



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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:** March 26, 2015  
**Time:** 4:00 p.m. - 5:00 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 March 25, 2015, 12:00 p.m. Written comments should be e-mailed to [jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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 March 25, 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 from previous Judicial Council Technology Committee meetings.

---

**I. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)**

---

**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**

**Discussion regarding Funding for V3 Case Management System (Action Required)**

There will be a facilitated discussion regarding the funding for the V3 Case Management System. The JCTC will be asked to vote on a recommendation.

Facilitator: Hon. James E. Herman

---

**II. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**Adjourn**



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

January 16, 2015  
12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.  
Teleconference

**Advisory Body  
Members Present:**

Hon. James E. Herman, Chair; Hon. David De Alba, Vice-Chair; Hon. Daniel J. Buckley; Hon. Gary Nadler; and Mr. Richard D. Feldstein

**Advisory Body  
Members Absent:**

Hon. Emilie H. Elias; Mr. Mark G. Bonino

**Liaison Members  
Present:**

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

**Others Present:**

Hon. Laurie M. Earl; Mr. Robert Oyung; Mr. Mark Dusman; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Renea Stewart; Ms. Jessica Craven; Mr. David Koon; Mr. Cory Jasperson; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; 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 approved the minutes of the December 11, 2014 Judicial Council Technology Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

**Item 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.

**Item 2**

**Update on the Improvement and Modernization Fund (Action Required)**

**Update:** Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Co-Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Mr. Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer, County of Santa Clara provided an update on the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's working groups recommendations related to the improvement and modernization Fund (IMF). The objective is to reduce Information

Technology (IT) costs funded from the State Trial Court IMF and to identify the needs and priorities of the trial courts and determine whether and how costs for existing programs/services could be reduced. The three recommendations include 1) the Judicial Council recommend that the JCTC oversee the implementation of proposed actions which include Telecommunications Support, California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), Enterprise Policy/Planning, Data Integration, Interim Case Management Systems, CCPOR, Testing Tools – Enterprise Test Management Suite, and Jury Management System; 2) IT should consider reducing as many external contractors as possible; and 3) consider creating a working group, or designating an existing advisory committee to focus on IT efficiencies and cost saving measures for smaller courts.

**Action:** The committee approved the recommendations and to co-present them at the next Judicial Council meeting.

### Item 3

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

**Discussion:** Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager of JCC Information Technology provided a presentation on CCPOR and the opportunity to deploy three additional courts with the remaining phase III grant funds from the California Department of Justice. The three courts include Sonoma, Monterey, and Mariposa and were identified from a previous survey and readiness assessment.

**Action:** The committee approved the deployment of CCPOR to Sonoma, Monterey, and Mariposa courts.

---

#### **A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS  
FEBRUARY 6, 2015

**Email Proposal**

The Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) was asked to approve a request from the Superior Court of Modoc County to update their Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) Accounting Configuration. Without this assistance, the court would have to manually calculate the base fine amount, which increases the risk of error and inaccurate distributions as well as being less efficient. Because council staff assistance on this request is estimated to exceed 50 hours, JCTC approval of the request is required. Due to the limited availability of JCTC members and the body's other priorities, the JCTC did not have time to consider this request at a meeting in a timely manner. Accordingly, the Chair concluded that prompt action by email was necessary.

**Notice**

On January 27, 2015, a notice was posted advising that the JCTC was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(B).

**Public Comment**

Because the email proposal concerned a subject that otherwise must be discussed in an open meeting, the JCTC invited public comment on the proposal under rule 10.75(o)(2). The public comment period began at 11:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 27, 2015 and ended at 11:00 a.m., Friday, January 30, 2015. No comments were received.

**Action Taken**

After the public comment period ended, JCTC members were asked to submit their votes on the proposal by 12:00 noon on February 3, 2015. All eight members voted to approve. The request from the Superior Court of Modoc County was approved.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/jctc.htm)  
[jctc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:jctc@jud.ca.gov)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 9, 2015

12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Teleconference

**Advisory Body  
Members Present:**

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

**Advisory Body  
Members Absent:**

Hon. Ming W. Chin; and Hon. Gary Nadler

**Liaison Members  
Present:**

Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers

**Others Present:**

Mr. Curt Soderlund; Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds; Ms. Renea Stewart; Ms. Jessica Craven; Ms. Kathy Fink; Ms. Jamel Jones; Mr. Cory Jasperson; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Ms. Lucy Fogarty; and Mr. Courtney Tucker

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.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

**Item 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.

**Item 2**

**Update on the Court Technology Advisory Committee and Review of Annual Agenda (Action Required)**

**Update:** Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Chair, Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC) provided a brief update on CTAC and reviewed the CTAC annual agenda.

**Action:** The committee approved CTAC's annual agenda unanimously.

**Item 3**

**Decommission the Merced Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) environment at the California Court Technology Center (CCTC) (Action Required)**

**Discussion:** Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds, Senior Manager of JCC Information Technology updated the committee on Merced Superior Court. The court has deployed Tyler's Odyssey case management system which is hosted locally at the Merced Court and is no longer using the SJE application hosted at the CCTC. The court is requesting that the Merced SJE environments hosted at the CCTC be decommissioned.

**Action:** The committee approved the requested action.

**Item 4**

**Rules for Electronic Service (Action Required)**

**Discussion:** Ms. Tara Lundstrom, Attorney of JCC Legal Services reviewed CTAC's proposal to amend rules 2.251 and 8.71 to authorize electronic service on trial and appellate courts that consent to such service with the committee.

**Action:** The committee approved the proposal.

**Item 5**

**Rules for Remote Courtroom Video (Action Required)**

**Discussion:** Ms. Tara Lundstrom, Attorney of JCC Legal Services reviewed CTAC's proposal to amend rule 4.220 to allow trial courts to continue conducting remote video proceedings in traffic infraction cases after January 1, 2016, with the committee.

**Action:** The committee approved the proposal.

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

# Judicial Council Technology Committee Open Meeting

The background of the slide features a large, faint, circular seal of the Judicial Council of Pennsylvania. The seal contains a central figure holding a scale and a sword, surrounded by the text "JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF PENNSYLVANIA" and the year "1926".

March 26, 2015

# Call to Order and Roll Call

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

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



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

# Chair Report

*Hon. James E. Herman*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

# Funding for V3 Case Management System (Action Required)

*Facilitated by Hon. James E. Herman*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

# Directive of the Judicial Council

In April 2014, the Judicial Council directed the Judicial Council Technology Committee to evaluate the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's recommendation of having the JCTC develop a plan to eliminate the funding from the Improvement and Modernization (IMF) and the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for V3 CMS and Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) costs, and to make recommendations to the Judicial Council.

In February 2015, the Council adopted the joint recommendation from the JCTC and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) that the JCTC continue to work with the affected courts to align V3 and Sustain Justice Edition case management systems with JCTC strategy.

# Process

- V2 and V3 Workstream – summer 2012 – March 2013.
- JCTC sent initial letter and survey to V3 courts in July 2014.
- Meeting with V3 courts August 2014.
- Discussed costing models for V3 courts at JCTC closed meetings in January 2015.
- V3 Ad Hoc Subgroup formed February 2015.
- V3 Ad Hoc Subgroup meets individually with V3 courts in March 2015 to get their input.
- V3 Courts to provide input to JCTC closed and open meetings in March 2015.
- Goal is to present recommendations to the Judicial Council at the April 16-17, 2015 meeting.

# Funding Strategy Alternatives

Two funding strategy alternatives have been discussed:

1. Sunset of V3 in 4 years
2. Incremental transitioning of costs using a cost sharing formula

Additionally, regardless of the alternative chosen, the V3 courts may seek funding for replacement CMSs. JCC staff will assist if desired by the V3 courts.

# Draft Recommendation from the JCTC Subject to Open Session Discussion and Vote

- After a period of four years starting on July 1, 2015 and ending June 30, 2019 branch funding for the V3 case management system will stop;
- There will be no change to the current source of V3 funding during these four years; funding will continue to come from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) or Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF); and
- At the end of the four year timeframe or earlier, courts will have deployed case management systems to replace V3, transferred operational and technical support for V3 to one or more of the V3 courts, or will have assumed all costs for V3 that previously would have been allocated from the TCTF or IMF.

# Request funds for Replacement Civil CMSs – this option can be used with either alternative

## Description:

- The V3 courts may develop a business case for V3 CMS replacement using the Superior Court of Fresno County's V2 CMS replacement as a model, or another model.
- Request funds from the Judicial Council (Emergency Funds or a loan) or from the State via a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) in implementing replacement civil CMSs.
- When the V3 courts are fully transitioned, in four years or less, funding will no longer be needed from TCTF or IMF.

# Request funds for Replacement Civil CMSs – this option can be used with either alternative (cont)

## Rationale:

- Recognizes the investments the V3 courts made in a statewide CMS, as well as their lack of funds to deploy a new civil CMS.
- Takes into consideration that three of the courts are donor courts under the Workload Allocation Funding Methodology (WAFM).
- Overall, it is counterproductive to expect the courts pick up operational and maintenance costs for V3, at the same time as expending funds to transition to a new CMS.
- Assists the V3 courts in bridging the gap to transition from V3 and the statewide CMS strategy to the new Judicial Branch technology strategy.

## Action Item

- JCTC to vote on recommendation to present to the Judicial Council on the V3 funding strategy.

## Next Steps

- JCTC will be asked to vote on report to Judicial Council.
- Explore with the V3 courts potential sources of funding to deploy replacement CMSs.
- Work with the V3 courts to develop a business case for funding replacement CMSs.

# Adjourn

*All*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

The seal of the Judicial Council of California is faintly visible in the background. It features a central figure, likely Justice, holding a scale and a sword. The seal is circular with the text "JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA" around the perimeter and "EUREKA" at the top. The year "1926" is at the bottom.

# Judicial Council Technology Committee Open Meeting

## Supplemental Materials

March 26, 2015

# V3 Process

- V2 and V3 Workstream – summer 2012 – March 2013.
- JCTC sent initial letter and survey to V3 courts in July 2014.
- Meeting with V3 courts August 2014.
- Discussed costing models for V3 courts at JCTC closed meetings in January 2015.
- V3 Ad Hoc Subgroup formed February 2015.
- V3 Ad Hoc Subgroup met individually with V3 courts in March 2015 to get their input.
- V3 Courts to provide input to JCTC closed and open meetings on March 26 2015.
- Present recommendations to the Judicial Council at the April 16-17, 2015 meeting.



# Alternative 1: Sunset of V3 in 4 years

## Description:

- No change to the current source of V3 funding – funding would continue to come from the TCTF or IMF for a set period, proposed four years.
- At the end of that period, V3 courts will either have deployed a replacement civil CMS, taken on support for V3, or will assume the full costs for V3.
- Rationale: Recognizes that the combination of the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) changes and an immediate start to a glide path will increase the difficulty for the V3 courts to fund a replacement CMS. This gives the V3 courts time to deploy a replacement civil CMS or take on support for V3.



# Alternative 2: Incremental transitioning of costs using a Cost Sharing Formula

## Description:

- The V3 courts will incrementally take on more of the V3 costs, with the funds from IMF or TCTF decreasing as court contributions increase, until 100% of the costs are allocated to the V3 courts.
- The progression, percentages, and length of time, need to be determined. A five year glide path is consistent with the WAFM and with current models for economic planning.

## Rationale:

Spreads out the impact on the V3 courts of absorbing the costs for V3.



# Alternative 2 Question – Cost Sharing Model

- There are four example cost sharing models.
  - Allocation proportional to court budget does not take usage into account, but does take court fiscal realities into account. As the WAFM is implemented, the courts' budgets should become more representative of usage.
  - Allocation by Filings is an accepted cost model for service providers, but costs fall disproportionately on the smaller courts.
  - Allocation by Users is an accepted cost model for software vendors, but less so for service providers, and costs fall disproportionately on the smaller courts.
  - Equal Allocation distributes costs disproportionately to the smaller courts.

## Alternative 2 - Progression

- A recommended progression for incremental transition would need to be determined
  - What is the length of time?
    - A five year glide path is consistent with the WAFM and with current models for economic planning.
  - What are the incremental percentages?
    - The WAFM is in use for transitioning court funding, however, it does not reach 100% transition: 10%, 15%, 30%, 40%, 50%, with a cap at 50%. The sixth year could be a jump to 100%.
    - Other progressions? 20% each year for five years?



# Alternative 2 – Impact as Courts transition at different times

## Issue:

For three V3 courts (The Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, and San Diego Counties), starting a project to deploy a replacement civil CMS will depend on completing projects already underway to replace other failing CMSs. This results in courts transitioning from V3 and no longer participating in cost sharing for V3 at significantly different times.

## Question:

How would we minimize the fiscal impact to the remaining courts as one or more courts convert to another civil CMS? Will the costs be picked up by the IMF or TCTF?



## IMF -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	Estimated 2015-16					
		2012-2013 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2013-2014 (Year-end Financial Statement)	Estimated 2014-15	No Reduction to 14-15 Allocation Level <sup>1</sup>	Subcommittee Recommended Allocations	Estimated 2016-17
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Beginning Balance	48,128,575	44,827,741	26,207,006	4,659,586	4,659,586	1,722,393
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	11,547,967	4,410,172	2,654,362	150,000	150,000	
3	<b>Adjusted Beginning Balance</b>	<b>59,676,542</b>	<b>49,237,913</b>	<b>28,861,368</b>	<b>4,809,586</b>	<b>4,809,586</b>	<b>1,722,393</b>
4	<i>Revenues</i>						
5	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	31,920,133	26,873,351	23,384,535	22,898,778	22,898,778	22,898,778
6	2% Automation Fund Revenue	15,753,200	15,242,700	14,471,411	13,916,340	13,916,340	13,916,340
7	Jury Instructions Royalties	518,617	445,365	484,063	484,063	484,063	484,063
8	Interest from SMIF	201,201	124,878	89,244	89,244	89,244	89,244
9	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	2,875	24,476	3,097	-	-	-
10	<i>Transfers</i>						
11	From State General Fund	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000
12	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	(23,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)
13	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)
14	<b>Net Revenues and Transfers</b>	<b>50,114,026</b>	<b>47,428,770</b>	<b>43,150,350</b>	<b>62,106,425</b>	<b>62,106,425</b>	<b>62,106,425</b>
15	<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>109,790,568</b>	<b>96,666,683</b>	<b>72,011,718</b>	<b>66,916,011</b>	<b>66,916,011</b>	<b>63,828,818</b>
16	<i>Expenditures</i>						
17	Allocation	71,923,000	73,961,680	71,466,600	77,724,737	64,896,037	89,758,132
18	Less: Unused Allocation	(7,123,067)	(4,082,985)	(4,412,049)	-	-	-
19	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	162,894	580,982	297,581	297,581	297,581	297,581
20	<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>64,962,827</b>	<b>70,459,677</b>	<b>67,352,132</b>	<b>78,022,318</b>	<b>65,193,618</b>	<b>90,055,713</b>
21	<b>Fund Balance</b>	<b>44,827,741</b>	<b>26,207,006</b>	<b>4,659,586</b>	<b>(11,106,307)</b>	<b>1,722,393</b>	<b>(26,226,895)</b>
22	Revenue/Transfers Over/(Under) Exp	(14,848,801)	(23,030,907)	(24,201,782)	(15,915,893)	(3,087,193)	(27,949,288)

1. Includes non-reimbursed civil case management system allocation that is being funded out of the TCTF in 2014-15 and the planned allocation for other post-employment benefit costs.