



JUDICIAL COUNCIL of CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

MS. SHELLEY CURRAN
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

HON. SHEILA F. HANSON
Chair

HON. SAMANTHA P. JESSNER
Vice-chair

*Mr. Mike Balie
Hon. Benjamin J. Cassidy
Hon. Kathy Ciuffini
Hon. Damon Connolly
Mr. Brian Cotta
Mr. Adam Creiglow
Hon. Julie R. Culver
Hon. Tara M. Desautels
Ms. Rebecca Fleming
Mr. Jason Galkin
Hon. Michael S. Groch
Hon. Amy K. Guerra
Mr. AJ Guzman
Ms. Carrie Holmes
Mr. Brett Howard
Hon. Kimberly Menninger
Hon. Ioana Petrou
Mr. Jake Pison*

COMMITTEE STAFF
*Ms. Jamel Jones
Tel. 415-865-4629*

May 12, 2025

Hon. Kyle S. Brodie, Chair
Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Vice-Chair
Technology Committee

Dear Judge Brodie and Judge Hernandez,

The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on the work of the Information Technology Advisory Committee's (ITAC) Information Technology (IT) Modernization workstream; and submit to the Technology Committee for consideration, the advisory body's recommended list of court project proposals for approval within the program.

Beginning with the fiscal year (FY) 2023–24 program cycle, the Technology Committee directed ITAC to oversee this workstream activity on an ongoing basis. For the FY 2025–26 cycle, our workstream was formed and held its kickoff in March and completed all project evaluations in April.

Program Requirements and Evaluation

The attached recommendations reflect the list of projects ITAC believes have met the project requirements for the program, including that each project must:

- Benefit the public;
- Comply with branchwide policies and standards;
- Be vetted and approved by the Technology Committee;
- Fall within at least one of the approved program categories;
- Be able to initiate project activities immediately after approval (July 2025);
- Show demonstrable progress by the end of the year (December 2025);
- Expend or encumber funds by end of the fiscal year (June 30, 2026);
- Be completed by the end of the third fiscal year (June 30, 2028); and
- Report bi-annually on measurable, successful outcomes.

Additionally, as in years past, the workstream checked for alignment with the principles of the program, including that projects should involve modernization or innovation, and assume one-time (and not ongoing) funding. As a result, the workstream did not recommend projects that were primarily part of regular maintenance or did not align with program scope/requirements. The workstream recognized that court IT budgets and the additional Technology Resource Planning “Cluster” allocation that the trial courts receive separately is more intended for those purposes.

Review Process

To arrive at our decisions, the workstream took the following steps:

- Reviewed all proposals without any budget information (as financials are intentionally not a consideration in this part of the process);
- Sought more information from courts when reviewers needed clarification;
- Flagged projects that did not meet the program and project requirements (previously cited), including any conflicts with branch standards or initiatives;
- Identified any projects that did not align with the program categories;
- Identified projects that could potentially be funded through alternate Judicial Council grant programs. (Staff then shared these referrals with the partner programs to maximize the court’s ability to receive funding from one or more sources);
- Reviewed final recommendations for consistency across decisions; and
- Finalized and received approval from ITAC on the list of proposed project recommendations (Attachment A) for consideration by the Technology Committee.

This year, we also reviewed project proposals for alignment with the judicial branch’s forthcoming generative artificial intelligence (AI) rule and standard, as outlined in the Chief Justice’s Artificial Intelligence Task Force’s [Invitation to Comment](#). Although these standards took specific focus in this cycle, courts are expected to comply with *all* applicable branch standards as part of the program requirements. To support the review, we contacted courts with project proposals that referenced the use of AI in at least one proposal to confirm whether their proposals include the use of generative AI and, if so, whether they have or plan to develop a policy consistent with the branch’s forthcoming guidance. All relevant courts confirmed they either have or will implement such policies, meeting the current review criteria.

Membership

The workstream consisted of 17 members including judicial officers, court executives, technology leaders, and operations experts across the appellate and trial courts; and representing a mix of small, medium, and large courts.

FY 2025-26 IT Modernization Grant Funding Project Recommendations

Attached, please find the list of IT Modernization projects recommended by ITAC for approval.

Thank you, again, for designating ITAC to complete this evaluation process. We understand and appreciate the importance of this assignment, its impact on the courts and to increasing access to justice through technology. Please let me know if I may provide any additional information.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Sheila F. Hanson".

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson

Chair, Information Technology Advisory Committee

Attachment

cc: Mr. John Yee, Director/Chief Information Officer, Judicial Council
Mr. Andraé Randolph, Principal Manager, Judicial Council
Ms. Jamel Jones, IT Manager, Judicial Council
Ms. Lisa Chavez, IT Supervisor, Judicial Council

FY2025-26 IT Modernization Grant Funding Project Recommendations

Court	Priority Letter	Project Title	Project Category	Workstream Recommendation	Notes
Supreme Court	A	Courtroom AV Facility Modifications and Infrastructure Upgrades	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Court of Appeal First Appellate	C	Digitization of Appellate Court Records	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Court of Appeal Third Appellate	B	Robotic Processing Automation (RPA)	Collaboration and Office Tools	Yes	
Alameda	B	Digitizing Records	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Alameda	C	Network Management and Administration Tools	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Amador	A	Remote Proceedings and AV Enhancements	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Amador	B	Modernization of Communication Platforms	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Amador	C	HR Solutions Optimization	Human Resources (HR) Systems and Solutions	Yes	
Butte	A	Digitization of Paper Files	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Butte	B	Enhancement of Training Room	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Calaveras	A	Digitization of Hard File Cases	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Contra Costa	A	Fully Redundant Modern Disaster Recovery Environment	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Contra Costa	B	Electronic Records Management	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Contra Costa	C	AI Cyber Security Agent	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Contra Costa	D	AI Self-Help Customer Service Chatbot	Customer Service	Yes	
Contra Costa	E	AI Server	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Contra Costa	F	Fiber Optic Network Modernization	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Contra Costa	G	AI LEA e-Citation Assistant	Electronic Filings	Yes	
El Dorado	A	Case File Digitization	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
El Dorado	B	AI real-time speech to text language services	Remote Proceedings	No	Inconsistent with branchwide framework/standards.
Fresno	A	SISK JAR sound upgrade	Courtroom Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Fresno	B	Implement backup solution	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Fresno	C	Courtroom TV for jury instructions, Zoom and evidence	Courtroom Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Fresno	D	Digital docket and way finding signs	Customer Service	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Fresno	E	wireless mics for courtrooms	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Glenn	A	Glenn/Willows Courthouse Jury Management Software & Hardware Upgrade	Jury Management System (JMS)	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Imperial	A	Remote Services – Winterhaven Court	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Imperial	B	Login with Access Card	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Kern	A	Kern - Project A - Remote Proceedings	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Kern	B	Kern - Project B - Infrastructure	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Kern	C	Kern - Project C - Courthouse Technology	Courthouse Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Kern	D	Kern - Project D - Courthouse Technology	Courtroom Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Kern	E	Kern - Project E - Information Security	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Kings	A	Hybrid Courtroom	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Kings	B	Family Court Services Conference Room	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Los Angeles	A	Cyber Security Modernization	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Los Angeles	B	Intelligent Process Modernization (IPM)	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Los Angeles	C	CourtSummary	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	No	Concerns in absence of branchwide standards.
Los Angeles	D	CourtHelp: Transforming Access to Justice Through Automated Assistance	Customer Service	Yes	
Los Angeles	E	Data and Analytics Platform (DAP)	Data	Yes	
Los Angeles	F	IT Operations Modernization	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Los Angeles	G	Electronic Recording Hardware – Endpoint Modernization	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Los Angeles	H	Modern Infrastructure Automation	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Los Angeles	I	Wireless Infrastructure Modernization	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Los Angeles	J	Sheriff Warrant Integration Modernization	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Los Angeles	K	LACC 3.0 Remote Hearing Platform Improvements	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Los Angeles	L	Remote Appearance Hardware - Encoder	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Madera	E	Courtroom AV System Upgrades	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Madera	F	AI Agent for Chat Bots	Customer Service	Yes	
Marin	A	Comprehensive Digital Courtroom and Remote Appearances Upgrade	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Marin	B	Accelerating Justice through Automated Case Processing	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	

Court	Priority Letter	Project Title	Project Category	Workstream Recommendation	Notes
Marin	C	User-Friendly Online Public Access to Court Records	Case Records	Yes	
Marin	D	Disaster Recovery Strategies for Sustaining Court Operations	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Marin	E	Enhancing Juror Services through Express Check-In Kiosks	Courthouse Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Marin	F	Cybersecurity Enhancements for a Secure Digital Environment	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Merced	A	Document Digitization Project	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Monterey	A	Case File Digitization Phase VI	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Monterey	B	Biometric Authentication	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Monterey	C	Data Protection Against Cybersecurity Threats	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Monterey	E	Disaster Recovery Storage Expansion	Cyber/Information Security	No	Maintenance, not modernization.
Napa	A	Incident Response Team	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Napa	B	Azure AD Migration	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Orange	A	Modernize Criminal & Traffic CMS	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	No	Inconsistent with branchwide framework/standards.
Orange	B	Criminal E-filing Application	Electronic Filings	Yes	
Orange	C	Enhance email security	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Orange	D	PAM - Identity/Privilege Access Mgmt	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Orange	E	Identity Threat Detection and Response (ITDR)	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Orange	F	ELF Lite Solution	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Orange	G	Collaborative Court CMS	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Orange	H	Magistrate Scheduling Solution	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Orange	I	Enhance Current CMS	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Orange	J	Data GPT	Data	Yes	
Orange	K	IVR Upgrade	Customer Service	Yes	
Orange	L	Search Warrant Imaging Application	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Placer	A	Multi-Factor Authentication Security Tokens	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Placer	B	Data Dashboards	Data	Yes	
Placer	C	Computer Imaging Software	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Placer	D	Public Chatbot	Customer Service	Yes	
Placer	E	Electronic Recording Indication—Clocks	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Riverside	A	Data Warehouse Project	Data	Yes	
Riverside	B	Zero Trust Network	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Riverside	C	Omni-Channel Support System	Customer Service	Yes	
Riverside	D	Legal Navigator Project	Customer Service	Yes	
Riverside	E	Court Pro Coach	Case Records	Yes	
Riverside	F	Assisted Listening Device Project	Courthouse Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Riverside	G	Remote Proceedings Hardware	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Riverside	H	Justice Stream Project	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Riverside	I	Electronic Noticing System	Automated Notifications	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Riverside	J	Probate Scheduler	Automated Notifications	Yes	
Sacramento	A	Windows 11 Upgrade	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Sacramento	B	Equipment to Support eCourt	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Sacramento	C	Audio Video Pilot	Remote Proceedings	Yes	
Sacramento	D	Courtroom Mobile Monitor and Carts for Public View	Courthouse Technology	Yes	
San Benito	A	Criminal and Juvenile eFiling System	Electronic Filings	Yes	
San Benito	B	IVR Jury Phone Line	Jury Management Systems (JMS)	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
San Benito	C	Organization & Caseflow Evaluation Contractor	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
San Benito	D	Searchable Network Access Storage for archived files	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
San Benito	E	Virtual Public County for Self Help Center	Customer Service	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
San Benito	F	Disaster Recovery Laptops	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
San Bernardino	A	Justice Continuity Disaster Recovery (DR)	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
San Bernardino	B	Court Access Portal UI Upgrade	Web Solutions	Yes	
San Bernardino	C	Data Warehouse Enhancements - Case Management Data	Data	Yes	
San Bernardino	D	Mobile or Self Check-In/Kiosk	Courthouse Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
San Diego	A	Odyssey Integrations Project	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
San Diego	B	Internal Cyber Security Penetration Test	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
San Diego	C	AI Solutions – Automating Family Law Judgment Processing	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	

Court	Priority Letter	Project Title	Project Category	Workstream Recommendation	Notes
San Diego	D	Data Analytics Projects	Data	Yes	
San Diego	E	Microfilm Conversion to Digital Records	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
San Diego	F	Digital Calendar Board for Courthouse Lobby	Courthouse Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
San Francisco	A	Document Digitization Project	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
San Francisco	B	Data Fabric Project	Data	Yes	
San Francisco	C	AI Auto review e-filing	Electronic Filings	Yes	
San Francisco	D	Onboarding MS Entra SSO	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
San Francisco	E	VoIP Cloud Migration	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
San Francisco	F	IVR Cloud Migration	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
San Mateo	A	Case Digitization	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Santa Barbara	A	Cyber Security Incident Response Support	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Santa Clara	A	Digitization of Paper Document	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Santa Clara	B	Robotic Process Automation	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Santa Clara	C	Multi-Factor Authentication on-site	Cyber / Information Security	Yes	
Santa Clara	D	SharePoint intranet	Collaboration and Office To	Yes	
Santa Clara	E	Interpreter Equipment	Interpreter Equipme	No	Hardware replacement, not modernization
Santa Cruz	A	Digitization of documents	Electronic Record anagement M)	Yes	
Santa Cruz	B	Inside Wiring Upgrade	Courthouse Tech ogy	Yes	
Santa Cruz	C	Workflow Automation	Collaboration and ce T s	Yes	
Santa Cruz	D	SIP Migration	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Shasta	A	Enhanced Network and Server Monitoring for Cybersecurity Visibility and Threat Response	Cyber/Information S u	Yes	
Shasta	B	Office 365 Data Protection Initiative	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Shasta	C	Shasta DR Build	IT Infrast	Yes	
Shasta	D	Tyler Odyssey Infrastructure Modernization Initiative	Case M agement ms (CMS) an hancements	Yes	
Shasta	E	Courthouse Secure Access Initiative	Cyb nformation	Yes	
Shasta	F	Laptop and Digital Communication Enhancement Initiative	IT I structure	No	Maintenance, not modernization.
Solano	A	Multifactor Authentication for Desktops and Laptops	Cyb nform n Securit	Yes	
Solano	B	Password Vault	Cyber/Infor ion Securit	Yes	
Solano	C	CMS Interfaces & Upgrades	Case Mana ent Syste s (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Solano	D	Digital Evidence Solution	Remote Pro	Yes	
Solano	E	Modernization of Data Protection Appliance & Service	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Solano	F	Courtroom A/V Upgrades	emote Proceedings	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Solano	G	Digitization of Case Files	tronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Stanislaus	A	Courthouse Infrastructure modernization	IT structure	No	Does not meet program scope/requirements.
Stanislaus	B	cyber security assessment report findi mitigation	Cyber nformation Security	Yes	
Stanislaus	C	Court AI expansion phase 1	Collaboration and Office Tools	Yes	
Stanislaus	D	E-warrant application modernization	Collaboration and Office Tools	Yes	
Stanislaus	E	Electronic Court Forms Phase 3	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Sutter	A	Court MFA and Badging for Login	Cyber/Information Security	Yes	
Sutter	B	Case Management System enhancements - 1010.6 pliance, e-cit ns, messaging, and public portal	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	
Tehama	A	Jury Modernization Project	Jury Management Systems (JMS)	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Ventura	A	Digital Signage Installation	Courthouse Technology	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Ventura	B	Courtroom AV/Display Input Equipment Upgrade	Courthouse Technology	Yes	
Yolo	A	JMS Upgrade	Jury Management Systems (JMS)	Yes	Project is also being considered for alternate funding
Yuba	A	Document Imaging	Electronic Records Management (ERM)	Yes	
Yuba	B	Implement Centralized Virtual Server Management System	IT Infrastructure	Yes	
Yuba	C	SMS Reminders for Hearings	Automated Notifications	Yes	
CATUG	A	Enterprise Justice Development/Enhancements - Phase 4	Case Management Systems (CMS) and Enhancements	Yes	Refer to IT Modernization Branchwide Funding Program.

FOR DELIBERATIVE PURPOSES ONLY
 THESE ARE **NOT** FINAL NUMBERS OR SCENARIOS.

Scenario 1R: Fully Fund Cyber/Info Sec projects, Small Courts highest priority, remaining pro rata				
Court	Cyber/Info Sec "Off the Top"	Small court	Pro Rata Amount	Allocation
Appellate Courts			\$ 498,205	\$ 498,205
Alameda			\$ 399,282	\$ 399,282
Alpine				
Amador		\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000
Butte			\$ 61,879	\$ 61,879
Calaveras		\$ 124,373		\$ 124,373
Colusa				
Contra Costa	\$ 31,400		\$ 228,997	\$ 260,397
Del Norte				
El Dorado			\$ 42,977	\$ 42,977
Fresno	\$ 542,590			\$ 542,590
Glenn				N/A*
Humboldt				
Imperial	\$ 106,194			\$ 106,194
Inyo				
Kern	\$ 288,310		\$ 46,146	\$ 334,456
Kings			\$ 48,641	\$ 48,641
Lake				
Lassen				
Los Angeles	\$ 2,350,000		\$ 1,249,696	\$ 3,599,696
Madera			\$ 57,151	\$ 57,151
Marin	\$ 18,105		\$ 52,948	\$ 71,053
Mariposa				
Mendocino				REFERRED TO BRANCH FUNDING
Merced			\$ 74,488	\$ 74,488
Modoc				
Mono				
Monterey	\$ 226,108			\$ 226,108
Napa	\$ 30,000		\$ 17,882	\$ 47,882
Nevada				
Orange	\$ 245,000		\$ 694,850	\$ 939,850
Placer	\$ 54,100		\$ 71,374	\$ 125,474
Plumas				
Riverside	\$ 900,000			\$ 900,000
Sacramento			\$ 495,871	\$ 495,871
San Benito		\$ 2,000	\$ 21,575	\$ 23,575
San Bernardino			\$ 613,513	\$ 613,513
San Diego	\$ 130,000		\$ 761,758	\$ 891,758
San Francisco	\$ 272,000		\$ 53,300	\$ 325,300
San Joaquin				
San Luis Obispo				
San Mateo			\$ 194,069	\$ 194,069
Santa Barbara	\$ 29,040			\$ 29,040
Santa Clara	\$ 224,800		\$ 246,473	\$ 471,273
Santa Cruz			\$ 73,871	\$ 73,871
Shasta	\$ 126,050			\$ 126,050
Sierra				
Siskiyou				
Solano	\$ 97,620		\$ 47,064	\$ 144,684
Sonoma				
Stanislaus	\$ 200,000			\$ 200,000
Sutter	\$ 86,436			\$ 86,436
Tehama				N/A*
Trinity				
Tulare				
Tuolumne				
Ventura			\$ 162,095	\$ 162,095
Yolo			\$ 69,256	\$ 69,256
Yuba		\$ 72,513		\$ 72,513
	\$ 5,957,753	\$ 258,886	\$ 6,283,361	\$ 12,500,000

Gray= Did not apply
 Orange = Small Court

*Removed from consideration as Jury Management Grant funded the court's sole project request.

Funding model includes individual court reductions as a result of removing projects not recommended for approval, ensuring no duplication of funding with other grants, not exceeding the court's requested amount, and not exceeding the straight pro rata cap.

FOR DELIBERATIVE PURPOSES ONLY

Following its May 12 meeting, the Technology Committee will submit the final proposal for recommendation to the Judicial Council.

FOR DELIBERATIVE PURPOSES ONLY
 THESE ARE **NOT** FINAL NUMBERS OR SCENARIOS.

Scenario 3R: Cyber/Info Sec - max \$4.9m, Small Court highest priority, and remaining pro rata				
Court	Cyber/Info Sec "Off the Top" \$4.9 m Max	Small court	Pro Rata Amount	Allocation
Appellate Courts			\$ 653,435	\$ 653,435
Alameda			\$ 430,000	\$ 430,000
Alpine				
Amador		\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000
Butte			\$ 69,090	\$ 69,090
Calaveras		\$ 124,373		\$ 124,373
Colusa				
Contra Costa	\$ 25,825		\$ 234,572	\$ 260,397
Del Norte				
El Dorado			\$ 47,985	\$ 47,985
Fresno	\$ 446,257			\$ 446,257
Glenn				N/A*
Humboldt				
Imperial	\$ 87,340			\$ 87,340
Inyo				
Kern	\$ 237,123		\$ 97,334	\$ 334,456
Kings			\$ 54,376	\$ 54,376
Lake				
Lassen				
Los Angeles	\$ 1,932,776		\$ 1,666,921	\$ 3,599,696
Madera			\$ 63,810	\$ 63,810
Marin	\$ 14,890		\$ 56,163	\$ 71,053
Mariposa				
Mendocino				REFERRED TO BRANCH FUNDING
Merced			\$ 83,168	\$ 83,168
Modoc				
Mono				
Monterey	\$ 185,964			\$ 185,964
Napa	\$ 24,674		\$ 23,208	\$ 47,882
Nevada				
Orange	\$ 201,502		\$ 738,348	\$ 939,850
Placer	\$ 44,495		\$ 80,979	\$ 125,474
Plumas				
Riverside	\$ 740,212			\$ 740,212
Sacramento			\$ 553,654	\$ 553,655
San Benito		\$ 2,000	\$ 22,119	\$ 24,119
San Bernardino			\$ 685,005	\$ 685,005
San Diego	\$ 106,920		\$ 784,838	\$ 891,758
San Francisco	\$ 223,709		\$ 101,591	\$ 325,300
San Joaquin				
San Luis Obispo				
San Mateo			\$ 216,683	\$ 216,683
Santa Barbara	\$ 23,884		\$ 5,156	\$ 29,040
Santa Clara	\$ 184,889		\$ 286,384	\$ 471,273
Santa Cruz			\$ 82,479	\$ 82,479
Shasta	\$ 103,670			\$ 103,670
Sierra				
Siskiyou				
Solano	\$ 80,288		\$ 64,395	\$ 144,684
Sonoma				
Stanislaus	\$ 164,492			\$ 164,492
Sutter	\$ 71,090			\$ 71,090
Tehama				N/A*
Trinity				
Tulare				
Tuolumne				
Ventura			\$ 162,095	\$ 162,095
Yolo			\$ 77,326	\$ 77,326
Yuba		\$ 72,513		\$ 72,513
	\$ 4,900,000	\$ 258,886	\$ 7,341,114	\$ 12,500,000

Gray= Did not apply
 Orange = Small Court

*Removed from consideration as Jury Management Grant funded the court's sole project request.

Funding model includes individual court reductions as a result of removing projects not recommended for approval, ensuring no duplication of funding with other grants, not exceeding the court's requested amount, and not exceeding the straight pro rata cap.

FOR DELIBERATIVE PURPOSES ONLY

Following its May 12 meeting, the Technology Committee will submit the final proposal for recommendation to the Judicial Council.