



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE
THIS MEETING WILL BE RECORDED

Date: January 16, 2015
Time: 12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831 Passcode: 3511860

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.

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), public comments about any agenda item must be submitted by January 15, 2015, 12:00 p.m. Written comments should be e-mailed to jctc@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to 2255 N. Ontario Street, Suite 220, Burbank, California 91504, attention: Jessica Craven. Only written comments received by January 15, 2015, 12:00 p.m. will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the December 11, 2014 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

I. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-9)

Item 1

Chair Report

Provide update on activities of or news from the Judicial Council, advisory bodies, courts, and/or other justice partners.

Presenter: Hon. James E. Herman

Item 2

Update on the Improvement and Modernization Fund (Action Required)

An update on the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's working groups recommendations related to the Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) will be

provided. The JCTC will be asked to vote on these recommendations.

Presenters: Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Co-Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer, County of Santa Clara

Item 3

California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) (Action Required)

Presentation on CCPOR and the opportunity to deploy three additional courts with the remaining grant funds from the California Department of Justice.

Presenter: Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager, JCC Information Technology

II. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm
jctc@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 11, 2014
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

**Advisory Body
Members Present:**

Hon. James E. Herman, Chair; Hon. David De Alba, Vice-Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Hon. Emilie H. Elias; Hon. Gary Nadler; Mr. Mark G. Bobino; and Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

**Liaison Members
Present:**

Others Present: Mr. David H. Yamasaki; Mr. Curt Soderlund; Mr. Mark W. Dusman; Mr. Cory Jasperson; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Renea Stewart; Ms. Jessica Craven; Mr. David Koon; and Ms. June Agpalza

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order, took roll call, and advised that no public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed and made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 10, 2014 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

Items 1

Chair Report (No Action Required)

Update:

Hon. James E. Herman, Chair of the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC), welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. An update was provided on the current work in progress including the Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC) to Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) transition, interim case management systems, and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's working group efforts to the Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF). Mr. David H. Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer of Santa Clara County who is now a member of CTAC and has agreed to take on the role of Executive Sponsor of the State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces workstream will also provide an update. Mr. David Koon will provide an update on the hosting options.

Item 2

State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces Workstream (Action Required)

Update: Mr. David H. Yamasaki provided an overview and an update on the workstream. There are two tracks that have been established which include governance and technical. Challenges, timing, and issues were also discussed. This approach will not conflict with any upcoming deployments or any deployments that are in progress.

Action: The committee made a motion to approve the State-level Data Exchanges and Justice Partner Interfaces Workstream and add this item to CTAC's annual agenda; this item passed unanimously.

Item 3

Update on Comparison of Hosting Cost Models

Update: Mr. David Koon, Supervising Analyst, Information Technology provided an update on proposals for different hosting models for the Sustain courts, which are working to identify a path forward for their next generation case management systems. The hosting models that were discussed included Tyler's Software as a Service (SaaS), California Court Technology Center (CCTC) Virtualized Servers, Amazon Web Services, and local court hosting. The committee also discussed the benefit of having the Sustain courts meet and discuss other options, as well as the opportunity for the Department of Finance (DOF) to attend these meetings and hear the discussion and challenges the courts are facing.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Judicial Council Technology Committee Meeting

January 16, 2015

Call to Order and Roll Call

- Welcome
- Open Meeting Script
- Approve minutes of previous meeting

*Hon. James E. Herman, Chair, Judicial Council Technology
Committee*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Chair Report

Hon. James E. Herman



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: Update on the Improvement and Modernization Fund

- Refer to Supplemental Deck

Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Co-Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer, County of Santa Clara



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

*Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager, Information
Technology*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Action: California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

- **Background**

- Approximately \$346,000 in grant funding was received from the California Department of Justice (DOJ) for CCPOR deployment Phase III.
- Eight courts have been deployed under Phase III.
- A grant extension to June 30, 2015 has been approved and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) modifications have been made to enable use of remaining grant funds for deployment of CCPOR to three additional courts.
- Potential courts must meet grant guidelines.
- Recommended courts were selected from CCPOR interest survey and still wish to participate.

Action: California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

- Summary of Work

County	Wave	Status
Madera	1	Live
Napa	1	Live - January 2015
Nevada	1	Live
San Francisco	1	Live
Sierra	1	Live
Trinity	1	Live
Modoc	2	Live
Shasta	2	Live
Sonoma	3	Pending JCTC Approval
Monterey	3	Pending JCTC Approval
Mariposa	3	Pending JCTC Approval

Action: California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

- **Grant Guidelines**

- No existing system in place
- No data integration
- No data conversion
- Justice Partner participation
- Can participate in this fiscal year
- Grant funded Scanners and software will be provided to the courts

- **Recommendation**

- JCTC approve to proceed with three additional courts - Sonoma, Monterey, and Mariposa.

Adjourn

All



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

IMF IT Work Group

January 2015

IMF Fund Condition Statement Summary

(Excerpt)

Line No.		Estimate as of 10/9/2014			
		FY 2013-14 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2014-15	2015-16	Difference (Column D-C)
		B	C	D	
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	49,237,913	29,333,045	3,631,046	(25,701,999)
15	Net Revenue/Transfers	47,428,770	43,150,350	62,106,425	18,956,075
16	Total Resources	96,666,683	72,483,395	65,737,471	(6,745,924)
18	Program and Project Allocations	69,878,695	71,466,600	71,732,095	265,495

IMF IT Allocation Summary

		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Project and Program		Approved Allocation	Approved Allocation	Estimated Allocation
		A	B	C
1	Telecommunications Support	15,608,480	11,705,000	10,649,166
2	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	9,465,100	10,487,200	10,583,037
3	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	5,122,800	5,268,500	5,220,302
4	Data Integration	3,906,900	3,903,600	3,850,213
5	Interim Case Management Systems	1,650,600	1,246,800	1,996,034
6	CCPOR (ROM)	675,800	585,600	1,047,954
7	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	582,500	624,300	619,699
8	Jury Management System	600,000	-	600,000
9	CLETS Services/Integration	515,200	433,400	513,620
10	Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services	572,000	200,700	442,957
11	Uniform Civil Fees	385,000	343,000	366,544
12	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	129,800	133,700	141,000
Total, Information Technology		39,214,180	34,931,800	36,030,526



Items reviewed September 19



Items reviewed October 15



Items reviewed December 3

Objectives

- Reduce IT costs which are funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF).
- The goal is to identify the needs and priorities of the trial courts and determine whether and how costs for existing programs/services could be reduced.
- Open for discussion is:
 - whether a program should be modified or eliminated (and how that would occur),
 - whether the trial courts could provide any of the programs/services to all 58 counties themselves
 - whether there are any costs that could (or should) be absorbed by the trial courts rather than paid from the IMF.

Proposed Actions

Program	Short Description	Proposed Action
Telecommunications Support	LAN/WAN network refresh	Fund program as proposed.
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	SAIC Data Center Hosting	Initiate Next Generation Hosting Tactical Plan workstream to identify cost reduction opportunities.
Enterprise Policy/Planning	Oracle Enterprise License	Determine need for re-negotiation.
Data Integration	Tibco Integration Services Backbone, hosted CLETS access	Initiate Next Generation Hosting Tactical Plan workstream to identify cost reduction opportunities.
Interim Case Management Systems	V2, V3, Sustain Justice Edition Case Management Systems	Postpone non-critical Sustain projects. Sunset CMS per JCTC.
CCPOR	California Courts Protective Order Registry	Continue deployment if grant funds are available. Do not fund deployment from IMF.
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	Testing tools for V3	Sunset per Judicial Council Technology Committee strategy.
Jury Management System	Jury Improvement Grant	Postpone spending funds.

Action Roadmap

Program	Impact	Cost Savings
Short-Term Actions (within 12 months)		
Interim Case Management Systems	Delays non-critical Sustain projects.	\$100K
CCPOR	Delay deployment to 4-6 courts if grant funds not available.	\$332K
Jury Management System	Delay non-critical jury improvements.	\$600K
Medium-Term Actions (12-24 months)		
Enterprise Policy/Planning	None in short term. Potential savings in future.	To be identified.
Long-Term Actions (24-36 months)		
California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	Complex analysis and transition requires work to start as soon as possible.	To be identified.
Data Integration	Complex analysis and transition requires work to start as soon as possible.	To be identified.
Interim Case Management Systems	To be identified.	To be identified.
Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	None.	To be identified.

Recommendations

1. Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council Technology Committee oversee the implementation of the proposed actions.
2. Judicial Council IT should consider reducing as many external contractors as possible.
3. Judicial Council consider creating a working group or designating an existing advisory committee to focus on IT efficiencies and cost saving measures for smaller courts.

Item 3
Options for Reducing IT Expenditures from the IMF for 2015-2016
(Action Item)

Issue

Determine options for reducing information technology expenditures from the Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund for FY 2015–2016 to address an anticipated reduction in available funds.

Background

A September 2014 review of the fund condition for the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) indicated a projected deficit of approximately \$12M. This includes an estimated funding reduction in overall funding of approximately \$6M for 2015-2016 compared to the previous fiscal year. Since information technology (IT) expenditures are a large portion of the IMF, Judge Earl, Chair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) established a working group comprised of trial court Judges, Chief Executive Officers, Chief Information Officers, and members of Judicial Council IT and Finance to identify options for reducing those costs. The members of the working group are: Judge Earl, Judge Jim Herman, Chair-Judicial Council Technology Committee, Judge Marsha Slough, Chair-Trial Court Presiding Judge’s Advisory Committee, Sherri Carter, CEO of the Los Angeles Superior Court, Lee Kirby, CEO of the Sierra Superior Court, Deborah Norrie, CEO of the Plumas Superior Court, Greg Harding, CIO of the Placer Superior Court, Snorri Ogata, CIO of the Los Angeles Superior Court, Rob Oyung, CIO of the Santa Clara Superior Court, Brian Peterson, Chair of the Court Information Technology Managers Forum, Zlatko Theodorovic, JC Finance Director, Mark Dusman, JC IT Director, and Diana Earl, JC IT.

Their goal was to identify the needs and priorities of the trial courts and determine whether and how costs for existing programs/services could be reduced. Open for discussion was whether a program should be modified or eliminated (and how that would occur), whether the trial courts could provide any of the programs/services to all 58 counties themselves, and/or whether there are any costs that could (or should) be absorbed by the trial courts rather than paid from the IMF.

Attachment 2A contains an excerpt from the IMF Fund Condition Statement that was included in the materials for the November 5, 2014 TCBAC meeting. The working group used that data and calculated a funding reduction to the IMF from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 of \$6,745,924. The attachment also illustrates a projected total expenditure of \$71,732,095 for all IMF programs and projects for 2015-2016.

Attachment 2B illustrates the twelve branchwide trial court IT programs that are funded by the IMF and managed by Judicial Council IT. Attachment 2C includes short descriptions for each of

the programs. The projected allocation for IT programs is \$36,030,526 for 2015-2016 which represents approximately 50% of the total IMF expenditures.

Analysis

If IT programs represent 50% of the IMF spend, then one approach to consider would be to allocate 50% of the \$6,745,924 IMF funding reduction to IT. In this scenario, the IT allocation would be reduced by \$3,372,962 for 2015-2016.

The working group focused their analysis on the first eight programs listed in Attachment 2B which represent 96% of the proposed IT expenditures for 2015-2016. They evaluated the following options for each of the programs with the associated considerations:

- **Fund program as proposed** – Do not reduce expenditure. Program is a high priority to the courts. 1 of 8 programs was identified in this category.
- **Postpone expenditure** – Expenditure can be postponed to the future. 3 of 8 programs were identified in this category.
- **Launch technology workstream to investigate new solutions** – The Judicial Branch Tactical Plan for Technology (2014-2016), approved by the Judicial Council at its public meeting on August 21-22, 2014 includes recommendations to launch projects (workstreams) to identify new efficient cost-effective technology solutions. 2 of 8 programs were identified in this category.
- **Trial courts provide service to other courts** – Identify one or more trial courts to provide a branchwide IT program/service to the other courts. 0 of 8 programs were identified in this category due to high cost and effort.
- **Trial courts absorb costs for programs** – Transfer cost of program to individual courts and have them absorb the cost in their existing budget. 0 of 8 programs were identified in this category due to constraints on existing trial court budgets.
- **Cancel/sunset program** – Eliminate or sunset program based upon Judicial Council Technology Committee recommendations. 2 of 8 programs were identified in this category.
- **Re-negotiate contract agreement with vendor** – Evaluate current business requirements against existing contracted services to determine if contract can be re-negotiated to reduce costs. 1 of 8 programs was identified in this category.

The working group identified short-term, medium-term and long-term actions designed to reduce program expenditures. These proposed actions are as follows:

Short-Term Actions (within 12 months)

1. Interim Case Management Systems – Postpone non-critical Sustain projects with no major impact on courts resulting in a \$100K savings.
2. California Courts Protective Order Registry – Continue deployment if grant funds are available. Do not fund deployment from IMF resulting in a \$332K savings. If grant funding is not available, CCPOR deployment would be delayed at 4-6 courts.
3. Jury Management System – Postpone spending funds which would delay non-critical upgrades to local jury management systems resulting in a \$600K savings.

Medium-Term Actions (12-24 months)

1. Enterprise Policy/Planning – Determine if the Oracle branchwide license agreement is aligned with current business needs or requires re-negotiation. No impact to courts in the short term but potential savings in the future.

Long-Term Actions (24-36 months)

1. California Courts Technology Center – Initiate Next Generation Hosting workstream (project) as outlined in the Judicial Branch Tactical Plan for Technology (2014-2016) to identify cost reduction and service improvement opportunities. No impact to courts in the short term but potential savings and effort required to implement and migrate to new solutions in the future.
2. Data Integration – Include data integration services as a component of the Next Generation Hosting workstream described above. No impact to courts in the short term but potential savings and effort required to implement and migrate to new solutions in the future.
3. Interim Case Management Systems – Sunset V2, V3, and Sustain Justice Edition case management systems based on Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) strategy. Impact and benefits to the courts to be identified by the JCTC.
4. Testing Tools – Enterprise Test Management Suite – Sunset testing tools for CCPOR, V2, and V3 case management systems in alignment with the plan for Interim Case Management Systems. No impact to the courts in the short term but new testing tools for CCPOR would need to be identified.

A summary of the analysis is included in Attachment 2D. This analysis was reviewed and positive input provided by trial court IT managers who attended the Court Information Technology Management Forum meeting on October 17, 2014.

In the course of the working group's analysis it was determined that there may be opportunities for smaller courts to increase efficiencies and reduce some of their IT costs. While such action would not result in reduction of the IMF costs, it would benefit the smaller courts to explore these opportunities especially at a time when funding for IT programs will be reduced. Therefore the TCBAC recommends the creation of a working group for such purpose.

Recommendation

1. The Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council Technology Committee oversee the implementation of the proposed actions outlined in Attachment 2D. Short-term actions (within 12 months) will result in a savings of approximately \$1.0M which is short of the estimated \$3.4M reduction needed. However, medium-term (12-24 months) to long-term (24-36 months) actions are anticipated to result in additional savings. Long-term actions should be initiated now due to the length of time required for analysis, implementation, and transition from existing to new solutions.
2. The Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council IT Office consider reducing as many external contractors as possible. External contractors have specific domain knowledge but are typically more costly than permanent employees.
3. The Judicial Council consider creating a working group, or designating an existing advisory committee to focus on IT efficiencies and cost saving measures for smaller courts.

Attachment 2A

**IMF -- Fund Condition Statement
(excerpt)**

			Estimate as of 10/9/2014		
Line No.		FY 2013-14 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2014-15	2015-16	Difference (Column D-C)
		B	C	D	
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	49,237,913	29,333,045	3,631,046	(25,701,999)
15	Net Revenue/Transfers	47,428,770	43,150,350	62,106,425	18,956,075
16	Total Resources	96,666,683	72,483,395	65,737,471	(6,745,924)
18	Program and Project Allocations	69,878,695	71,466,600	71,732,095	265,495

**IMF – IT Program Allocation
(as of September 2014)**

		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
	Project and Program	Approved Allocation	Approved Allocation	Estimated Allocation
		A	B	C
1	Telecommunications Support	15,608,480	11,705,000	10,649,166
2	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	9,465,100	10,487,200	10,583,037
3	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	5,122,800	5,268,500	5,220,302
4	Data Integration	3,906,900	3,903,600	3,850,213
5	Interim Case Management Systems	1,650,600	1,246,800	1,996,034
6	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	675,800	585,600	1,047,954
7	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	582,500	624,300	619,699
8	Jury Management System	600,000	-	600,000
9	CLETS Services/Integration	515,200	433,400	513,620
10	Justice Partner Outreach / e-Services	572,000	200,700	442,957
11	Uniform Civil Fees	385,000	343,000	366,544
12	Adobe LiveCycle Reader Service Extension	129,800	133,700	141,000
	Total, Information Technology	<i>39,214,180</i>	<i>34,931,800</i>	<i>36,030,526</i>

IMF – IT Program Descriptions

1. **Telecommunications Support** - This program develops and supports a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. The core objective of the program is to maintain the investment made in the original telecommunications project by updating local network equipment that is no longer supported due to aging technology.
2. **California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)** - The CCTC program provides a Judicial Branch Technology Center (data center) for use by all courts and a comprehensive disaster recovery program for court management systems, including Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Systems (SAP), California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR), and Interim Case Management Systems, (CMS V2, CMS V3, and Sustain Justice Edition). The CCTC also provides a complete suite of IT services to five hosted Superior Courts (Madera, Modoc, San Benito, Lake, and Plumas). The hosted courts are charged annually for their services via the Schedule C process.
3. **Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)** - This budget primarily funds the Oracle Branchwide License Agreement (BWL), which includes four components: Enterprise Database, Advanced Security, BEA WebLogic Suite, and Identity Manager with additional options. In addition, this budget funds one enterprise architect for the Enterprise Architecture (EA) program, and funds the Innotas project portfolio management tool.
4. **Data Integration** - The Data Integration (DI) program currently provides services that enable the secure and efficient exchange of information between the courts and their justice and integration partners.
5. **Interim Case Management Systems** – This program provides support for the Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2), the Civil, Probate and Mental Health Case Management System (V3), and Sustain Justice Edition.
6. **California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)** - CCPOR creates a statewide repository for restraining and protective orders that contains both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers. While usually funded by a grant, those funds may not be available for 2015-2016.
7. **Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite** - The Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS) is a program that provides a suite of software quality assurance tools, staff and testing expertise for CCPOR, the Criminal and Traffic Case Management System (V2) and the Civil, Probate and Mental Health Case Management System (V3).
8. **Jury Management System** - Jury grant program for trial courts to improve their jury management systems. Per Government Code section 77029(h), these funds can only be used for jury improvement.

Attachment 2D

IMF – IT Proposed Actions

	Project and Program	Short Description	Proposed Action	Time frame*	Impact	Cost Savings
1	Telecommunications Support	LAN/WAN Network Refresh	Fund as proposed.		None.	None
2	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	Judicial Branch Data Center hosted by SAIC	Initiate Next Generation Hosting Tactical Plan workstream to identify cost reduction opportunities.	Long term	Complex analysis and transition requires work to start as soon as possible.	To be identified
3	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	Oracle Branchwide License Agreement	Determine if agreement is aligned with current business needs or requires re-negotiation.	Medium term	None in short term. Potential savings in future.	To be identified
4	Data Integration	Tibco Integration Services Backbone (ISB)	Initiate Next Generation Hosting Tactical Plan workstream to identify cost reduction opportunities.	Long term	Complex analysis and transition requires work to start as soon as possible.	To be identified
5	Interim Case Management Systems	V2, V3, Sustain Justice Edition Case Management Systems	Postpone non-critical Sustain projects.	Short term	Delays non-critical projects.	\$100K
			Sunset based on Judicial Council Technology Committee strategy.	Long term	To be identified.	To be identified
6	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	Judicial Branch Protective Order Registry	Continue deployment if grant funds are available. Do not fund deployment from IMF.	Short term	Delay deployment to 4-6 courts if grant funds not available.	\$332K
7	Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	Testing tools for CCPOR, V2,V3 Case Management Systems	Sunset based on Judicial Council Technology Committee strategy.	Long term	None.	To be identified
8	Jury Management System	Jury Improvement Grant	Postpone spending funds.	Short term	Delay non-critical jury improvements.	\$600K
Total Short-term Savings						\$1.0M

*Short term = within 12 months; Medium term = 12-24 months; Long term = 24-36 months.