing oversight of the judicial branch programs that manages renovations, facilities operations, maintenance, and real estate for trial courts throughout the state.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Contact: Suzanne Blihovde

Date Prepared: 3/2/2017

Budget Services Liaison: Suzanne Blihovde

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-10

A. Working Title: Stabilization of Civil Assessment Revenue

B. Description of Funding Request: A General Fund augmentation (amount \$TBD) beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to transition the deposit of civil assessment revenues, including the \$48.3 million in Maintenance of Effort (MOE buyout), into the General Fund instead of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and instead, provide a General Fund amount TBD into the TCTF to replace the civil assessment revenues that will be paid into the General Fund.

Civil assessment revenues, as imposed pursuant to Penal Code (PC) 1214.1, are currently deposited into the TCTF, net of cost recovery pursuant to PC 1463.007. Per Judicial Council policy, the remitted civil assessment revenues are allocated to the trial courts one hundred percent, net the civil assessment buyout amount. The civil assessment buyout amount of \$48.3 million is maintained in the TCTF to replace the reduced MOE payments made by the counties, and supports the courts' base allocations.

C. Estimated Costs: The amount of this request has not been determined; however, it is estimated to be between \$146.8 million to \$154.7 million annually. The General Fund augmentation to the TCTF would remain a set amount to ensure fund stability, while the civil assessment revenues remitted into the General Fund would vary based on revenues collected. Any excess remitted over the set TCTF augmentation would be to the General Fund's benefit, while the General Fund would take on the risk of any decreases in civil assessments revenue below the TCTF augmentation.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Advocacy groups, the Federal Department of Justice, the state's legislature and the Judicial Council have been highlighting how the imposition of increased fines and fees impact the people served by the judicial branch. Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye, in her March 2016 state of the judiciary address to the legislature, stated that California's fines and fees structure "has morphed from a system of accountability to a system that raises revenue for essential government services." The Chief Justice questioned whether this system effectively serves its purpose of accountability or instead causes an iniquity that penalizes the poor. Under the current civil assessment statute, there is a perceived conflict of interest between the imposition of the civil assessment and the funding a court receives. The proposed funding swap helps remove that conflict of interest by breaking the direct link between the imposition of the assessment and the court's funding source. Removing this perceived conflict of interest will help the Judicial Council better pursue its policy goals of achieving a more equitable fines and fees system. In addition, this request will help meet the Judicial Council's goals to provide more stability in revenues supporting the base court operations funded by the TCTF, by removing the fluctuations in civil assessment revenues.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee act as the lead committee as it makes allocation recommendations for court allocations. In addition, there is a Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee that reviews Trial Court Trust Fund allocations and the Funding Methodology Subcommittee which reviews and refines the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council of California
Contact: Patrick Ballard

Date Prepared: 2/24/2017
Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-12

- A. Working Title:** Funding for 10 of the 50 Judgeships Authorized by AB 159
- B. Description of Funding Request:** A General Fund augmentation, estimated between \$8.3 million and \$15.4 million, to support 10 of the 50 trial court judgeships authorized by Assembly Bill 159 (Ch. 722, Stats. 2007), accompanying support staff, and county-provided sheriff security. While the latest Judicial Needs Assessment (2016) shows that the branch needs just over 188 judgeships based on workload metrics, efforts to secure funding for the 50 previously-authorized judgeships have been unsuccessful. This request for a more modest number of judgeships is to address the most critical judicial shortage in the trial courts with the greatest need. The allocation of the 10 judgeships would be based on the methodology outlined in Government Code section 69614 (b), which states that judges shall be allocated, in accordance with the uniform standards for factually determining additional judicial need in each county, as updated and approved by the Judicial Council, pursuant to the Update of Judicial Needs Study, based on the following criteria: (1) Court filings data averaged over a period of three years; (2) Workload standards that represent the average amount of time of bench and nonbench work required to resolve each case type; (3) A ranking methodology that provides consideration for courts that have the greatest need relative to their current complement of judicial officers. The allocation would also take into consideration, if enacted, any of the currently pending bills to reallocate vacant judgeships. At the time of the writing of this concept proposal three bills have been introduced relating to reallocation of vacant judgeships—AB 414 (Medina), SB 39 (Roth) and proposed Trailer Bill language included in the 2017-18 Governor’s Budget.
- C. Estimated Costs:** Estimated cost of \$8.3 million to \$15.4 million General Fund for 10 trial court judgeships and the full complement of staff needed as identified in the RAS/WAFM model and county-provided sheriff security.
- D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** The Judicial Council began efforts to seek the most critically needed 150 judgeships with Senate Bill 56 (Ch. 390, Stats. 2006). This legislation authorized the first fifty most critically-needed judgeships and the associated funding. In October 2007, Assembly Bill 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722) was enacted authorizing the second set of 50 judgeships, to be allocated as determined by the council. Initially, funding for these 50 judgeships would have allowed appointments to begin in June 2008. Because of budget constraints, funding was delayed until July 2009, however, no funding was included in the 2009 Budget Act to support the judgeships. Over the past three fiscal years, the council has approved the submission of Budget Change Proposals for critically needed new judgeships, however, to date, no funding has been provided.
- E. Required Review/Approvals:**
- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
 - Judicial Branch Budget Committee

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee take on the lead advisory role as this committee makes recommendations to the council on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for the trial courts and provides input to the council on policy issues affecting trial court funding. In addition, there is a Funding Methodology Subcommittee established under TCBAC that focuses on the ongoing review and refinement of WAFM.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council of California

Contact: Brandy Sanborn

Budget Services Liaison: Brandy Sanborn

Date Prepared: 2/27/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-11a

A. Working Title: Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings

B. Description of Funding Request: An augmentation of \$22.0 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. The total need, based on the current workload model to achieve the Judicial Council's statewide caseload standard of 141 clients per attorney, is \$202.9 million; however, existing funding of \$114.7 million is provided in the annual Budget Act specifically for this purpose. This request represents 25 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317. Inadequate funding and subsequent high caseloads lead to high attorney turnover and lack of retention of qualified advocates for children. Effective counsel will ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays, improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge, and ultimately shortening the time children spend in foster care.

C. Estimated Costs: \$22.0 million General Fund beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel. If approved, the augmentation would provide a total of \$136.7 million, which represents 67 percent of the funding need.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel became a state fiscal responsibility through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (SB 612/AB 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945) which added section 77003 to the Government Code and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. Welfare and Institutions Code section 317(c) requires the juvenile court to appoint counsel to represent all children in dependency proceedings¹ absent a finding that the particular child will not benefit from the appointment. The court must also appoint counsel for all indigent parents whose children have been placed out of the home or for whom out-of-home placement is recommended, and may appoint counsel for all other indigent parents.

The statewide funding need for court-appointed counsel is based primarily on the number of children in court-ordered child welfare supervision. The Judicial Council has established a caseload standard of 141 clients per full time equivalent attorney and a total funding need of \$202.9 million to achieve this standard. Previous Budget Change Proposals were submitted in 2016-17 and 2017-18; however, they were denied.

¹ Under section 317.5, each child "who is the subject of a dependency proceeding is a party to that proceeding." (§ 317.5(b).)

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee take on a joint lead advisory role as TCBAC makes allocation recommendations for dependency counsel and there is a Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Joint Subcommittee already established under TCBAC to enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort. The subcommittee is made up of members from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and TCBAC.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council of California

Contact: Brandy Sanborn

Budget Services Liaison: Brandy Sanborn

Date Prepared: 2/27/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-11b

- A. Working Title:** Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings
- B. Description of Funding Request:** An augmentation of \$44.1 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. The total need, based on the current workload model to achieve the Judicial Council’s statewide caseload standard of 141 clients per attorney, is \$202.9 million; however, existing funding of \$114.7 million is provided in the annual Budget Act specifically for this purpose. This request represents 50 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317. Inadequate funding and subsequent high caseloads lead to high attorney turnover and lack of retention of qualified advocates for children. Effective counsel will ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays, improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge, and ultimately shortening the time children spend in foster care.
- C. Estimated Costs:** \$44.1 million General Fund beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel. If approved, the augmentation would provide a total of \$158.8 million, which represents 78 percent of the funding need.
- D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests:** Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel became a state fiscal responsibility through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (SB 612/AB 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945) which added section 77003 to the Government Code and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. Welfare and Institutions Code section 317(c) requires the juvenile court to appoint counsel to represent all children in dependency proceedings¹ absent a finding that the particular child will not benefit from the appointment. The court must also appoint counsel for all indigent parents whose children have been placed out of the home or for whom out-of-home placement is recommended, and may appoint counsel for all other indigent parents.

The statewide funding need for court-appointed counsel is based primarily on the number of children in court-ordered child welfare supervision. The Judicial Council has established a caseload standard of 141 clients per full time equivalent attorney and a total funding need of \$202.9 million to achieve this standard. Previous Budget Change Proposals were submitted in 2016-17 and 2017-18; however, they were denied.

¹ Under section 317.5, each child “who is the subject of a dependency proceeding is a party to that proceeding.” (§ 317.5(b).)

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee take on a joint lead advisory role as TCBAC makes allocation recommendations for dependency counsel and there is a Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Joint Subcommittee already established under TCBAC to enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort. The subcommittee is made up of members from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and TCBAC.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council of California

Contact: Brandy Sanborn

Budget Services Liaison: Brandy Sanborn

Date Prepared: 2/27/2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-11c

A. Working Title: Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings

B. Description of Funding Request: An augmentation of \$66.1 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. The total need, based on the current workload model to achieve the Judicial Council’s statewide caseload standard of 141 clients per attorney, is \$202.9 million; however, existing funding of \$114.7 million is provided in the annual Budget Act specifically for this purpose. This request represents 75 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317. Inadequate funding and subsequent high caseloads lead to high attorney turnover and lack of retention of qualified advocates for children. Effective counsel will ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays, improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge, and ultimately shortening the time children spend in foster care.

C. Estimated Costs: \$66.1 million General Fund beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel. If approved, the augmentation would provide a total of \$180.8 million, which represents 89 percent of the funding need.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel became a state fiscal responsibility through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (SB 612/AB 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945) which added section 77003 to the Government Code and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. Welfare and Institutions Code section 317(c) requires the juvenile court to appoint counsel to represent all children in dependency proceedings¹ absent a finding that the particular child will not benefit from the appointment. The court must also appoint counsel for all indigent parents whose children have been placed out of the home or for whom out-of-home placement is recommended, and may appoint counsel for all other indigent parents.

The statewide funding need for court-appointed counsel is based primarily on the number of children in court-ordered child welfare supervision. The Judicial Council has established a caseload standard of 141 clients per full time equivalent attorney and a total funding need of \$202.9 million to achieve this standard. Previous Budget Change Proposals were submitted in 2016-17 and 2017-18; however, they were denied.

¹ Under section 317.5, each child “who is the subject of a dependency proceeding is a party to that proceeding.” (§ 317.5(b).)

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee take on a joint lead advisory role as TCBAC makes allocation recommendations for dependency counsel and there is a Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Joint Subcommittee already established under TCBAC to enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort. The subcommittee is made up of members from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and TCBAC.

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

Requesting Entity: Judicial Council of California

Contact: Brandy Sanborn

Budget Services Liaison: Brandy Sanborn

Date Prepared: 2-27-2017

Document Tracking Number: IFR-18-11d

A. Working Title: Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings

B. Description of Funding Request: An augmentation of \$88.2 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. The total need, based on the current workload model to achieve the Judicial Council's statewide caseload standard of 141 clients per attorney, is \$202.9 million; however, existing funding of \$114.7 million is provided in the annual Budget Act specifically for this purpose. This request represents 100 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317. Inadequate funding and subsequent high caseloads lead to high attorney turnover and lack of retention of qualified advocates for children. Effective counsel will ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays, improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge, and ultimately shortening the time children spend in foster care.

C. Estimated Costs: \$88.2 million General Fund beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel. If approved, the augmentation would provide a total of \$202.9 million, which represents 100 percent of the funding need.

D. Relevance to the Judicial Branch Budget and Other Funding Requests: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel became a state fiscal responsibility through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (SB 612/AB 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945) which added section 77003 to the Government Code and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. Welfare and Institutions Code section 317(c) requires the juvenile court to appoint counsel to represent all children in dependency proceedings¹ absent a finding that the particular child will not benefit from the appointment. The court must also appoint counsel for all indigent parents whose children have been placed out of the home or for whom out-of-home placement is recommended, and may appoint counsel for all other indigent parents.

The statewide funding need for court-appointed counsel is based primarily on the number of children in court-ordered child welfare supervision. The Judicial Council has established a caseload standard of 141 clients per full time equivalent attorney and a total funding need of \$202.9 million to achieve this standard. Previous Budget Change Proposals were submitted in 2016-17 and 2017-18; however, they were denied.

¹ Under section 317.5, each child "who is the subject of a dependency proceeding is a party to that proceeding." (§ 317.5(b).)

2018-19 FY Initial Funding Request

E. Required Review/Approvals:

- Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
- Judicial Branch Budget Committee

F. Proposed Lead Advisory Committee: Budget Services proposes that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee take on a joint lead advisory role as TCBAC makes allocation recommendations for dependency counsel and there is a Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Allocation Methodology Joint Subcommittee already established under TCBAC to enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort. The subcommittee is made up of members from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and TCBAC.