

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Rather than trying to secure additional funds for the County Sheriffs, the branch should be advocating for a reversion of Court Security Realignment partnered with increased flexibility to utilize non-governmental security services.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Benefit Increases
Costs TBD by court survey

Approximate dollar value: \$

2. Technology - Proven technologies to reduce the need for court staff
Costs TBD based on those courts that have successfully implemented technology solutions that have translated to need for less staff.

Approximate dollar value: \$

3. Funding associated with new court facilities.
Costs TBD based on survey of those courts with new facilities.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Butte

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies		X	While the Court is supportive of the Sheriffs Association's pursuit of adequate funding to provide the appropriate level of security services, we disagree with the Court taking a lead role in the funding discussions as this is not the Court's budgetary responsibility.
Security funding at new court facilities		X	While the Court is supportive of the Sheriffs Association's pursuit of adequate funding to provide the appropriate level of security services at new court facilities, we disagree with the Court taking a lead role in the funding discussions as this is not the Court's budgetary responsibility.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	X		The Court is supportive of funding facility operations costs for new courthouses. However, operations costs are not clearly defined and additional explanation is needed.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		The Court is supportive of funding for facility operations costs for transferred facilities. However, the definition of facility operation costs for transferred facilities should be elaborated on.
Trial court technology needs	X		The Court recognizes the need for new technologies and we are highly supportive of funding trial court technology needs.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	X		
3 rd 50 Judgeships	X		
Benefit increases	X		

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Butte

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

- 1. **Technology** - Courts need to have a dedicated funding stream for the replacement of aging and obsolete case management systems and other local technology equipment. Courts' lack of ability to carry any kind of significant reserve from year to year prohibits them from saving monies and managing some of these costs locally. Given the lack of dedicated funding and ability to carry reasonable reserves, Courts are solely dependent on the State to provide these critical technology needs. A case management system is seen as the most important aspect to be addressed with any BCP approved technology funding.

Approximate dollar value: \$ No estimate

- 2. **Benefits** – There is currently no SAL being provided annually and Courts cannot match rising costs.

Approximate dollar value: \$ No estimate

- 3. **2nd 50 of judges** – This funding would alleviate funding in other areas, for example the assigned judges program.

Approximate dollar value: \$ No estimate

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	X		Please reference attached document
Security funding at new court facilities	X		Please reference attached document
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	X		Please reference attached document
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		Please reference attached document
Trial court technology needs	X		Please reference attached document
2 nd 50 Judgeships	X		Please reference attached document
3 rd 50 Judgeships		X	Please reference attached document
Benefit increases	X		Please reference attached document

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Retirement Cost Increases
Retirement costs increases are not within the control of the trial courts. Retirements benefits and the contributions to be made by the employer are governed by statute.
Approximate dollar value: \$ 800,000

2. Phoenix Financial System
The Phoenix Financial System is a statewide system used by all of the trial courts in California. The system provides for continuity in financial reporting and should be funded centrally for the benefit of the Judicial Branch and the State.
Approximate dollar value: \$ 200,000

3. Health Benefit Increases
Although the trial courts can negotiate lower cost health plans, the cost of health care is rising every year. Health care costs have increased historically but the impact of health care reform is causing them to rise further. Costs increases can be mitigated by the trial courts but not eliminated.
Approximate dollar value: \$ 150,000

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
Superior Court of California, County of DEL NORTE

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	X		Entrance screening is a must and needs to be funded separately from Sheriff's Security funding
Security funding at new court facilities			Not applicable to us
Facility operations costs for new courthouses			Not applicable to us
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		Necessary to maintain buildings transferred from Counties. Daily and monthly upkeep is not being met at present
Trial court technology needs	X		Constant upgrade and updating necessary to keep courts in line with technology
2 nd 50 Judgeships	X		We have been approved yet not funded for this for a number of years
3 rd 50 Judgeships	X		More judgeships are necessary throughout the state
Benefit increases	X		With the increase in health premiums becoming more and more expensive this is a necessity

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of DEL NORTE

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Security costs for entrance screening for Del Norte. We are one of the few courts in the state without entrance screening and the increased risks in today's world, it is just a matter of time.
Approximate dollar value: \$ \$200,000.

2. Second 50 judgeships.
This was approved years ago yet still not funded. Judgeships are a necessity.
Approximate dollar value: \$ \$500,000 for increase to facilities for chambers and courtroom

3. Increase in benefit costs
We are working with a minimum number of staff and keeping them is a must. Court's share of benefit being covered for employees is helpful in this regard.
Approximate dollar value: \$ \$300,000.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Lets get the 2nd 50 funded first.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Funding to increase self help services

Approximate dollar value: \$ 247,000

2. Fully fund AB1058 Programs

Approximate dollar value: \$ 135,000

3. Cover increase benefit costs annually

Approximate dollar value: \$ 287,000

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Fresno

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	All courts need appropriate funding for necessary security. However there has been an interesting debate via email as to who should actually secure the BCP. In Fresno we have had some very difficult times working with our Sheriff's Court Security Unit. Today however, we work together to ensure the past does not come back to haunt us. Bottom line, I want to help make sure they are adequately funded, because if they are not, the courts and our customers are the ones who will ultimately end up in harms way. I am just not sure who should actually submit the BCP.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Funding for additional security for new facilities is also very necessary. Courts should have to accurately demonstrate their need. In Fresno, we did NOT receive funding when we opened two new facilities, however we adamantly believed it was appropriate at the time, and want it available for others. Again, it seems a joint approach is more reasonable.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Again, although we did not receive facility operations cost when we opened new courthouses, we believed it was appropriate and still do.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The Branch has been behind in Technology for years. With the demise of CMS V4, many courts find themselves in desperate need for a new CMS, Fresno included. To be more efficient as in the Chief's top priorities of increasing efficiencies through technology, courts need help to purchase new systems to implement efficient procedures.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	In Fresno we currently have 49 authorized judicial positions (42 judges and 7 commissioners). Based on the Judgeship needs formula we need 63 judicial positions or an increase of 23%. Four new judgeships are certainly not enough, however they will help.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	At this time, it is probably not reasonable to request the 3rd 50 - we will be extremely lucky to receive the 2nd 50!
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We strongly agree that courts should receive funding for benefit increases.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Fresno

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. 2nd 50 new Judgeships: we need additional judges to help complete our case loads.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 4 judges, staff etc.

2. Increase in benefit costs: ongoing money will help us from having to lay off additional employees further adding to our already reduced staff and public access to the courts.

Approximate dollar value: \$ \$2,359,880

3. Technology: we have the distinction of being the only court on CMS V2 (criminal and traffic). We desperately want to move on to a different CMS thereby saving the court and the Branch on going money. Additionally our civil CMS - Banner was at the end of life last year so we are barely holding on.

Additionally there are the CMS V3 courts who will need additional dollars to move off of V3 again, saving the Branch ongoing costs. Lastly, courts who were patiently waiting to move to CMS V4, need to explore a replacement CMS.

Approximate dollar value: \$ \$4,999,999

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies		X	We believe this is the State's responsibility.
Security funding at new court facilities	X		Not accounted for in realignment.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	X		Not accounted for in current funding processes.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		Not accounted for in current funding processes.
Trial court technology needs	X		Not accounted for in current funding processes.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	X		Addresses important infrastructure needs of the trial courts.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	X		Addresses important infrastructure needs of the trial courts.
Benefit increases	X		Recently became unfunded even though courts have increases.

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

- 1. Benefit Increases: For two reasons: 1) these increases have been funded, or partially funded for many years and it affects all the trial courts (unlike security and new facilities), and 2) these increases can be substantial and are not funded through any other mechanism.

Approximate dollar value: \$ Use the current survey for retirement, retiree health and health to calculate statewide cost.

- 2. 2nd 50 judgeships: Many courts need more judgeships and this should be a priority. We believe the State needs to invest in the infrastructure of the branch incrementally before some courts reach a crisis level in caseload management.

Approximate dollar value: \$ Use current salaries/benefits for judges and existing worksheets and formulas for staffing.

- 3. Court Technology: This is another infrastructure issue that should be addressed at the State level. The needs of the trial courts greatly vary in terms of technology and there should be some mechanism to request funding for projects.

Approximate dollar value: \$ Survey courts for priorities and request cost estimates.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of KINGS

Part I: Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. **Please let us know whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the assessment of this Court, that the realignment of court security fiscal responsibility from trial courts to counties (as part of the Criminal Justice Realignment Act of 2011) has been fundamentally successful. To this court's knowledge, implementation has not resulted in long-term, serious issues such as reduced security service delivery or increased obligations on sheriffs or counties that have not been appropriately resolved. Moreover, as security funding has now been transferred to California's counties, this Court believes CSAC and the CSA are better positioned to submit BCPs when additional funding is warranted to maintain required levels of service to the courts. In such an instance, the Court will support their appropriately proposed BCP. <p>KINGS Point of Contact: Jeffrey Lewis, Chief Deputy CEO 559-582-1010 x5001 jlewis@kings.courts.ca.gov</p>
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<p>See above rationale as, again, this Court is not aware of significant security funding issues specific to new court facilities.</p> <p>KINGS Point of Contact: Jeffrey Lewis</p>
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for maintaining, renovating and building courthouses comes from three sources; the Court Facilitates Trust Fund (county facility payments), State Court Facilities Construction Fund (fees and fines collected) and the Immediate and Critical Needs Account (fees and fines collected). Since 2009 the state Legislature has borrowed or swept \$750M from these funds for needs outside of the Branch. According to the Office of Courthouse Construction Management (OCCM) these funds are shrinking in relationship to the growing needs as buildings age and deteriorate. The OCCM contracts for all building maintenance and uses an outside vendor for this work. As OCCM is charged with responsibility for managing court facility operations and their costs, it is reasonable to assume that OCCM is better positioned to determine whether adequate justification exists to submit a BCP addressing any gap between needed funding and estimated costs for current and near-term facilities' projects. <p>KINGS Point of Contact: Sandy Salyer, Director of Finance 559-582-1010 x5010 ssalyer@kings.courts.ca.gov</p>

ACTION ITEM 7

Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<p>See above rationale as, again, this Court is not aware of significant funding issues specific to transferred court facilities.</p> <p>KINGS Point of Contact: Sandy Salyer</p>
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsequent to the California Judicial Council's decision to terminate production and deployment activities associated with the California Case Management System V4 project (CCMS) in March of 2012, six (6) courts were identified as having <u>urgent</u> CMS needs, requiring replacement of their legacy systems within 12 months. • Another twenty-two (22) courts identified a critical need to replace one or more of their CMS within the next one to five years. • Drastic cuts in trial court funding over the previous 4 fiscal years (FY) and the requirement to reduce each trial court's reserves to 1% by the end of FY2013-14, make it more than likely that a majority of these twenty-eight (28) courts will need additional funding beyond their current operating budget (or reserves) to acquire a new or upgraded CMS, compelling the need for submission of a branch-wide technology BCP. <p>KINGS Point of Contact: Jeffrey Lewis</p>
2nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2004, the California Judicial Council (CJC) approved a proposal to request the Legislature create 150 judgeships per year over three years [although the statewide judgeships need then was estimated to be approximately 350]. • SB56, passed by the Legislature in 2006, created the first 50 judgeships on the CJC's priority list. • AB 159, passed by the Legislature in 2007, created the second set of 50 judgeships, based on an updated priority list approved by the CJC in 2007. • However, due to the budget shortfall in that fiscal year, the Legislature deferred funding until July 2009 for the second tranche of 50 judgeships. • To date, the 50 judgeships authorized by the passage of AB159 (Jones) remain unfunded. • The National Center for State Courts [NCSC] California Judicial Workload Assessment – Final Report, dated November 2011, determined that California's <u>Implied Judicial Officer Need</u> using 2011 Quality-Adjusted Case Weights was 2367 in comparison to 2022 Authorized Judicial Positions (AJP) including the 50 judgeships that were authorized by AB 159 but not funded, a technical shortfall of 345 judicial officers but, in essence, a statewide shortage of 395 judicial positions. • A BCP submission rectifying this long-standing, well-documented, and substantial shortfall in the need for judicial officers in the state is critical. <p>KINGS Point of Contact: Jeffrey Lewis</p>
3rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2007, the Legislature passed AB 159, creating a second set of 50 new judgeships; however, funding was delayed until the beginning of FY 2009-10 [See above.] • Additionally, due to continued funding concerns and the delay of the second round of 50 judgeships, which would

ACTION ITEM 7

			<p>have pushed the third [and final] round of judgeships to no earlier than the end of FY 2009-10, the Legislature did not pass SB 1150, which would have created the final 50 judgeships on the CJC's priority list of 150 new judicial positions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To date, the 3rd set of 50 new judgeships has been neither authorized nor funded by the Legislature. Accordingly, a BCP is warranted to provide the necessary relief for meeting the needs of the state's judicial system and the citizenry of this state. <p>KINGS Point of Contact: Jeffrey Lewis</p>
<p>Benefit increases</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Agree</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From FY 2009-10 through FY 2012-13, the state's trial courts have experienced net cumulative one-time and ongoing reductions totaling \$599M. At this time, meaningful restoration of this operational funding appears to be problematic, at best. In large part, due to these budgetary shortfalls and the state's worsening fiscal climate, a number of courts, as early as FY 2008-09, began to reduce benefit costs through bargaining for new contracts - or renegotiating existing labor agreements. In particular, reducing exposure to under-funded and unfunded liabilities were areas of focus given the "new normal" that courts were forced to accept. Notwithstanding the efforts of fiscally prudent courts, the combined allocation proportion of trial court benefit cost changes for employee (and retiree) health care costs increased from approximately 31.1% in FY 2010-11 to 43.9% in FY 2012-13 while, conversely, the PERS/37 Act retirement cost changes have decreased by 54.5% [or \$14 million] over the same 2-year period. Given the continued austere fiscal environment facing the trial courts for the foreseeable future – and competing (and, arguably, more deserving) needs for statewide BCP consideration, only increases in employer contribution rates for CALPERS and 1937 Act retirement rates should be considered in any statewide BCP, whereas un- and under-funded health care cost increases (including those associated with retiree health benefits) should be borne by employees through the negotiation (or renegotiation) process, as appropriate. <p>KINGS Points of Contact: Jeffrey Lewis or Sandy Salyer</p>

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of KINGS

Part II. Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

#1. TRIAL COURT TECHNOLOGY NEEDS:

Please refer to the AOC's publication entitled Results of the Trial Court Technology Needs Survey of June 2012 (and as updated August 2012) for justification as to why this Court continues to consider **Trial Court Technology Needs** to be the paramount BCP in the interest of this state's trial courts for FY 2013-14.

Approximate dollar value: \$ UNKNOWN, although previous costing surveys developed by the AOC in preparation for trial court CCMS V4 acquisitions and deployments may serve as a baseline estimate until a more accurate AOC survey/assessment based on potential vendors' CMS costs for courts of extra small [XS], small [S], medium [M] and large [L] size is conducted.

#2. SECOND ROUND OF 50 JUDGESHIPS:

California continues to suffer from a severe shortage in the number of trial court judgeships.

The ramifications are serious and far-reaching, and include a significant decrease in Californians' access to the courts, compromised public safety, an unstable business climate, and considerable backlogs in some courts that inhibit fair, timely, and equitable justice.

Access to courts is fundamentally compromised by these judicial shortages. Securing adequate judicial resources for the courts is a top priority for the California Judicial Council [CJC] and is critical to ensuring public access to justice. Reports on the critical shortage of judicial officers have been submitted to the Judicial Council since 2001 and form the basis of the council's requests to the Legislature to create new judgeships.

As delineated, in the **Explanation** section in *Part I.* of this BCP Survey (justifying this Court's strong agreement in the need for a BCP to fund the second set of 50 judgeships), the CJC took necessary action in 2004 to seek legislative approval for the creation of - and funding appropriation for - 150 new judgeships over a three-year period to partly remedy an estimated judicial position shortfall of 350 [or an additional 15.4% need].

Legislation [SB 56] in 2006 represented the initial step in addressing the serious shortages of judges by authorizing and funding the first 50 judgeships. It was followed in 2007 by AB 159, creating the second set of 50 new judgeships and, as with the first set of 50 judgeships, funding was to be provided for judicial staff and facilities to house the new judges, where required. A total of \$27 million was to be appropriated for fiscal year 2007-2008, with ongoing funding of \$40 million. However, as the state's fiscal crisis loomed, then worsened, funding for this second round of new judgeships was deferred until July 2009, then delayed indefinitely.

Today, the statewide need for judicial officers is currently equivalent to 2367. Comparing this need to the 2022 Authorized Judicial Positions (AJP) in the state reflects a net requirement of 345 new judgeships or, as a percentage of the total need, the judicial branch has a 14.6 percent shortfall. More correctly, though, since the present AJP *includes the 50 judgeships that were authorized by AB 159 but not funded*, a technical shortfall of 395 exists and that yields a percentage shortage of 16.7%, which is worse than the 15.4 % judicial officer need identified in 2004 when the CJC initiated its efforts to secure adequate judicial resources. Clearly, a BCP to correct this unacceptable, prolonged deficiency in statewide judgeship numbers is crucial.

Approximate dollar value: \$ UNKNOWN; however, \$67 million [\$27 million one-time and \$40 million ongoing] in FY 2007-08 dollars was the planned appropriation for AB 159 for funding the second set of 50 judgeships.

#3. EXPANSION OF INTERPRETING SERVICES:

California, like most states, has long provided qualified interpreters in criminal, juvenile dependency and family law cases in which domestic violence-related are sought, but has not as a matter of policy provided interpreters in civil matters. However, the need for court interpreters in matters other than criminal cases is recognized by an increasing number of policymakers in California state government, as well as the U.S. Department of Justice [DOJ].

Legislative efforts to define, authorize, and fund the use of interpreters in civil matters have become more common in recent years, including Assembly Bill (2302) which was passed by both houses in 2006 but vetoed by the then-governor due to its fiscal impact and two bills [SB 597 (Lara) and AB 1127 (Chau)] introduced this past legislative session. The issue will almost certainly face the courts again as it becomes more likely each year that a modified version of previous bills will succeed in the near future.

Equally important, the DOJ Civil Rights Division, in an August 2010 letter, advised that while an increasing numbers of state court systems have taken steps to improve their capacity to handle cases and other matters involving parties or witnesses who are limited English proficient (LEP), DOJ continues to encounter state court language access policies or practices inconsistent with federal civil rights guidelines. Perhaps more significantly, the DOJ, is continuing its investigation into whether at least one of the state's courts are violating federal laws for failing to provide interpreters in many civil and family law cases., as DOJ views *all* court proceedings as critical, and states that "...every effort should be taken to ensure competent interpretation for LEP individuals during *all* hearings, trials and motions." Moreover, while recognizing that most state and local courts are struggling with unusual budgetary constraints that have slowed the pace of progress in expanding language access, DOJ warns that fiscal pressures do not provide an exemption from civil rights requirements.

Therefore, in anticipation of an emerging consensus in state government on the need to expand court interpreter services to family law and most (or all) civil case types, and in view of DOJ's stated position on full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a BCP of sufficient scope to accommodate a viable AOC pilot program to position the judicial branch to respond to this demand for "across-the-board" language services for LEP individuals is strongly encouraged.

Approximate dollar value: \$ UNKNOWN; however, funding for the aforementioned AB 2303 in 2006 was capped at \$10 million for one year. Anecdotally, an estimate prepared by the AOC several years ago was in the range of \$12-15 million per year for civil interpreting and, more recently, a figure of \$40 million was conservatively offered during regional bargaining discussions.

NOTE: Rather than rely on any of these "guesstimates", it is highly recommended that AOC Finance personnel contact the AOC's Senior Labor and Employee Relations Officer (from the Human Resources Services Office, Judicial and Court Administrative Services Division), who convened a March 13, 2013 meeting of stakeholders from a number of AOC Offices and representatives from selected trial courts, to discuss options for estimating the costs of court-funded civil interpreting for all case types. A costing-out methodology was chosen and, subsequent to that meeting, the AOC engaged in in-house discussions regarding what survey development resources will be available to help validate the assumptions agreed upon, collect the data; and analyze/report on the data (i.e., the annual cost for expansion into civil proceedings).

ADDENDUM: This Court would also offer a fourth possible BCP for the branch to consider on behalf of trial courts should sufficient interest exist statewide; namely, funding to offset the costs of court reporting in civil and family law matters in which one or more parties appear *in forma pauperis*.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles**

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-15 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reasons for your agreement or disagreement.

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Benefit increase (LASC Priority 1)	X		<p>A BCP is required to reflect the net cost increases associated with benefit plans offered to court employees. These costs are unavoidable, on-going costs related to maintaining the current level of court operations. Failing to provide funding will effectively force courts to make operational changes that may have a direct impact on general court services and access to justice.</p> <p>A BCP is required as a result of the benefit cost increases no longer being funded, similar to other state agencies, under the policy adjustment process. We would recommend that the BCP include both current and prior year unfunded benefit cost increases.</p> <p>Approximate dollar value: BCP's are in-process and will provide estimated funding needs for FY 14-15.</p>
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities (LASC-Priority 2)	X		<p>A BCP is required to reflect the funding needs for facility operations costs that are not sufficiently provided for by the Court Facilities Trust Fund. These costs include routine maintenance, utility bills, lease obligations and related insurance. These costs are paid by the Court Facilities Trust Fund which is primarily funded by County Facility Payments (CFP). Although CFPs are adjusted annually for CPI, General Fund supplementation is necessary to ensure proper maintenance and facility operations for courthouses throughout the state. Current funding levels are insufficient to provide an adequate level of funding for routine maintenance. Further, the routine maintenance budget is not presently based on actual need but rather is the net left in a restricted fund once "must-pay" obligations, such as utility costs, are met. The result is that "must-pay" facility operations cost take priority and, as "must-pay" costs continue to grow, much needed facility maintenance is deferred.</p> <p>Approximate dollar value: Estimates are not readily available given time constraints to respond to the survey.</p>
Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court technology needs (LASC-Priority 3)	X		<p>A BCP is required to reflect the funding for priority technology needs as technology provides opportunity for operational efficiencies, system improvements and the ability to provide streamlined, cost-effective services to the public. Improved access to justice is also achieved with investments in technology. The technology needs and priorities will vary by Court and will include, but are</p>

			<p>not limited to, maintaining, updating and refreshing existing operational systems as well as new technology initiatives.</p> <p>Approximate dollar value: Estimates are not readily available given time constraints to respond to the survey.</p>
Trial court security funding deficiencies		X	<p>Due to realignment, the Court is no longer in the position to respond to fiscal matters relating to security. Since realignment, the Court's focus has been on level and quality of services provided by the Sheriff.</p> <p>While funding may be a pressing issue for the Sheriff; receiving the required service levels could be a bigger issue for trial courts. In the last six months, LASC noted decline in the level of security services provided by the Sheriff. We continue to work with the Sheriff to reach agreement on service levels in light of recent courthouse closures.</p> <p>However, the Court is willing to work with the Sheriff to identify actual operating costs and we would support any effort made to pursue full funding. In our opinion, with realignment, CSAC and CSSA are better suited to represent counties' interest in justifying additional funds for court security.</p>
Security funding at new court facilities	X		<p>Per GC Section 69923, "...the court may pay for court security service delivery or other significant programmatic changes that would not otherwise have been required absent realignment...". Therefore, the court would be financially responsible for services levels above those provided at the time of realignment.</p> <p>A BCP would provide courts a method for identifying and requesting funding for new operating costs.</p>
Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	X		<p>The Court Facilities Trust Fund does not provide a sufficient level of funding to address new and/or increased financial obligations.</p> <p>A BCP would provide courts a method for identifying and requesting funding for new facility operations costs.</p>
2 nd 50 Judgeships	X		<p>Additional judgeships and corresponding support staff are necessary to better manage caseload per Judicial Officer and to improve the timeliness and quality of access to justice. It is imperative that any funding request for additional Judgeships also include funding for the appropriate support staff and security resources.</p>

3 rd 50 Judgeships	X		Additional judgeships and corresponding support staff are necessary to better manage caseload per Judicial Officer and to improve the timeliness and quality of access to justice. It is imperative that any funding request for additional Judgeships also include funding for the appropriate support staff and security resources.
-------------------------------	---	--	---

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Madera

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	While only a few courts can benefit from this BCP, it is important to ensure everyone entering a courthouse is safe. There needs to be some control placed on the Sheriff's Department on how they spend the funds.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	I am unclear what this proposed BCP includes. If it is to cover screening security at new court facilities - with new facilities the many access entrances should be reduced or controlled through locking doors. If this is to cover Sheriff Deputies in the courtrooms- the courthouses are being built to the current need so the first BCP would cover these cost.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Many courts are facing failing CMS or will be facing a failing system. Courts should have an option of a CMS that best fits their needs.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Many courts have closed courtrooms or courthouses; there is a number of judges without a courtroom. Courts have implemented layoffs and furloughs so there is less support staff for the new judgeships.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Why work on the 3rd 50 judgeships when we have not received the 2nd 50 judgeships.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This is a cost which is not controlled by the courts. These costs increase and we are left trying to cover the increase. All courts could benefit from this BCP.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Madera

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. New Courthouse Transition Costs -

Many counties are receiving or will be receiving new courthouses. The cost to the court to move into the new courthouse is not covered and becomes an expense to the court receiving the new courthouse. With reserves being eliminated, the cost to courts to transition into a new courthouse include moving expenses, telephone systems, wi-fi connections, refrigerators, etc. The courts have no options and must budget these expenses.

I do not have a dollar value. A survey to courts that have moved into new courthouses or are in the process could arrive at an estimated cost of these expenses.

Approximate dollar value: \$

2. New Courthouse Court Operating Costs -

Courts which have been in County buildings and receiving County services are now being moved into new courthouses without the County support. These services then transfer to the court at an additional expense. Such services include janitorial, mail processing, IT, etc. While the courts are located in a shared facility these services are shared expenses, once the courts move into new buildings these expenses become all court expenses. Relocating into new facilities is not a decision made by the individual court yet the courts are to cover the additional expenses.

I do not have a dollar value. A survey to courts that have moved into new courthouses or are in the process could arrive at an estimated cost of these expenses.

Approximate dollar value: \$

3.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Marin

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Marin will respond to the survey due August 9. Marin has operated with 2 to 3 fewer deputies since security realignment. Each additional deputy costs \$142,000 salary and benefits.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Not applicable in Marin.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Not applicable in Marin.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Not applicable in Marin.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Marin would benefit from a document management system for e-filing.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This is a priority for a number of courts.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This is a priority for a number of courts.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Marin will respond to the survey due August 13. Benefit increases have averaged \$320,000/year for the past three years.

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Marin

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Self-Help costs are \$184,000 a year in Marin and grant funding is \$97,000. In addition to funding the difference between current costs and the grant, there is a need to improve access to justice with an increase in funding for self help services.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 179,000

2. Benefit cost increases have averaged \$320,000 a year in Marin for the past three years.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 320,000

3. Security funding requires \$142,000 salary and benefits for each additional deputy. Number of deputies assigned to the court has decreased from 19 to 16 with security realignment.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 284,000

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Merced

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Since funding is no longer part of the courts budget, this should be pursued by the State Sheriff's Association via the Governor/Legislature.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as #1
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Many of the transferred facilities are in need of major repair/renovation work.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Since CCMS is no longer an option, many of us will be required to use our funds to procure a new CMS system. Funding should be provided to help the courts in this regard.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Benefit increases should continue to be funded.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Trial Court Technology Needs- since many of us have had to downsize our courts, (less staff due to budget cuts) it is even more important than ever to focus on our technology needs on a statewide basis. As stated above, since the state CCMS is no longer an option, many courts will need to replace their existing systems but are not at the point where they want to request assistance via other avenues such as the 2%, etc., as a result we like other courts will need to use funds that would have been earmarked for other areas to be used for a new CMS system. Many courts also have storage facilities filled with court files that need to be imaged which in turn would reduce the lease cost of these storage facilities. The Judiciary should focus on BCP's for tech needs. Estimate of a new CMS system via MSA for Merced is \$2.3M.

Approximate dollar value: \$ unknown costs statewide

2. Benefit Costs- for all courts

Approximate dollar value: \$ TBD by Steven Chang

3. Facility Costs for tranferred facilities.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Modoc

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Although not a top priority for Modoc yet, it soon could be. With increasing and continuing violence throughout the state, court security at all levels within the judicial branch must be considered a highly elevated issue. Our weakest areas of security are the lack of perimeter cameras and the combining of common areas when transporting prisoners from the jail to the court. Short of changing the location of the court in relationship to the jail, nothing can be done to eliminate the combining of common areas at this time. In order to rectify the issue of perimeter cameras, we estimate the total cost, including installation, to be approximately \$35,000.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	As far as a statewide BCP, this proposal focuses on a very limited number of facilities and does not benefit the statewide judicial branch. Although important for those counties with new facilities, as a whole there are more important pressing issues.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Should counties completely separate from the courts the unknown complications from such a split could be devastating. Courts would become responsible for all the utility costs incurred at each facility in addition to other unforeseen expenses. Modoc County's heating costs alone are at over \$120,000 per year. We have no idea of what our electricity costs might be and if we were notified that we would now be responsible for these costs, we could not pay the bills. If this should happen, the total costs are unknown and troublesome at the very least. Although not a problem today, it could be at any time and we, for one, would not survive.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Technology is the way of today and for the future to come. With production demands being what they are without funding to replenish staff, technological advances become more and more important. It remains imperative that the AOC continues to support the Sustain pilot courts for as long as possible. We simply can not afford a new system, nor is there the ability and staff to man such a project. If the support ends or the need arises that a new system must be obtained, most courts can not afford to incur such costs. The anticipated costs would be prohibitive and unattainable. Currently, we pay in excess of \$125,000 per year and costs would be considerably higher if we needed to purchase a new system, all required licenses, and hire staff to maintain it.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This remains a very important issue for those counties in need, but again as a statewide BCP, this proposal does not benefit the entire California judicial branch.

ACTION ITEM 7

3 rd 50 Judgeships <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above.
Benefit increases <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This BCP affects every court in the state of California. The only product courts offer is service. We are not producing food or manufacturing medical equipment or any other items, we are administering justice and we need personnel in order to do that. We already know that benefits will continue to increase every year and with the limitation of a 1% carry-over, those costs will not be adequately funded. Current benefit costs per employee approximate \$10,000 per year.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Modoc

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Benefits costs. Should staffing levels return to 100% the benefits for the new employees together with the ongoing, yearly increases our benefits costs would be approximately \$120,000 per year. We would need an additional \$30,000 for benefits alone for filling our current vacancies.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 30,000

2. Trial Court Security Funding Deficiencies. With increasing and continuing violence statewide, a minimum level of security should include perimeter cameras with a focus on any areas where prisoners may come in contact with the public and/or court employees.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 35,000

3. Facility Operations Costs for Transferred Facilities. If counties find a way to separate all expenditures for utilities and any other costs, courts would need to start incurring those costs. This is a very rough estimate based on typical business usage, with the possibility that the actual amounts could vary greatly.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 250,000

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Monterey

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Funding restoration should be the top priority, focusing on inflationary cost increases related to Court operations, specifically personal services and general expenses. Over the past 5 years the Court has been diligently pushing down on all Court expenses, but we are at the tipping point.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Funding restoration should be the top priority, focusing on inflationary cost increases related to Court operations, specifically personal services and general expenses. Over the past 5 years the Court has been diligently pushing down on all Court expenses, but we are at the tipping point.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Monterey's South County facility is inadequate for providing access to justice for our constituents, we have hearing rooms where a trial court is needed. Monterey supports that funding should be restored for the approved courthouse projects.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Monterey's facilities have roof leaks, elevator issues, HVAC issues, and known safety issues that require adequate funding before fixes can be addressed. Monterey supports seeking adequate funding to manage facility operations costs.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<p>Monterey supports seeking funding for Trial Court technology needs. The Court has a critical need to update its case management system (CMS) to a web-based system which will allow litigants to interact with the court in a paperless environment. The Court's CMS is at least 10 years old, is antiquated and does not support integration with newer technologies like electronic records, electronic filing, work flow management, public access to records, data exchanges with justice partners, and other enhancements that streamline and optimize court operations.</p> <p>Current funding for asset replacement is insufficient. Current funding does not support critical infrastructure system replacement, which drives up support costs and impacts system availability. Additionally, currently funding only supports a 7+ year desktop replacement cycle.</p> <p>Finally the court needs funding for records management to convert paper files to digital documents. This will provide cost savings, improve workflow and access.</p>
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	In support of the Judicial Needs Assessment provided to the State Legislature pursuant to Government Code 69614(b) Monterey concurs with seeking funding. The funding should be adjusted for inflationary cost increases related to Court operations, specifically personal services and general expenses in support of the new Judgeships.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Although the 3rd group of 50 judgeships is greatly needed across the California superior courts, it may be a stronger position to focus on the 2nd group of 50 judgeships now, and once funding is received for the

ACTION ITEM 7

	<p>2nd group, direct the Branch focus on the 3rd group. Funding restoration should be the top priority, focusing on inflationary cost increases related to Court operations, specifically personal services and general expenses. Over the past 5 years the Court has been diligently pushing down on all Court expenses, but we are at the tipping point.</p>
<p>Benefit increases <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree</p>	<p>Monterey supports seeking ongoing funding for benefit increase. Funding restoration should be the top priority, focusing on inflationary cost increases related to Court operations, specifically personal services and general expenses. Over the past 5 years the Court has been diligently pushing down on all Court expenses, but we are at the tipping point.</p>

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Monterey

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. The Court has a critical need to update its case management system (CMS) to a web-based system which will allow litigants to interact with the court in a paperless environment. Our CMS is at least 10 years old, is antiquated and does not support integration with newer technologies like electronic records, electronic filing, work flow management, public access to records, data exchanges with justice partners, and other enhancements that streamline and optimize court operations.
 - The adoption of technologies for CMS and e-Filing will afford the Court with opportunities to advance court operations, drive process efficiencies and optimize cost savings.
 - Moving to electronic records for Civil case types will save the Court \$2.00 -\$3.50 per document or an estimated \$400K annually.
 - Implementing new case management functions along with process optimization may potentially result in an annual cost savings of \$180K.

We have a current quote from a vender that has been competitively procured for \$2.5M for a web-based CMS application.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 2.5M

2. Inflationary benefit cost increases should be fully funded. Funding restoration should be the top priority, focusing on inflationary cost increases related to Court operations, specifically personal services and general expenses. Over the past 5 years the Court has been diligently pushing down on all Court expenses, but we are at the tipping point. Ideally \$2.3M should be restored to our base budget (Monterey's allocation of the \$261M Reduction). A permanent mechanism for funding inflationary benefit cost increases, that adjusts annually and provides the funding, before the Court books the expense, should be our goal. The Court provides CALPers Health and retirement and at the local level we have little control over these costs as the county manages the contract. We have been able to negotiate to have employees pick up some of the costs, but without NSI's there is little more we can do.

The annual Trial Court's Benefit Cost Change Survey would provide this financial information for all courts.

Approximate dollar value: \$

3. Monterey's facilities have roof leaks, elevator issues, HVAC issues, courtroom acoustical issues, and known safety issues that require adequate funding before fixes can be addressed. Monterey supports seeking adequate funding to manage facility operations costs. The costs can be found in CAFM.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Nevada

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Self evident.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Self evident.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Without additional funding, courts moving into new courthouses may become insolvent due to the increases in costs associated with the new buildings.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We've been told that the funding provided through CFPs is not nearly enough to cover the annual operating cost of transferred court facilities. Assuming this is true, additional funding should be requested. If another source of funds is not established, buildings will not be properly maintained and the long term costs to keep them functioning will greatly increase.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Old and inadequate case management systems.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We are not opposed to pursuing funding for these judgeships. However, we are concerned that the benefiting courts may not have the fiscal resources to adequately staff the case load assigned to these judges.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We are not opposed to pursuing funding for these judgeships. However, we are concerned that the benefiting courts may not have the fiscal resources to adequately staff the case load assigned to these judges.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Without an augmentation of our baseline budgets to match the benefits cost increases, we will continue to erode access to justice.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Nevada

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Benefits Costs. The annual increases to benefits costs are beyond a court's ability to control and any increase (without a corresponding increase in baseline funding) reduces the resources needed to ensure adequate access to justice.

Approximate dollar value: \$?

2. Trial Court Security Funding Deficiencies. Many trial courts do not receive enough security funding to properly staff building and courtroom security. As a result, they either choose to accept increased risk of a security breach or they augment the security budget with operations funding. Neither option is acceptable and the State should be pressed to remedy this issue through increased security funding.

Approximate dollar value: \$?

3. Trial Court Technology Needs. A significant number of trial courts have antiquated and failing case management systems. Under the current funding scheme, courts are not able to amass the financial resources needed to replace their CMS. Additional funding must be requested from the State to fill this need before courts experience a catastrophic failure of their primary business system.

Approximate dollar value: \$?

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Orange

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The Criminal Justice Realignment Act shifted the funding and financial responsibility for court security to the Counties. Therefore the counties and sheriffs should take the lead in requesting money, and the judiciary can lend support. But the judiciary should not take the lead, as we have no control over the money. Moreover, the judiciary might be given the Hobson's choice of funding security or keeping the courts open.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The Criminal Justice Realignment Act shifted the financial responsibility and funding for court security to the Counties. Therefore, the sheriffs should be requesting additional funding to meet their new responsibilities. The judiciary should not take the lead. We have no legal control over the money. Moreover, the judiciary might be given the Hobson's choice of funding security or keeping the courts open.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The State assumed the responsibility for ongoing operations and maintenance of trial court facilities nearly eight years ago. In this time, there has been no supplemental funding provided to address the increasing cost of business. It is critical for the daily operations and long term functioning of the court facilities that sufficient funding is made available. There is a separate Court Facilities Trust Fund for this, so we cannot 'move' money from operations to maintenance. However, we do have the same problem of the Hobson's choice of funding facility maintenance or keeping the courts open. But if the courthouse is unusable because of facility problems, we are closed either way.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same reason as given above for facilities costs of new courthouses. We need money to maintain the buildings so we can use them as courthouses.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Courts are faced with many aging and obsolete case management systems. It is vital for the effective operation of the courts that funding be made available to replace the obsolete and failing case management systems.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We do not have sufficient funding today to support the existing judgeships.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We do not have sufficient funding today to support the existing judgeships.
Benefit increases	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The Governor and DOF should fund our branch's benefit increases in the same manner as the other branches of state government are funded. If the other branches receive automatic (that is, DoF adds in to proposed budget) 'technical adjustments' for benefit increases then the judicial branch ought to be treated equally. The judiciary should not

ACTION ITEM 7

	have to submit a BCP for this, especially if it forces the judiciary to choose between funding benefit increases and funding on-going operations.
--	---

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Orange

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Replenishment of Trial Court Trust Fund for basic operations expenses - The judicial branch collaborated to create a new funding and resource allocation model known as the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM). The model defines the trial court operating funding need as \$2.599B for basic operations, whereas our current funding is \$1.44B, resulting in a shortfall of \$1.16B. While the judicial branch acknowledges that the state is not in a position to fund the entire shortfall at this time, the Judicial Branch request a replenishment of a portion of the funding shortfall in FY 2014-15.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 200M to \$1.0B

2. Facilities Operations: Request an amount of funding that will allow the judicial branch to maintain both existing and new buildings at least to the standards used by DGS to maintain state buildings housing the executive and legislative branch. The State assumed the responsibility for ongoing operations and maintenance of trial court facilities nearly eight years ago, including all new costs (Government Code section 70351). It is critical for the daily operations and long term functioning of the judicial branch that sufficient funding be made available.

Approximate dollar value: \$ to be defined by OCCM.

3. CMS Replacement: Courts are faced with many aging and obsolete case management systems. It is vital for the effective operation of the courts that funding be made available to replace the obsolete and failing systems. In addition, new systems will allow streamlining of court operations, permanently reducing operations costs. The funding needs for the courts can be spread out over a number of years. A BCP should be sought for those courts most critically in need (based on a survey of courts) that should be pursuing case management system replacements in FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15.

Approximate dollar value: \$ \$50,000,000

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Only if the courts have more input on the level of service provided by local Sheriffs' offices
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This issue should also be addressed in any BCP for court security funding deficiencies.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The trial courts cannot provide these additional costs from their current operating budgets.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This program is currently not funded at the level required to meet the needs.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	For those courts who have failing systems or any technology that benefits all trial courts
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	These costs need to be funded at 100% if possible. They are costs over which the trial courts have no or very limited control.

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Benefit Increases - this could be determined by the annual survey submitted by each trial court. These are uncontrollable costs that need to be funded as they are in the executive branch

Approximate dollar value: \$ unknown -

- 2.

Approximate dollar value: \$

- 3.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Criminal Realignment transferred security funding and oversight of court security from the courts to the counties. Riverside strongly believes this is a county responsibility and that the Branch should focus on issues and funding needs that are within the scope of trial court operations and for which the branch has oversight. However, we do believe the Branch should work in collaboration with the Counties and Sheriff organizations and support their requests for funding if the court believes the need is justifiable.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The State assumed responsibility for new and transferred facilities and should also assume responsibility for funding the courts for the ongoing operational costs of them. Since assuming this responsibility there has been no increased funding provided to the courts. It is critical funding be provided to ensure continued operations of court facilities.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above. These two items should be combined.
Trial court technology needs	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Until the branch has a strategic plan that has complete support from the courts, it is unlikely additional technology funding will become available, and highly unlikely that the legislature would appropriate any funding for this purpose.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The branch is critically underfunded in the area of judicial appointments and the courtroom staff that would support the appointments. Counties and resource needs have already been identified. Funding should be allocated to these counties based on workload.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above. These two items should be combined.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Riverside strongly believes that funding benefit increases, as well as cost of living increases should be automatic, as are these budget adjustments made to the Legislative, Executive and the Judicial Branch state entities. However, if timing does not permit for this negotiation to take place, a BCP should be submitted and should be a high priority. Benefit cost increases, and funding for COLAs equal to those approved for the Legislative, Executive and Judicial Branch state entities, should be sought. Additional funding should also be requested to the extent necessary to eliminate furloughs so that service levels can also return to normal in the trial courts.

July 2013

Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Benefit, COLA, and elimination of furloughs: Since SAL has been eliminated, there is no mechanism to provide for staff salary increases. In addition, health benefit costs are on a continuous rise for all courts, just as they are for the Legislative and Executive branch agencies. This will keep the Judicial Branch in line with cost increases provided to other agencies within the State and ensure that the trial courts can be competitive in retaining and recruiting qualified staff.

Calculate salary increases based on 7A data, and include the increase to salary driven benefits; health benefits increases aside from those related to the salary increases, should be based on the benefit survey completed by the trial courts. Courts still enforcing furloughs would have to provide input on what dollar amount would be needed to eliminate existing furloughs; courts who avoided furloughs through use of fund balance would need to provide the annual amount of fund balance utilized to avoid them.

Approximate dollar value: \$

2. Judgeships: New Judgeships are based on criteria as defined in the Judicial Council's Judicial Needs Assessment Report. From this, positions are allocated based on workload. It is critical for this funding to be allocated to those entities within the judiciary that have an identified need to ensure equal access to justice and timely resolution of cases for the residents of the respective counties.

The resources allocated should be calculated utilizing the judge's salary and an average cost of support staff.

Approximate dollar value: \$

3. Facilities costs: New and transferred court facilities are state-owned, should be given the same considerations, and should be maintained under the same standards as other state-owned facilities. To ensure operations continue in a safe and efficient environment, funding should be made available as courts are not in a position to absorb these costs.

OCCM should have information as to the operational costs required for the new/transferred facilities.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Although we fully support the need for additional court security funding, and Sacramento Superior Court will be standing right behind the Sheriff in their request for additional funding, we don't think we should be the ones requesting a BCP. The security services provided by the Sheriff must continue to meet the needs of the trial court. While we cannot and should not supplement funding from the judicial branch budget for court security, as the funding is not the responsibility of the judicial branch, we must stand united in support of proper funding to the Sheriff's for court security.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above, although we fully support the need for additional court security funding, the Sheriff should be the one requesting BCP's for their court security needs. As more courts open new courthouses in the future, this will become a need to be funded in consideration of new construction - it should be part of the process for total estimates for new courthouses.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This should be pursued in FY14-15 if there is sufficient need documented. As more courts open new courthouses in the future, this will become a need to be funded in consideration of new construction - it should be part of the process and cost estimates for new courthouses.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This has clearly been underfunded and/or underestimated since the beginning of facility transfers from the County to the Courts. There needs to be an ongoing baseline adjustment in order to properly maintain these court facilities.
Trial court technology needs	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Although we do not believe it is the appropriate time to submit a BCP for trial court technology needs until a strategic plan for technology has been developed. This should become a priority once a strategic plan is complete.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We do not believe it is the appropriate time to submit a BCP for additional judgeships at a time when trial courts do not have sufficient funding to hire staff to support those judgeships. We need to pursue this after trial court funding has been restored to a level that allows us to be able to staff existing courtrooms and programs.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We do not believe it is the appropriate time to submit a BCP for additional judgeships at a time when trial courts do not have sufficient funding to hire staff to support those judgeships. We need to pursue this after trial court funding has been restored to a level that allows us to be able to staff existing courtrooms and programs.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We absolutely agree that this BCP should be pursued.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. **BENEFIT COST INCREASE:** This is another top priority for Sacramento and should have been requested in FY 13-14 with the result being the judicial branch has to figure out how to absorb the current year so it is imperative that this is requested each and every year. Benefit increases must be funded for the Judicial Branch, same as they are for all state executive agencies.

Approximate dollar value: \$

2. **FACILITY OPERATION COSTS FOR TRANSFERRED FACILITIES:** This item/budget has clearly been underfunded and/or underestimated since the beginning of facility transfers from the County to the courts. There needs to be an ongoing baseline adjustment in order to properly maintain these court facilities.

Approximate dollar value: \$

- 3.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of SAN BENITO

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	My agreement is qualified. Notwithstanding the realignment of security funding to the Sheriffs/Counties, the Courts still have a responsibility to ensure the safety of the public, staff, judicial partners, inmates, etc. As such, I'm uncertain if a BCP, legislation or some other process is the answer for additional security funding. However, since I believe security funding is deficient for a majority of the Courts, a BCP is worth the risk of letting the Sheriffs/Counties shirk their "realigned" responsibility to secure additional funds. (See next category)
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	I agree based on the individual need of San Benito. However, ultimately I must disagree as the majority of the Courts won't have a new court facility in FY14-15. As well, despite the realignment of security funding, a BCP for this purpose may provide the Sheriffs/Counties reason to believe that the responsibility for increased security at new courthouses lies with the Judicial Council.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Again, I agree based on the individual need of San Benito. However, ultimately I must disagree as the majority of the Courts won't have a new court facility in FY14-15.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	See second page.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	In one form or another, technological needs affect all 58 jurisdictions.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	See second page.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	It's highly unlikely that the Judicial Council will receive funding for 100 Judgeships in a single budget cycle. Therefore, this second request for Judgeships could be considered a wasted BCP.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	See second page.

July 2013

Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of SAN BENITO

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. COUNTY FACILITIES PAYMENT: A BCP and/or legislation to augment funds currently received from the County Facilities Payments is needed to adequately maintain trial court facilities. It's imperative that existing trial court facilities as well as new trial court facilities are maintained according to standards that maximize the use life of the buildings and by extension, the dignity of judicial services. Insofar as building maintenance applies to all 58 jurisdictions and there are varying degrees of need, it's impossible to recommend a dollar value. However, the AOC has records of their original assessments of trial court facilities throughout the State that should provide a valuable reference point for calculations. And a political observation from as far outside the beltway as possible: Additional funding to maintain buildings may be easier to digest by DOF than repaying funds to construct new buildings.
Approximate dollar value: \$ See Above
2. BENEFIT INCREASES: A BCP for benefit increases will provide financial assistance to offset a statewide issue. Notwithstanding that some of the increases may be the result of ill-advised labor agreements, offsetting these increases will absorb a recurring expense as well as provide partial budgetary relief. Similar to a BCP building maintenance, it's impossible to recommend a dollar value given the lack of knowledge about the individual trial court budgets. In another political observation, the unions may have a temporary reason to remain silent if the funding is authorized specifically for an expense that helps their clientele.
Approximate dollar value: \$ See Above
3. SECOND 50 JUDGESHIPS: A BCP to fund the second set of 50 Judgeships will provide numerous Courts the ability to provide their communities with greater judicial services. As well, funding for the 50 Judgeships is likely to provide ancillary benefits in the form of modestly increased flexibility with managing budgets and staff. A recommended dollar amount isn't provided due to an understanding that this figure is mostly predetermined.
Approximate dollar value: \$ See Above

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Security funding as a BCP is essential, though I think misunderstood by many court leaders. We need to make clear to the state that 1) the security realignment DOES NOT fully fund court security cost growth, and 2) the impact upon courts of not providing sufficient funding - that is, an unacceptable reduction in security services.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This was an area specifically not addressed in the realignment and a funding approach needs to be developed.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We may need a placeholder, but a BCP discussing ongoing annual needs, especially for case management system replacement is needed.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	At least the 2nd 50 should be proposed.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This should be a baseline adjustment not requiring a BCP. However, if DOF won't honor that, then BCP definitely.

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Court Security

Approximate dollar value: \$

2. New Judgeships

Approximate dollar value: \$

3. Funding for staff salaries, retirement, and other benefit costs. (This should be a baseline adjustment, not a BCP, but needs to be included in the budget.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies		X	With the realignment of court security funding from the court to the county, additional security funding must be led by the Sheriff's and CSAC.
Security funding at new court facilities		X	With the realignment of court security funding from the court to the county, additional security funding must be led by the Sheriff's and CSAC.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	X		Due to budget reductions and restrictions on fund balances, courts will have very limited resources to fund any additional costs for new facilities.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		Due to budget reductions and restrictions on fund balances, courts will have very limited resources to fund any additional costs for facilities.
Trial court technology needs	X		Old case management systems need to be replaced and/or upgraded in many counties throughout the state.
2nd 50 Judgeships	X		Most courts have reduced staffing due to years of budget cuts so additional funding will be needed to staff additional judgeships.
3rd 50 Judgeships	X		Most courts have reduced staffing due to years of budget cuts so additional funding will be needed to staff additional judgeships.
Benefit increases	X		Our court will have benefit increases in the next three fiscal years. A process to fund these types of increases on an on-going basis statewide is critical.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important.

Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Benefit Increases:

For FY 11-12, the court has \$1.6 million in benefit increases that are not funded on an on-going basis. Also, the court's FY 12-13 ongoing benefit funding need is \$3.5 million. Currently, the AOC has not been able to guarantee that these benefit increases will be funded in the future. In addition, the court estimates that for FY 13-14 and FY 14-15 benefit costs increases will be approximately \$2.5 million each year due to retirement rate increases.

Approximate Dollar Value: \$10.1 million

2. Trial Court Technology Needs:

Since 2012 when CCMS V4 was removed from the Courts as a potential CMS system, the issue of our Court requiring CMS to replace aged system continues to be a critical need for our Courts.

In 2012 through 2013, a number of state Courts participated in the identification and award of viable CMS systems that California Courts could contract with locally and individually to meet this critical need area. Costs for small, medium and large Courts were made known through this process whereby Courts could enter into their own Master Service Agreements for systems that met their requirements.

CMS implementations focused within the current state Court Approved vendors make this an affordable option if done through separate project implementations spread over multiple fiscal years thus sharing the cost for procurement and case type implementation.

In San Diego, a high-level, 48 month implementation for upgrading our aged Family, Criminal, and Traffic systems through Tyler Technologies is being reviewed.

Family Case Category - Tyler Technologies has provided San Diego with a one-time implementation cost of \$3,418,000 to install Family Law, which would include the cost for the software licensing, Tyler Professional Services and Travel Expenses as they assist us in the onsite implementation and data conversion activities. Infrastructure costs for hardware, software and

ACTION ITEM 7

labor has been factored in to the costs. Additional on-going maintenance costs of \$527,000 will be required.

Criminal Case Category – Tyler Technologies has provided San Diego with a one-time implementation cost of \$3,712,000 to install a new Criminal System. This system, like Family Law, will include the cost of software licensing, Tyler Professional Services and Travel Expenses, which will be a slight increase in costs due to the Criminal case category requiring a more complex onsite implementation and data conversion effort as we also begin to develop and plan for our local Justice Partner integration requirements. Infrastructure costs for hardware, software and labor has been factored in to the costs. Additional on-going maintenance costs of \$357,000 annually.

Traffic Case Category - Tyler Technologies has provided San Diego with a one-time implementation cost of \$2,866,000 to install a new Traffic System. This system, like Family Law, will include the cost of software licensing, Tyler Professional Services and Travel Expenses. Infrastructure costs for hardware, software and labor has been factored in to the costs. Additional on-going maintenance costs of \$288,000 annually.

Additional On-going Costs:

A required six Full Time IT Application Programmer staff will be required to support the three implementations and ongoing support activities. This is estimated to be \$806,400 ongoing.

Approximate Dollar Value: The total estimated cost for all three case categories is \$11,974,400.

3. Facility Operations Costs for New Courthouses:

When the new Central Courthouse facility opens, the court will have additional costs for after-hours security, janitorial costs and weekend overtime paid to the Sheriff. Currently, the court is paying a proportionate share of these expenditures based on building occupancy in three court facilities. The completion of the new courthouse will consolidate staff from all three facilities in one building. Since the new courthouse will only be occupied by court staff, the court will need additional funding to pay 100% of these costs rather than a proportionate share.

Approximate Dollar Value: \$450,000 to \$650,000

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Despite the fact that security funding has been transferred to local counties in the budget, it is important for the branch to advocate for adequate funding because sufficient security makes court operations more efficient. The fact is security is an integral part to a smooth-running court, and therefore we must have an obligation to ensure security is adequate.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	New facilities are built to replace existing facilities. One of the intents of new facilities should always be to make operations more efficient. Thus, it should be the case that a new facility replacing an existing facility should be able to operate with just as much or even less security than the building or buildings that the new facility replaced. For instance, if a new facility is built that has better security features than the replaced facility, examples being it is less porous by having fewer uncontrolled or unmonitored egress points or actually has separate circulation corridors for public, judges/staff, and in-custody defendants, than the funding that was in place to operate security in the replaced facilities should be sufficient for the new facility. If this is not the case, then the solution should be to design new facilities to better use existing resources - not to design new facilities that will require more resources and then ask for these resources through a BCP.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Similar to the response above, new facilities should be designed to make better use of existing resources. Then, courts need to take it a step further and use the new facility equipped with current design elements to become more efficient. For instance, technology should be an integral part of the facility design and building process. Then, once a new facility is built, the court should modernize filing processes and procedures (e-filing, imaging, etc). The solution is to build new courthouses that will better use existing resources - not to build new courthouses that will require more resources and then ask for these resources through a BCP.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Transferred facilities are relics that we must live with. We all know that there is insufficient funds to replace all existing facilities with new ones. Yet, these facilities are assets of the branch, and we must maintain them properly to avoid deterioration. The public sector is prone to deferring building maintenance in favor of new initiatives or other services. However, this actually costs more money in the long run, as replacement of major building components is far more costlier than just maintaining existing components to ensure maximum lifespan.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Technology costs are one-time investments to become more efficient. Given the lean budgets that the courts have experienced and the probable continuation of lean budgets, it is vital that technology investments be made to become more efficient and save money and resources in the long run.

ACTION ITEM 7

2 nd 50 Judgeships <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Courts throughout the state are suffering from years of budget cuts that have resulted in service and staff reductions. Seeking new judgeships now would essentially be asking for more judges in a time when courts do not have sufficient services or staff to support that judges that currently exist..
3 rd 50 Judgeships <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Same as above
Benefit increases <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Benefits is an area of court budgets that is bound to increase every year with little or no control by the court. Courts can negotiate lower benefits contributions in our labor agreements, but the annual premium increases by insurance providers and retirement systems far outweigh any savings that are generated by lower contribution rates that are negotiated. Further, if benefits increases are funded for the executive and legislative branches, so too should it be funded for the judicial branch.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Benefits Funding

Reasons stated above. Methodology for calculating value should be survey-based as was done in prior years.

Approximate dollar value: \$

2. Security Deficiencies Funding

Reasons stated above. Methodology for calculating value should be survey-based as was done in prior years.

Approximate dollar value: \$

3. Trial Court Technology Needs

Reasons stated above. Methodology for calculating value should be survey-based to assess what each trial court's top priorities are with the understanding that the trial court has done some preliminary costing-out of the need.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This court has never been fully funded for court security costs, including perimeter screening. Because we did not have sufficient funding, we had to use court attendants in our 5 dedicated civil courtrooms. Today, that cost continues to be our expense. Had we had sufficient funding to pay for deputy sheriffs in those courtrooms, today, that cost would belong to the county under the Court Security Realignment statute. Perimeter screening is another concern. If funding for court security are "equalized" across the state and standards are developed, then perimeter screening should also be done by deputy sheriff staff and not private security. Those courts who had sufficient funding to cover perimeter screening costs with sheriff deputies, continue to enjoy this benefit with the court security realignment. Those of us who were not successful in obtaining additional court security funding, prior to realignment, continue to have and absorb those expenses out of regular court operations funding.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	There will be increased security related costs for new court facilities. These costs increases include additional screening stations and staff to run these stations; alarm systems monitoring; and night guards.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	There will be increased facility operations costs for new courthouses. The biggest ongoing cost is for janitorial and janitorial supplies.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We did not experience increased facility operations costs with the transfer of our court facilities.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	As courts can no longer build a fund balance for more than 1% of its base funding, the financial ability for courts to pay for new case management systems or other technological advances has been eliminated. A BCP supported by the state, appears to be the only method for courts to meet their future technology needs.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The judicial branch will need these judicial officers and the standard complement of staff, immediately. As the economy has begun to improve and our law and justice partners of our cities and counties have begun to hire staff, we will quickly find ourselves lagging behind our partners. The arrests and filings will increase and we will not be in a position to support the increase in workload.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The judicial branch will be needing these judicial officers and the standard complement of staff, immediately. As the economy has begun to improve and our law and justice partners of our cities and counties have begun to hire staff, we will quickly find ourselves lagging behind our partners. The arrests and filings will increase and we will not be in a position to support the increase in workload.

ACTION ITEM 7

Benefit increases <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This is an area where courts have no control over the increases. Like the Executive and Legislative branches of government, these increases should be funded, ongoing, annually.
---	--

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Benefit increases - This is an area where courts have no control over the increases. Like the Executive and Legislative branches of government, these increases should be funded, ongoing, annually. The cumulative approximate dollar value for these cost increases for our court beginning FY10-11 through FY12-13 are \$3,501,374.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 3,501,374

2. Trial court security funding deficiencies - This court has never been fully funded for court security costs, including perimeter screening. Because we did not have sufficient funding, we had to use court attendants in our 5 dedicated civil courtrooms. Today, that cost continues to be our expense. Had we had sufficient funding to pay for deputy sheriffs in those courtrooms, today, that cost would belong to the county under the Court Security Realignment statute. Perimeter screening is another concern. If funding for court security are "equalized" across the state and standards are developed, then perimeter screening should also be done by deputy sheriff staff and not private security. Those courts who had sufficient funding to cover perimeter screening costs with sheriff deputies, continue to enjoy this benefit with the court security realignment. Those of us who were not successful in obtaining additional court security funding, prior to realignment, continue to have and absorb those expenses out of regular court operations funding.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 2,083,893

3. 2nd 50 Judgeships - The judicial branch will need these judicial officers and the standard complement of staff, immediately. As the economy has begun to improve and our law and justice partners of our cities and counties have begun to hire staff, we will quickly find ourselves lagging behind our partners. The arrests and filings will increase and we will not be in a position to support the increase in workload.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 2,584,129

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Benefit Increase

Approximate dollar value: \$ have already sent in info

2. Deficiencies related to trial court security
- not a current problem in San Mateo - but we support for other courts where this is an issue.

Approximate dollar value: \$ _____

3. _____

Approximate dollar value: \$ _____

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	agree		not an issue currently for San Mateo, but I support this as a priority knowing that it is an issue at other courts
Security funding at new court facilities			
Facility operations costs for new courthouses			
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities			
Trial court technology needs			
2 nd 50 Judgeships			
3 rd 50 Judgeships			
Benefit increases	agree		this is the main priority BCP for our court

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
Superior Court of California, County of Shasta

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	strongly		Security continues to operate at a deficit
Security funding at new court facilities		X	Consolidated facilities should have a lower security cost
Facility operations costs for new courthouses		X	Save this one for the following year
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		Buildings are falling apart and their replacements delayed
Trial court technology needs	strongly		Projects that will save \$, converting paper to digital
2 nd 50 Judgeships	X		
3 rd 50 Judgeships		x	Save this one for the following year
Benefit increases	X		The same increases afforded to the other branches

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Shasta

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. a) Eliminate the \$261 million ongoing reduction to the trial courts and restore the money using WAFM. The trial courts cannot sustain this reduction each year and continue to operate. Likewise the money should be replaced using the new methodology in order to get severely underfunded courts back on track.
 b) Provide funding to operate comprehensive collections programs in courts that receive no trial court funding or insufficient funding for this effort that generates increased revenue for the state. It would pay for itself.
 Approximate dollar value: \$ 261m b) 200m

2. Fund court appointed dependency counsel expenses so that all costs incurred by the trial courts are funded. The courts are mandated to provide attorney services. Costs that exceed the annual allocation must come out of funds that are used to pay for court operations. Due to the erosion of funding over the last several years courts must lay off staff in order to have sufficient money to pay court appointed counsel. Allocations are not being adjusted according to increased need which is substantiated with solid data collection and statewide standards for representation.
 Approximate dollar value: \$ 6 or 7m statewide (locally our deficit is over \$200,000.)

3. Provide one-time funding for courts to utilize technology to save money. Projects that require substantial capital outlay such as converting phones to voice over IP will save money over the long term but underfunded courts can never come up with the initial investment. Another example would be converting old paper records stored in leased space all across this state to digital format. Scanning is costly but the ultimate savings would be huge in terms of lease savings and ultimately the square footage needed in our existing and future facilities.
 Approximate dollar value: \$ 100m (let the Council allocate based on project presentations made to them)

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Solano

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Our Sheriff's Office has thus far been able to provide security with the funding provided by the state; however, that is clearly not the case in all courts. The Solano Sheriff has taken the position that he will not backfill if there is not sufficient funding. Adequate funding for all courts is necessary. I would like to see CSAC or the Sheriffs take the lead with the JC joining or supporting a BCP; however, if there is insufficient funding in this area it will either greatly impact our operation and/or local budget.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We have a new facility opening in 2014. Security funding has not been identified for perimeter security costs. Solano supports a BCP in this area.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We have a new facility opening in 2014. There is currently insufficient funding to operate current court facilities statewide, not to mention new facilities that will open across the state pursuant to SB 1732 and SB 1407. This is one of the top three for Solano.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	There is insufficient funding to currently maintain transferred facilities and Solano supports a BCP in this area.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The only concern with a BCP in this area is the state's demand that a technology road map be in place prior to submission. Accordingly, this BCP may be premature. Solano defers to the Technology Committee on timing for this BCP, but fully supports as a concept.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We have one AB 159 judgeship and would like to see these positions funded.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Solano supports funding for the 3rd set of 50; however, we believe the 2nd round should be funded prior to making a full court press for the 3rd set.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Solano ranks this as the top priority BCP. Benefits funding impacts all courts statewide and negatively impacts our budgets when not funded. The Judicial Branch should be treated the same as the Legislative and Executive Branch for benefits funding.

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Solano

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Benefits -- we are currently working on the benefits survey and anticipate having the cost survey completed within the next few weeks.

Approximate dollar value: \$

2. Facility Operations Cost for New Facilities -- We have not yet calculated this figure.
Security Funding for New Facilities -- Sheriff's Office working on a cost calculation for this survey.

Approximate dollar value: \$

3. 2nd 50 Judgeships -- dollar amount calculated when judgeship bill adopted in AB 159.

Approximate dollar value: \$

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies		X	While some Courts may be experiencing a deterioration in the level of court security services by their local Sheriff's Departments, AB 109 shifted the financial responsibility from the branch to the County. The immediate and long-term solution should be via legislation and not BCP submitted by the branch. The trials courts are being held hostage by Sheriffs and the legislature. The branch is not equipped to verify the true costs reported by the Sheriffs and trial courts have no leverage to ensure that tax payer dollars are being spent efficiently and as intended by law.
Security funding at new court facilities		X	I would have the same strong objections for court security (Sheriff). I would only support weapons screening if funded by the Court and after verification by the appropriate advisory committee
Facility operations costs for new courthouses		X	Seeking a BCP to address this ongoing and long-term problem is a simple band aid approach and may lead to a one-time solution to a long-term problem. A better approach is to secure a legislative fix and greater political pressure on the executive branch to stop borrowing from earmarked trial court facilities funds and repay the previously redirected funds.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities		X	Seeking a BCP to address this ongoing and long-term problem is a simple band aid approach and may lead to a one-time solution to a long-term problem. A better approach is to secure a legislative fix and greater political pressure on the executive branch to stop borrowing from earmarked trial court facilities funds and repay the previously redirected funds.
Trial court technology needs		X	While tremendous progress is being made in addressing our statewide technology needs, the branch needs to develop a comprehensive statewide technology plan to ensure that it addresses strategic needs and sustains broad stakeholders' support and buy-in. Without this pre-requisite work, this well-intentioned BCP will

ACTION ITEM 7

			be dead-on-arrival and will not address the most critical needs for most courts.
2nd 50 Judgeships		X	While I recognize the critical need for additional judges, adding more judges at a time when most courts don't even have sufficient support court staff to sustain existing operations may result in unintended adverse consequences. In some cases, the courts that would be receiving some of these new judges have had to close some of their existing courthouses/courtrooms. Additionally, adding new judges may result in additional funding to address court security and court facility needs. I don't think this is the right time to submit this BCP.
3rd 50 Judgeships		X	While I recognize the critical need for additional judges, adding more judges at a time when most courts don't even have sufficient support court staff to sustain existing operations may result in unintended adverse consequences. In some cases, the courts that would be receiving some of these new judges have had to close some of their existing courthouses/courtrooms. Additionally, adding new judges may result in additional funding to address court security and court facility needs. I don't think this is the right time to submit this BCP.
Benefit increases	X		While I agree that we should submit a BCP for these costs, the branch should consider a different strategy to secure greater buy-in and minimize the argument that we have 58 different rates and some are within local control. Maybe approaching a statewide average to cover increases, similar to the old SAL formula.

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies		X	The Court believes this is a county responsibility
Security funding at new court facilities		X	The Court believes this is a county responsibility
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	X		
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		
Trial court technology needs	X		
2 nd 50 Judgeships	X		
3 rd 50 Judgeships	X		
Benefit increases	X		

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of _____

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. _____

Approximate dollar value: \$_____

2. _____

Approximate dollar value: \$_____

3. _____

Approximate dollar value: \$_____

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Sutter

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Given the branch is no longer responsible for this funding due to realignment, this issue should be resolved through legislation and not a BCP.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Given the branch is no longer responsible for this funding due to realignment, this issue should be resolved through legislation and not a BCP.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Agree, as this is a critical component of a new facility program and there are no other alternatives available.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Not at this time. While these needs are critical, restoration of discretionary funding is a higher priority.
Trial court technology needs	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Not at this time. While technology needs are critical, restoration of discretionary funding is a higher priority.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	An adequate number of judgeships is the foundation for access to justice. (Note: It seems some consideration will need to be given to how any funding provided to trial courts in support of new judgeships will be distributed in light of WAFM.)
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	An adequate number of judgeships is the foundation for access to justice. Also see note above.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	As these are routinely provided to Executive Branch departments, we should apply and expect to receive the same.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Sutter

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Restoration of baseline discretionary funding necessary to provide and support core operations.

Amount to be based on either restoration of previous reductions or may be supported by WAFM.

Approximate dollar value: \$ TBD

2. Costs related to the opening and operation of new facilities as this is a critical component of a capital outlay program.

Costs would be determined by the net increase in critical facility operational costs directly related to the new facility to include but not be limited to utilities, building and systems maintenance, moving, and custodial.

Approximate dollar value: \$ TBD

3. New Judgeships. Adequate judgeships are the single most critical resource essential to the delivery of justice. In light of WAFM a new funding strategy needs to be developed to identify the amount of funding required, and how it will be distributed, to support new judgeships. For example, if a court that under the historical funding model has been comparatively well funded receives funding for a new judgeship, does funding for support of a new judgeship get allocated directly to that court, and if so, how is it treated for purposes of WAFM; or is the support funding redistributed statewide pursuant to WAFM?

Approximate dollar value: \$ TBD

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey
 Superior Court of California, County of Trinity

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	X		Providing a safe environment is a critical core function.
Security funding at new court facilities	X		Providing a safe environment is a critical core function.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	X		Refer to comments in # 3 below.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	X		Refer to comments in # 3 below.
Trial court technology needs		X	Statewide, this may not be a critical request at this time.
2 nd 50 Judgeships		X	Mitigated by the Assigned Judges Program and Reciprocal Orders
3 rd 50 Judgeships		X	Mitigated by the Assigned Judges Program and Reciprocal Orders
Benefit increases	X		A necessary budget expense.

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Trinity

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. One BCP to include Marshal and Sheriff security needs. It is a critical core function of the courts to provide a safe and secure environment for judges, court staff and the public we serve. This is a "safety" issue first and foremost with acts of violence and threats of violence on the rise. Presiding Judges have a duty to work with the AOC, Marshal/Sheriff and State to resolve security deficiencies especially when funding adversely impacts resources (manpower & equip.).
Approximate dollar value: \$ TBD based on follow-up security surveys. Trinity's need is \$270K.

2. Retirement and health care costs should be funded for the Judicial Branch like the other 2 branches. Courts have been fiscally responsible in sharing these costs with employees when possible through labor negotiations and in compliance with new legislative mandates. However, rising costs continue to impact our ability to sustain. If benefits costs are not funded by the state, personal service costs may affect staffing levels resulting in diminished services to the court users.
Approximate dollar value: \$ TBD based on annual benefit surveys.

3. The state has made an investment into new courthouses, therefore they should first be "secure" (rated #1 above) and second be maintained. This is a difficult one to rate because older facilities and historic courthouses are in critical need of improvements, maintenance and modifications.
Just like security, the needs for new and transferred facilities should be combined into one BCP.
Legislative updates may be necessary to assist courts occupying historic courthouses to meet their needs.
Approximate dollar value: \$ _____

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Tulare

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	No issues to date with court security funding deficiencies in Tulare County.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	No issues to date with court security funding deficiencies in Tulare County.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The BCP priority should be adequate funding to the trial courts so that trial court operations can be maintained at a level that supports the public's right to access to justice.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The BCP priority should be adequate funding to the trial courts so that trial court operations can be maintained at a level that supports the public's right to access to justice.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	It is crucial that adequate funding be made available directly to the trial courts for technology needs so that the automation of processes at the trial court level can be adequately developed. These automated processes will assist the trial courts with necessary efficiencies resulting from unprecedented budget reductions.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Not a priority when the court is laying off current employees and can not afford the staff that would need to be hired for a new judgeship.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Not a priority when the court is laying off current employees and can not afford the staff that would need to be hired for a new judgeship.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	It is imperative that the trial courts be funded for annual benefit cost increases. Benefit cost increases are fully funded in the legislative and executive branch because those branches acknowledge the necessity of additional funding for these cost increases. The judicial branch should be similarly funded for benefit cost increases.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Tulare

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Trial Court Operations Expenditures - by far the most important BCP priority should be adequate funding of trial court operations expenditures. Tulare County has closed facilities, laid off a commissioner and several employees and has implemented mandatory furloughs of 12 days a year for a 4.62% pay reduction to staff (we are entering our 5th year of mandatory furloughs), to name just a few cost savings measures. We are now facing this new fiscal year with a \$3.7 million dollar deficit. We are already operating at the bare minimum. All that is left to cut is additional employees which will have a catastrophic impact to the public in the form of severely limited access to justice. The BCP priority should be a restoration of trial court funding to a level adequate to support trial court operations so that the public's right to access to justice is maintained.

Approximate dollar value: \$ 3,700,000 - for Tulare court

2. See response above.

Approximate dollar value: \$

3. See response above.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Ventura

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	We understand that this is an issue with some courts, but believe that the inequities should be addressed legislatively rather than through a Judicial Branch BCP.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Ventura

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Benefits Increases. The accumulation of unfunded ongoing benefit and retirement increases over the past several years will account for almost 20% of our structural deficit projected for the end of FY 13-14. Access to the court may be further limited without funding for incurred obligations.

Approximate dollar value: \$ \$1.4 mil local, est. \$82 mil

2. Facilities operations costs for transferred facilities. It has become clear that the annual maintenance CFP's submitted by the counties does not generate enough money to cover the operations and maintenance of the trial courts. We are concerned that alternatives such as across the board application of a funding per square foot standard based on total CFP payments will not raise the level of maintenance and operations for deficient facilities, and risks lowering the level for all court facilities. A BCP is warranted here consistent with the intent of SB 1407.

Approximate dollar value: \$ \$600,000 locally; statewide

3. Trial court technology needs. The Court supports the efforts of the Judicial Council's Technology Advisory Committee in developing an approach for funding trial court technology needs. We face the immediate challenges of a failing civil/dependency case management system, uncertainty of future maintenance for V3 which hosts our civil, small claims, and probates case types. Other technology needs include e-filing, and electronic document management systems. Caps on reserves removes a funding source used in the past for technology, which is why a BCP is a high priority for us.

Approximate dollar value: \$ \$12 mil locally; statewide

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Yolo

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	The Sheriff's Association, however, the Sheriff's Association should take the lead in advocating for additional funding in collaboration with the Judicial Branch.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Based on the same reasoning as above, if the Sheriff's Association needs additional resources to manage security in new court facilities, they should take the lead in those advocacy efforts.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Adequate funding for facilities, both new and transferred, is needed to maintain the safety and functionality of all court facilities.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Ongoing funding is needed for servers and infrastructure. This item should not be merely for Case Management Software.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Benefit cost increases continue without adequate ongoing funding allocated to the courts. This should be a top priority (see additional comments on next page).

July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey

Superior Court of California, County of Yolo

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... **When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.**

1. Ongoing funding for Court Operations should meet the needs identified in the new Workload Allocation Funding Methodology. As such, the Branch should request funding to fully implement the methodology. Lack of adequate funding jeopardizes the needs of the public. The request should also include: benefit cost increases; court-appointed dependency counsel; replacement of screening stations; technology replacement and upgrades; Statewide Technology Costs.

Approximate dollar value: \$ Workload Allocation Fundin

2. Benefit cost increases continue year after year without adequate ongoing funding allocated for these costs. Courts need ongoing funding for these increases in order to maintain current levels of service. Without adequate funding for the ongoing increases, Courts are forced to make operational adjustments to keep pace with the cost increases which are largely beyond the Court's control.

Approximate dollar value: \$ Benefit Cost Increase Surv

- 3.

Approximate dollar value: \$

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Yuba

Below is a rough list of proposed trial court BCPs for FY 2014-2015 that the AOC has developed. Please let us know **whether you agree or disagree with pursuing these proposals for FY 2014-15 and the reason for your agreement or disagreement.**

Proposed BCP	Agree	Disagree	Explanation
Trial court security funding deficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This is a county issue with the realignment of court security funding from court to county.
Security funding at new court facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	This is a county issue with the realignment of court security funding from court to county.
Facility operations costs for new courthouses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Maintain facilities and investments already spent.
Facility operations costs for transferred facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Maintain facilities so that they do not fall into disrepair and require the need for new construction of courthouses.
Trial court technology needs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Trial court technology is the backbone of the entire court operation. With the new surplus limitations, individual trial courts will no longer have the resources to pursue major technology upgrades and/or refreshers. Examples include CMS, jury, & phone systems, among others.
2 nd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Due to workload.
3 rd 50 Judgeships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Due to workload.
Benefit increases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	Due to rising health care costs (Affordable Health Care Act) and retirement costs (PEPRA), the court will have no control over these costs.

**July 2013
Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Survey**

Superior Court of California, County of Yuba

Please report what you believe are the top 3 statewide BCPs that the branch should pursue on behalf of the trial courts for FY 2014-15, along with an explanation of why you believe them to be important. Examples might include benefits costs, Phoenix costs, court-appointed dependency counsel costs, costs for replacing screening stations, etc... When providing your list, please also include a rough estimate of what you believe to be the approximate dollar value(s) of your proposed BCPs or a suggestion on how the dollar value(s) could be determined.

1. Trial court technology - Trial court technology is the backbone of the entire court operation. With the new surplus limitations, individual trial courts will no longer have the resources to pursue major technology upgrades and/or refreshers. Examples include CMS, jury, & phone systems, among others.

Approximate dollar value: \$ unknown, survey courts

2. Benefits increases - Due to rising health care costs (Affordable Health Care Act) and retirement costs (PEPRA), the court will have no control over these costs.

Approximate dollar value: \$ unknown, survey courts

3. All others

Approximate dollar value: \$ unknown, survey courts