



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Materials for January 15, 2015 Meeting*
Table of Contents

Draft Minutes from December 9, 2014 Meeting1

Action and Discussion Items

Item 3 – 2015–2016 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Allocations
for Information Technology Programs (Action Item)5

Item 1 – Update on the Governor’s Budget Proposal for 2015–2016 (Discussion Item)13

Item 2 – Current Fund Condition Statements for the Trial Court Trust Fund and State
Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (Discussion Item)46

Item 4 – Budget Change Proposal for Funding Trial Court Security Costs (Action Item)48

Item 6 – Amendments to the Statute Requiring a 2 Percent Reserve Held in the TCTF
(Action Item)51

Item 5 – Children’s Waiting Room Distributions (Action Item)57

*Updated on January 12, 2015 at 5:24 pm to include the report on item 5.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 9, 2014
12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Conference Call

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Laurie M. Earl (Chair), Loretta M. Begen, Thomas J. Borris, Rene A. Chouteau, C. Don Clay, Mark A. Cope, Thomas DeSantos, Barry P. Goode, Lloyd L. Hicks, Elizabeth W. Johnson, Laura J. Masunaga, Marsha Slough, Robert J. Trentacosta, Brian Walsh; and David S. Wesley; Executive Officers: Sherri R. Carter, Jake Chatters, Richard D. Feldstein, John Fitton, Rebecca Fleming, Kimberly Flener, Shawn C. Landry, Deborah Norrie, Michael D. Planet, Michael M. Roddy, Brian Taylor, Mary Beth Todd, Tania Ugrin-Capobianco, Christina M. Volkers, and David Yamasaki; Judicial Council staff advisory members: Curtis L. Child, Curt Soderlund, and Zlatko Theodorovic.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judges and CEOs: None; Judicial Council staff advisory members: Jody Patel.

Others Present: Patrick Ballard, Steven Chang, Shelley Curran, Donna Hershkowitz, Vicki Muzny, and Don Will.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 12:01 p.m. and roll was taken.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the November 5, 2014, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting as revised to correct misspelling of the last names of Judge Goode and Zlatko Theodorovic.

Public Comment

None received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–7)

Item 1

Court Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Reallocation

Action: The advisory committee made and approved unanimously the following motions based on recommendations of the Court Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding Allocation Work Group to be presented to the Judicial Council at its January 22, 2015 business meeting:

- 1. The Judicial Council consider approving a process to reallocate the dependency court appointed counsel funds that are estimated to remain unspent in 2014–2015.***
- 2. The courts eligible to receive any reallocation of the unspent Court Appointed Dependency Counsel funds in 2014 are those that are receiving less than 90 percent of the need as calculated by the dependency counsel caseload funding model.***
- 3. The formula used to reallocate funding to the eligible courts be based on the actual dollars of need represented by the eligible courts. Actual dollars of need is calculated by subtracting funding need from base funding.***
- 4. A reallocation be made in January 2015 that will consist of 50 percent of the unencumbered funding in the DRAFT budget (or approximately \$550,000) and that staff project estimated year-end expenditures for all courts in April and, if necessary, in June to determine if there are any anticipated unspent funds. These reallocations would be based on the methods in the previous recommendations.***
- 5. The four previous recommendations will apply only to 2014–2015 and the Court Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding Allocation Work Group will continue to review the overall allocation methodology for dependency counsel funding in its upcoming meetings.***

Item 2

2013–2014 1% Cap Allocation Reductions

Action: A motion was made and passed unanimously to be presented to the Judicial Council at its January 2015 meeting to approve the one-time five member review committee's recommendations that the preliminary reduction allocations be adjusted to match courts' final 1% calculations and the Judicial Council staff provide technical assistance to courts, individually, where warranted, and as a whole, on identified issues of concern in order to improve the process going forward.

Item 6

AB 1657 – Court Interpreters

Action: This was a discussion item with no action taken at this time. Donna Hershkowitz provided an update to the members on the status of the issue and indicated that a report would be presented to the Judicial Council at its December 12, 2014 meeting to ensure that the council's actions are consistent with law based on AB 1657.

Item 3

Budget Change Proposal for Funding Trial Court Security Costs

Action: A motion was made and passed unanimously to approve Option 3 presented by the Trial Court Security Working Group that a Budget Change Proposal be submitted in Spring 2015 that will provide for the maintenance of funding at 2010–2011 security levels and also include a request for a growth percentage increase starting in 2016–2017. The recommendation will be presented to the Judicial Council for consideration at its January 2015 meeting.

Item 4

Childrens Waiting Room

Action: No action taken. This item was pulled from the agenda and will be presented at a later meeting.

Item 5

Funding for New Workload Due to Proposition 47

Action: This was a discussion item with no action taken. Shelley Curran provided an update on this item including discussions held with the Department of Finance in an effort to obtain additional funding for courts for new workload created by passage of the legislation. At Judge Earl's suggestion, Ms. Curran will use the Criminal Realignment Subcommittee to review the survey that has been prepared and to provide input. She will contact the co-chairs of the subcommittee – Judge Wesley and David Yamasaki – this week.

Item 7

Update on the Judicial Council's Action to Amend CRC 10.64 Regarding TCBAC Membership

Action: This was a discussion item with no action taken. Judge Earl advised the members that the Judicial Council had amended the rule of court to redefine "presiding judge" to include an immediate past presiding judge and to eliminate the use of co-chairs.

Other Items

Judge Earl provided an update on the efforts being undertaken with Court Information Advisory Committee members to reduce the amount of funding being drawn from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) in 2014–2015. She anticipates that this group will bring recommendations to the TCBAC at its January 2015 meeting. She expects that the amount

included in these recommendations will be insufficient to address the projected fund shortfall, and that the Revenue and Expenditures Subcommittee will need to meet to make additional recommendations on reductions in funding of programs in the IMF.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:18 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on _____, 2015.

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

Issue

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

Background

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis

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

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

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

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

Short-Term Actions (within 12 months)

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

Medium-Term Actions (12-24 months)

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

Long-Term Actions (24-36 months)

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

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

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

Recommendation

1. The Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council Technology Committee oversee the implementation of the proposed actions outlined in Attachment 2D. Short-term actions (within 12 months) will result in a savings of approximately \$1.0M which is short of the estimated \$3.4M reduction needed. However, medium-term (12-24 months) to long-term (24-36 months) actions are anticipated to result in additional savings. Long-term actions should be initiated now due to the length of time required for analysis, implementation, and transition from existing to new solutions.
2. The Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council IT Office consider reducing as many external contractors as possible. External contractors have specific domain knowledge but are typically more costly than permanent employees.
3. The Judicial Council recommend that the Judicial Council Technology Committee consider as a technology initiative, consistent with the Technology Strategic and Tactical Plans and Governance and Funding Model, a working group comprised of members from CTAC, the Judicial Council Technology Committee, the Judicial Council IT office, trial court Chief Information Officers and trial court CEOs from small, medium and large sized courts to focus on IT efficiencies and cost saving measures for smaller courts. Such measures to include, but not limited to, an analysis of replacing or renegotiating CCTC hosted services as well as hosting or service collaboration opportunities with other courts.

Attachment 2A

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

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

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

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

IMF – IT Program Descriptions

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

Attachment 2D

IMF – IT Proposed Actions

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

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



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
 455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
 Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
January 9, 2015	For Your Information
To	Deadline
Judicial Officers and Employees of the California Judicial Branch	N/A
From	Contact
Martin Hoshino Administrative Director	Zlatko Theodorovic, Finance Director 916-263-1397, zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov
Subject	Cory Jaspersen, Governmental Affairs Director 916-323-3121, cory.jaspersen@jud.ca.gov
2015–2016 Judicial Branch Budget	

The Governor’s proposed fiscal year (FY) 2015–2016 budget released today provides \$179.9 million in new funding for the judicial branch. The proposal includes a 5 percent increase over last year’s appropriation for the trial courts. It also includes new funding to address employee and judicial officer–related costs for the trial and appellate courts, Proposition 47 implementation costs, backfills for revenue shortfalls related to the Trial Court Trust Fund, and funding for 12 court construction projects. The budget does not reflect any new loans or transfers from branch operational or construction funds.

This initial proposal for the judicial branch budget of \$3.648 billion includes \$1.585 billion from the General Fund, representing 1.4% of state General Fund spending. The proposed budget also includes \$174.7 million from various branch construction funds for infrastructure related expenditures. In terms of the total state expenditures of \$164.7 billion, the branch represents 2.2% of spending.

Specifics on the proposal that provides the foundation for budget discussions with the Legislature and the Administration over the next several months are outlined below.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 9, 2015
Page 2

Trial Court Reinvestment

The Governor's proposal includes a baseline budget reinvestment of \$90.1 million in new General Fund support for the trial courts to help meet existing court workload obligations and ongoing baseline cost increases. This amount is equal to 5 percent of the trial court support appropriation and is the second installment in a two-year strategy to stabilize trial court funding. The first installment in the current year budget is \$86.3 million. Although the judicial branch will still face operational challenges in FY 2015–2016, this new funding represents a welcome continuation of the reinvestment that began with the 2013 Budget Act.

Judicial Branch Employee-Related Costs

An additional \$51.6 million in General Fund support is included for retirement and health benefit costs for trial court and state-level judicial branch employees: \$42.7 million for the trial courts and \$8.9 million for the state-level judiciary. (Of the \$42.7 million for the trial courts, \$10.8 million represents a partial return of \$22 million removed from benefit and retirement funding provided in the 2014 Budget Act.)

Proposition 47 Implementation Costs

New funding of \$26.9 million is proposed in FY 2015–2016 and \$7.6 million in FY 2016–2017 to address increased trial court workload associated with Proposition 47 (the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act), which reduced many possessory drug offenses and low-value property thefts to misdemeanors. The new law provides a process for incarcerated individuals to petition the courts for resentences or reclassifications. Based on our discussions, the Administration recognized this important, unbudgeted new workload, and we were pleased to collaborate with the Governor and his staff to secure needed funding to address the impact of the new law on our courts.

Revenue Backfill and Technical Adjustments

The budget includes \$30.9 million in ongoing funding and an additional allocation of up to \$19.8 million for FY 2015–2016 to address the anticipated revenue shortfalls in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) due to lower filing fee revenues. This increases the total revenue backfill to \$50.7 million. The proposal does not address any backfill of the current year shortfall beyond the \$30.9 million. We will continue to work with all parties to analyze and advocate for more stable funding in this vital area.

To help maintain ongoing critical court programs, the budget proposes that the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) retain \$20 million of revenues in the fund rather than transferring those funds to the Trial Court Trust Fund.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 9, 2015
Page 3

Technical adjustments to both funds are proposed to realign expenditure authority with available resources. Specifically, the Governor's budget reflects a reduction of expenditure authority of \$23.7 million for the TCTF and \$15.2 million for the IMF.

Fee Increase Extension

The proposed budget eliminates the July 1, 2015, sunset on various fee increases initially included as part of the 2012 Budget Act. These fees currently generate approximately \$37 million annually and have been used to sustain funding for trial court operations reduced as part of prior year General Fund reductions. Fee increases have been used to partially offset budget reductions of the past several years; however, we continue to advocate that they cannot provide a sustainable budget for the judicial branch and ultimately undermine the goal of equal access to timely justice.

Judicial Officer Salary Increases

New funding in the amount of \$10.3 million is included for judicial officer salary increases consistent with Government Code section 68203, which provides that judicial salaries are increased by the average percentage salary increase for California state employees in a fiscal year. (This funding is a standalone line item in the budget and is not part of trial court operations.)

Cost-of-Living Adjustment for Judiciary Entities at the State Level

The budget proposes \$4.6 million to provide for a 2 percent cost-of-living adjustment for the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Judicial Council, and Habeas Corpus Resource Center consistent with the increases already provided to all other state employees in previous years.

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding

The proposed budget adds provisional budget bill language indicating that of the amount appropriated for trial court operations, \$103.7 million is available to support court-appointed dependency counsel.

Rent Costs: State-Level Judiciary

The budget includes \$934,000 to address projected rent increases in buildings occupied by the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Judicial Council, and Habeas Corpus Resource Center.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 9, 2015
Page 4

Traffic Amnesty Program

In an effort to increase revenue collections and address a shortfall in the State Penalty Fund, a traffic violator amnesty program, similar to the program implemented by the Administration in FY 2011–2012, also is proposed.

Judicial Branch Construction Program

The Governor’s proposal for the Facility Construction Program, which appears as a separate line item in the State Budget, includes funding from various branch construction funds for 12 projects that are in either acquisition, preliminary plans, working drawings, or construction phase (See below).

Court Facility Construction Projects

1. Lake New Lakeport Courthouse	\$40,803,000	Construction
2. Siskiyou New Yreka Courthouse	\$56,936,000	Construction
3. Mendocino New Ukiah Courthouse	\$6,068,000	Working Drawings
4. Santa Barbara New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	\$6,294,000	Working Drawings/Construction
5. Shasta New Redding Courthouse	\$8,849,000	Working Drawings/Construction
6. Sonoma New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	\$11,252,000	Working Drawings
7. Stanislaus New Modesto Courthouse	\$15,252,000	Working Drawings
8. Tuolumne New Sonora Courthouse	\$4,066,000	Working Drawings
9. El Dorado (Reappropriation) New Placerville Courthouse	\$4,780,000	Acquisition/Preliminary Plans
10. Inyo (Reappropriation) New Inyo County Courthouse	\$1,930,000	Acquisition/Preliminary Plans
11. Los Angeles (Reappropriation) New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse	\$13,772,000	Acquisition
12. Riverside (Reappropriation) New Mid-County Civil Courthouse	\$4,673,000	Acquisition/Preliminary Plans

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 9, 2015
Page 5

Governor's Budget Summary

The Governor's Budget Summary statement with respect to the judicial branch budget is attached.

A breakdown of the proposed FY 2015–2016 budget for all judicial branch entities is provided here:

Judicial Branch Entity	Proposed Total Funding Level
Supreme Court	\$46.1 m
Courts of Appeal	\$216.6 m
Trial Courts	\$2,701.6 m
Judicial Council	\$134.7 m
Judicial Branch Facility Program	\$360.7 m
Habeas Corpus Resource Center	\$14.2 m
Total Branch Operational Budget	\$3,473.9 m
Court Construction Projects	\$174.7 m
Total Branch Funding	\$3,648.6 m

Note: Some totals will not be exact due to rounding.

Significant State Budget Proposals

Water, Flood Protection and Combating Climate Change—The Budget includes the first \$532 million in expenditures from the Proposition 1 water bond to continue the implementation of the Water Action Plan, the administration's five-year roadmap towards sustainable water management. Additionally, the Budget includes the last \$1.1 billion in spending from the 2006 flood bond to bolster the state's protection from floods. It also proposes \$1 billion in cap-and-trade expenditures for the state's continuing investments in low-carbon transportation, sustainable communities, energy efficiency, urban forests and high-speed rail.

Strengthened Rainy Day Fund and Pays Off Debt—Under the Budget, the state's Rainy Day Fund will have a total balance of \$2.8 billion by the end of the year – an insurance policy against future economic downturns. The Budget spends an additional \$1.2 billion from Proposition 2 funds on paying off loans from special funds and past liabilities from Proposition 98. In addition, the Budget repays the remaining \$1 billion in deferrals to schools and community colleges, makes the last payment on the \$15 billion in Economic Recovery Bonds that was borrowed to cover budget deficits from as far back as 2002 and repays local governments \$533 million in mandate reimbursements.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 9, 2015
Page 6

Increases K-12 School Spending by almost \$4 billion—Funding levels will increase by more than \$2,600 per student in 2015-16 over 2011-12 levels.

Holds Tuition Flat for College Students—The Budget commits \$762 million to each of the university systems that is directly attributable to the passage of Proposition 30. This increased funding is provided contingent on tuition remaining flat.

Expands Workforce Training—The Budget provides over \$1.2 billion in funding to support a coordinated framework for adult education, career technical education, workforce investment and apprenticeships.

Provides Medi-Cal Health Care Coverage to 12.2 Million Californians—Due principally to the implementation of federal health care reform, Medi-Cal caseload has increased from 7.9 million in 2012-13 to an estimated 12.2 million this coming year. The program now covers 32 percent of the state’s population. This tremendous expansion of health care coverage for low-income Californians continues to be an administrative and financial challenge.

Prefunds Retiree Health Care—The state’s unfunded liability for retiree health care benefits is currently estimated at \$72 billion. State health care benefits for retired employees remain one of the fastest growing areas of the state budget: in 2001, retiree health benefits made up 0.6 percent of the General Fund budget (\$458 million) but today absorb 1.6 percent (\$1.9 billion). The Budget proposes a plan to make these benefits more affordable by adopting various measures to lower the growth in premium costs. The Budget calls for the state and its employees to share equally in the prefunding of retiree health benefits, to be phased in as labor contracts come up for renewal. Under this plan, investment returns will help pay for future benefits, just as with the state’s pension plans, to eventually eliminate the unfunded liability by 2044-45. Over the next 50 years, this approach will save nearly \$200 billion.

Other Judicial Branch Budget Proposals

The Governor’s budget proposal does not include a number of significant judicial branch proposals:

- A modification of the 1 percent fund balance policy for trial court fund balances;
- New judgeships; and
- Technology (The Administration indicated ongoing interest in supporting our technology needs and may work with us to develop funding options.)

We will continue to work with the Administration and the Legislature to address these important issues.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 9, 2015
Page 7

Funding Gains for the Judicial Branch

The reinvestment in the branch that began in FY 2013–2014 has resulted in \$244.385 million in new funding.

Judicial Branch Entity	As of Proposed 2015–16
Supreme Court	\$1.141 million
Courts of Appeal	\$5.310 million
Judicial Council	\$1.229 million
Judicial Branch Facility Program	\$0.006 million
Habeas Corpus Resource Center	\$0.339 million
Trial Courts	\$236.360 million
Total Reinvestment since 2013-14	\$244.385 million

Next Steps

The proposed reinvestment of an additional \$90.1 million directly for trial court operations and a further \$89.8 million in new funding represents a promising step toward a more sound financial footing for California’s courts. However, some funding cuts from previous years remain. The courts have responded with innovations and efficiencies. At the same time, they have had to continue to make difficult decisions that curtail the delivery of vital services.

The collective efforts of the Chief Justice, the Judicial Council, trial and appellate court leadership, and our justice system partners have been crucial in addressing statewide budget challenges for the courts and in securing new, critically needed funding to ensure access to justice.

There is much work to be done to continue the reinvestments and new investments of public resources into California’s courts as well as work to create a more stable and sustainable system of funding and operations.

The Governor’s proposal marks the beginning of a budget process of several months. This will include legislative hearings, meetings with representatives and their respective staff, updated state revenue numbers in April, a May Revision to the Governor’s proposed budget, and then a flurry of legislative activity to pass a balanced budget by June 15. The Chief Justice, and the Judicial Council, with the support of trial and appellate court leaders, the bar, and other justice system stakeholders, will continue our advocacy with the Governor and the Legislature on behalf of the public for sufficient funding for branch operations, in addition to advancing solutions for the delivery of timely access to justice for all Californians.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 9, 2015
Page 8

The Governor's proposed 2015–2016 budget may be reviewed at: www.ebudget.ca.gov.

JUDICIAL BRANCH

The Judicial Branch consists of the Supreme Court, courts of appeal, trial courts, and the Judicial Council. The trial courts are funded with a combination of funding from the General Fund, county maintenance-of-effort requirements, fines, fees, and other charges. Other levels of the Judicial Branch receive most of their funding from the General Fund. The Budget includes total funding of \$3.7 billion (\$1.7 billion General Fund and \$2 billion other funds) in 2015-16 for the Judicial Branch, of which \$2.7 billion is provided to support trial court operations. The Judicial Council is responsible for managing the resources of the Judiciary.

In 1998, California voters passed a constitutional amendment that provided for voluntary unification of the superior and municipal courts in each county into a single, countywide trial court system. By 2001, all 58 counties had voted to unify their municipal and superior court operations. This was the culmination of over a decade of preparation and work to improve court coordination and uniform access to justice. The Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 consolidated the costs of operating California's trial courts at the state level. The Act was based on the premise that state funding of court operations was necessary to provide more uniform standards and procedures, economies of scale, structural efficiency and access for the public. The Act created a state-funded trial court system and capped county contributions, providing that the state assumed responsibility for growth in the costs of court operations. Prior to state funding, many small courts were in financial crisis and needed emergency state funding to keep their doors open.

JUDICIAL BRANCH

2015-16 BUDGET

During the recession, like every area of state government, General Fund support for the Judicial Branch was reduced; however, for the Judicial Branch, the state mitigated the impact of the reductions through increased user fees, the redirection of various special funds, and through the expenditure of trial court reserves. During the fiscal crisis, some trial courts were forced to reduce service hours, furlough and lay off employees, and close courtrooms, while other courts were able to provide salary increases and did not have to close courtrooms. The disparity in how trial courts handled the reductions highlighted the need for a comprehensive evaluation of the state's progress in achieving the goals outlined in the Act. A working group composed of Administration and Judicial Branch appointees made recommendations to better allocate existing resources. The Chief Justice and the Judicial Council, through a modification of the Workload Allocation Funding Model, have taken significant steps to promote equal access to justice by allocating funding more equitably.

As shown in Figure JUD-01, after making various budget adjustments, trial court funding remained fairly consistent with pre-recession levels and is proposed to be 3.5 percent above 2007-08 in 2015-16.

Figure JUD-01
Judicial Branch Expenditures
(Dollars in Thousands)

Judicial Branch Expenditures by Program	2007-08 Actual	2013-14 Actual	2014-15 Estimated	2015-16 Governor's Budget
Supreme Court	\$44,397	43,440	45,973	46,095
Courts of Appeal	200,706	204,544	216,212	216,626
Judicial Council	130,396	132,966	139,869	134,678
Habeas Corpus Resource Center	12,553	12,588	14,233	14,242
Facility Program	(49,965)	(236,110)	(338,528)	(360,704)
Staff and OE&E	22,634	25,202	31,000	34,000
Trial Court Facility Expenses	27,331	210,908	307,528	326,704
Trial Courts	3,288,873	2,437,488	2,538,117	2,701,598
Total	\$3,726,890	\$3,067,136	\$3,292,932	\$3,473,943
Adjustments to Trial Courts	\$3,288,873	\$2,437,488	\$2,538,117	\$2,701,598
Trial Court Facility Expenses	\$27,331	\$210,908	\$307,528	\$326,704
Use of Local Reserves		264,000		
Sub-total, Trial Courts	\$3,316,204	\$2,912,396	\$2,845,645	\$3,028,302
Trial Court Security Costs ¹	-444,901			
Adjusted Total, Trial Courts	\$2,871,303	\$2,912,396	\$2,845,645	\$3,028,302

¹ For comparison purposes, court security costs for 2007-08 are removed from trial court expenditure totals due to the realignment of court security costs beginning in 2011-12.

Similar to other areas of government, the Branch needs to operate differently without the expectation of funding restorations. Yet, like the rest of state government, the Judicial Branch has growing costs related to employee retirement and health care. As part of the 2014 Budget Act, the Administration proposed a two-year funding approach to provide the trial courts with stable funding and sufficient time to carefully evaluate and pursue workload process changes and efficiencies that will modernize court operations and improve access to justice. The two-year funding approach includes: (1) providing 5-percent General Fund growth to the trial court operations budget in each year, (2) providing ongoing budgetary adjustments to account for changes in employee benefit costs that are not controlled by the trial courts, and (3) providing General Fund to address anticipated fee shortfalls. The Chief Justice has created the Commission on the Future of California's Court System to modernize court operations. The Commission is expected to evaluate trial court operations and to identify potential efficiencies that will improve access to justice. The Budget includes \$180 million in proposed new funding, in addition to the \$160 million provided in the 2014 Budget Act.

Significant Adjustments:

- Trial Court Funding—Consistent with the proposed two-year strategy, the Budget includes an augmentation of \$90.1 million General Fund to support trial court operations.
- Trial Court Employee Costs—The Budget includes \$42.7 million General Fund for trial court employee benefit costs, of which \$10.8 million reflects funding for trial courts that have now made progress towards meeting the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 standard. The Administration is committed to funding future increases related to existing health benefits and retirement costs for trial court employees and retirees.
- Trial Court Trust Fund Revenues—The Budget includes an additional \$19.8 million General Fund to reflect a further reduction of fines and penalty revenues in 2015-16. Coinciding with this adjustment, the Administration proposes permanently extending temporary fines and penalty revenue measures enacted as part of the 2012 Budget Act.
- Proposition 47—With the passage of Proposition 47 in November 2014, it is anticipated that trial courts will experience increased workload primarily in the early years of implementation due to the requirement that courts reclassify certain drug and theft crimes that involve less than \$950 from felonies to misdemeanors.

JUDICIAL BRANCH

The Budget includes \$26.9 million General Fund to reflect a projected increase in trial court workload.

- **Amnesty Program**—The Budget proposes the establishment of an 18-month outstanding delinquent debt amnesty program that would be administered by the courts and counties. Courts and counties would recover their costs to administer the amnesty program utilizing revenues collected through the program. (See Public Safety Chapter for additional details.)
- **Dependency Counsel Funding**—The Administration recognizes the important role played by counsel who represent abused and neglected children and their parents in dependency cases. The Judicial Council’s current annual budget allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$103.7 million. Over the last several years, the Council has evaluated the workload of dependency lawyers and recommended a basic caseload standard of 188 cases per attorney. An improvement in attorney caseload would reduce hearing delays and potentially shorten time to permanency for families. The current statewide average caseload is 248 cases per attorney. Many counties fall well within the standard but others far exceed it. Judicial Council allocations to courts are based on historical factors rather than on current caseloads. The Administration will work with the Judicial Council to develop a caseload-based allocation methodology and explore ways to reduce the number of cases per attorney.

0250 Judicial Branch

Article VI of the Constitution creates the Supreme Court of California and the Courts of Appeal to exercise the judicial power of the state at the appellate level. Article VI also creates the Judicial Council of California to administer the state's judicial system. Chapter 869, Statutes of 1997, created the California Habeas Corpus Resource Center to represent any person financially unable to employ appellate counsel in capital cases.

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (Chapter 850, Statutes of 1997) provided a stable and consistent funding source for the trial courts. Beginning with fiscal year 1997-98, consolidation of the costs of operation of the trial courts was implemented at the state level, with the exception of facility, revenue collection, and local judicial benefit costs. This implementation capped the counties' general purpose revenue contributions to trial court costs at a revised 1994-95 level. The county contributions become part of the Trial Court Trust Fund, which supports all trial court operations. Fine and penalty revenue collected by each county is retained or distributed in accordance with statute. Each county makes quarterly payments to the Trial Court Trust Fund equal to the fine and penalty revenue received by the state General Fund in 1994-95, as adjusted by amounts equivalent to specified fine and fee revenues that counties benefited from in 2003-04. The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Chapter 1082, Statutes of 2002) provided a process for the responsibility for court facilities to be transferred from the counties to the state by July 1, 2007, which was extended to December 31, 2009, by Chapter 9, Statutes of 2008. The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 also established several new revenue sources, which went into effect on January 1, 2003. These revenues are deposited into the State Court Facilities Construction Fund for the purpose of funding the construction and maintenance of court facilities throughout the state. Counties contribute revenues for the ongoing operation and maintenance of court facilities based upon historical expenditures for facilities transferred to the state.

The mission of the Judicial Branch is to resolve disputes arising under the law and to interpret and apply the law consistently, impartially, and independently to protect the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitutions of California and the United States, in a fair, accessible, effective, and efficient manner.

Since department programs drive the need for infrastructure investment, each department has a related capital outlay program to support this need. For the specifics on the Judicial Branch's Capital Outlay Program see "Infrastructure Overview."

3-YR EXPENDITURES AND POSITIONS

	Positions			Expenditures		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0130 Supreme Court	142.7	167.1	167.1	\$43,440	\$45,973	\$46,095
0135 Courts of Appeal	759.4	867.5	867.0	204,544	216,212	216,626
0140 Judicial Council	589.8	676.2	676.2	132,966	139,869	134,678
0145 Judicial Branch Facility Program	123.9	161.0	161.0	236,110	338,528	360,704
0150 State Trial Court Funding	-	-	-	2,437,488	2,538,117	2,701,598
0155 Habeas Corpus Resource Center	78.1	91.0	91.0	12,588	14,233	14,242
TOTALS, POSITIONS AND EXPENDITURES (All Programs)	1,693.9	1,962.8	1,962.3	\$3,067,136	\$3,292,932	\$3,473,943
FUNDING				2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0001 General Fund				\$1,208,225	\$1,444,737	\$1,585,465
0044 Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund				195	199	198
0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund				31,171	27,673	25,674
0327 Court Interpreters Fund				165	164	163
0587 Family Law Trust Fund				1,346	1,705	1,813
0890 Federal Trust Fund				3,980	6,587	6,596
0932 Trial Court Trust Fund				1,471,777	1,373,898	1,369,396
0942 Special Deposit Fund				32	99	-
0995 Reimbursements				73,645	83,524	83,526
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund				61,984	130,462	140,818
3060 Appellate Court Trust Fund				5,580	6,807	6,756
3066 Court Facilities Trust Fund				104,672	107,899	103,681
3085 Mental Health Services Fund				1,039	1,058	1,050
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund				104,208	91,912	147,805
3259 Recidivism Reduction Fund				-	15,000	-
8059 State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund				1,085	1,206	1,000
9728 Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund				-1,968	2	2
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS				\$3,067,136	\$3,292,932	\$3,473,943

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

LEGAL CITATIONS AND AUTHORITY

DEPARTMENT AUTHORITY

California Constitution, Article VI.

PROGRAM AUTHORITY

0150-State Trial Court Funding:

California Constitution, Article VI, Section 4.

0150037-Court Interpreters:

Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, Government Code Sections 71800-71829.

0155-Habeas Corpus Resource Center:

Government Code Sections 68660-68666.

MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGES

- Support for Trial Court Operations-The Budget proposes an increase of \$90.1 million General Fund to support trial court operations and an increase of \$42.7 million General Fund for trial court employee benefit cost changes.
- Proposition 47-The Budget proposes \$26.9 million General Fund to support workload associated with Proposition 47.
- Trial Court Trust Fund Revenue-The Budget includes an increase of \$19.8 million General Fund to reflect a further reduction of fine and penalty revenue in 2015-16.

DETAILED BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS

	2014-15*			2015-16*		
	General Fund	Other Funds	Positions	General Fund	Other Funds	Positions
Workload Budget Adjustments						
Workload Budget Change Proposals						
• 5-Percent Augmentation to Support Trial Court Operations	\$-	\$-	-	\$90,060	\$-	-
• Rent Augmentation	-	-	-	934	-	-
• State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Realignment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals, Workload Budget Change Proposals	\$-	\$-	-	\$90,994	\$-	-
Other Workload Budget Adjustments						
• Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustments	\$-	-\$45,165	-1.2	\$25,021	-\$31,650	-1.7
• Salary Adjustments	10,245	-	-	10,245	-	-
• Retirement Rate Adjustments	4,372	1,044	-	4,372	1,043	-
• Benefit Adjustments	3,053	157	-	881	94	-
• Pro Rata	-	-	-	-	6,953	-
• SWCAP	-	-	-	-	7	-
• Carryover/Reappropriation	-	1,938	-	-	-	-
• Lease Revenue Debt Service Adjustment	-63	130	-	-79	22,599	-
Totals, Other Workload Budget Adjustments	\$17,607	-\$41,896	-1.2	\$40,440	-\$954	-1.7
Totals, Workload Budget Adjustments	\$17,607	-\$41,896	-1.2	\$131,434	-\$954	-1.7
Policy Adjustments						
• Proposition 47 Workload	\$-	\$-	-	\$26,900	\$-	-
Totals, Policy Adjustments	\$-	\$-	-	\$26,900	\$-	-
Totals, Budget Adjustments	\$17,607	-\$41,896	-1.2	\$158,334	-\$954	-1.7

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.
† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

Trial Court Funding, Expenditures, and Positions - 2013-14 and 2014-15

	Trial Court Funding, Expenditures, and Positions				2013-14 and 2014-15			
	2013-14 Actual				2014-15 Estimated			
	State Funding ¹ (Program 45)	Non-State Funding	Total Court Expenditures ²	Filled Positions as of 7/1/2013 ³	State Funding ³ (Program 45)	Non-State Funding ³	Total Court Expenditures ³	Filled Positions as of 7/1/2014 ⁴
Alameda	91,791,236	9,640,132	100,326,991	694	90,018,251	8,302,702	122,709,141	672
Alpine	574,831	50,893	629,115	3	133,308	35,523	705,960	3
Amador	2,455,070	90,976	2,730,931	31	2,419,308	93,025	2,563,799	27
Butte	10,626,333	903,357	11,753,598	112	11,158,532	864,236	12,686,866	109
Calaveras	2,601,384	204,688	3,187,267	29	2,546,645	156,600	3,174,309	27
Colusa	1,788,999	269,809	2,418,610	15	1,671,788	246,530	2,160,906	13
Contra Costa	51,370,313	3,988,041	60,621,164	297	50,936,979	4,430,646	58,193,418	315
Del Norte	2,901,860	196,047	3,809,726	27	2,394,925	317,356	3,829,017	27
El Dorado	7,590,209	458,345	8,450,503	71	7,810,382	515,470	8,647,445	74
Fresno	52,469,707	3,262,460	60,851,608	429	53,397,783	3,199,414	57,573,726	414
Glenn	2,350,267	559,860	3,039,541	23	2,224,104	581,772	3,252,373	23
Humboldt	7,494,574	199,030	8,416,964	86	7,630,158	202,182	8,475,200	87
Imperial	9,515,373	1,819,099	13,287,680	130	9,949,262	1,814,246	12,343,404	138
Inyo	2,458,794	204,569	3,451,417	19	2,506,606	188,280	2,709,576	15
Kern	45,591,540	13,108,544	59,635,675	353	47,695,367	12,219,002	65,053,786	396
Kings	8,195,374	1,052,238	9,617,394	86	7,998,293	765,200	9,593,801	81
Lake	3,584,597	56,076	3,857,695	29	3,611,013	43,245	3,939,548	30
Lassen	2,678,050	236,390	2,987,167	31	2,639,492	253,322	3,293,115	22
Los Angeles	612,873,069	33,608,004	664,384,645	4,409	652,256,000	33,489,000	721,449,997	4,220
Madera	8,437,138	374,700	9,721,598	97	8,448,914	256,938	8,713,382	96
Marin	15,015,001	486,473	17,335,016	125	14,580,857	493,000	14,870,822	114
Mariposa	1,198,197	160,298	1,638,422	13	1,344,389	186,858	1,566,324	14
Mendocino	5,851,182	608,718	6,584,480	51	5,861,096	245,520	7,035,341	56
Merced	14,250,028	543,205	15,666,132	118	14,524,524	487,000	15,849,509	123
Modoc	1,111,511	75,586	1,256,209	11	1,053,932	77,873	1,164,534	11
Mono	1,491,947	36,732	1,982,252	16	1,657,802	69,100	1,796,558	17
Monterey	19,201,414	632,006	22,027,842	180	19,989,610	689,080	20,513,128	175
Napa	8,469,954	694,445	10,220,062	72	8,491,170	696,103	9,465,910	72
Nevada	6,109,148	440,913	6,683,015	57	6,250,862	548,598	6,629,758	58
Orange	163,647,953	22,422,452	209,612,151	1,477	166,019,625	28,503,869	202,944,241	1,416
Placer	15,657,780	616,121	17,480,364	107	15,858,898	733,000	17,011,883	105
Plumas	1,728,507	9,410	2,237,303	13	1,574,313	9,230	1,630,487	11
Riverside	108,940,674	23,010,156	130,796,004	1,078	115,198,285	23,406,466	144,463,187	1,033
Sacramento	81,527,127	4,404,715	94,961,035	637	82,121,539	5,324,631	91,382,978	613
San Benito	3,128,482	77,365	3,977,793	26	2,938,919	60,000	3,242,444	26
San Bernardino	93,002,957	6,116,901	104,749,662	877	99,225,772	7,191,833	109,835,266	892
San Diego	154,719,718	11,057,199	168,821,294	1,259	155,398,718	11,485,624	172,208,772	1,262
San Francisco	71,652,750	4,419,967	81,433,534	451	72,326,083	3,982,966	80,354,631	437
San Joaquin	30,371,701	2,493,482	32,263,325	249	31,049,505	2,631,226	36,598,010	287
San Luis Obispo	15,739,116	1,360,455	18,399,258	130	15,736,402	1,290,578	17,282,588	131
San Mateo	37,421,943	1,157,384	39,606,466	262	38,180,684	1,074,500	41,873,202	244
Santa Barbara	24,874,052	2,695,508	28,657,511	250	25,090,261	2,689,063	29,464,388	232
Santa Clara	90,704,288	8,343,409	106,443,077	735	89,640,425	8,524,309	101,727,767	706
Santa Cruz	12,757,365	769,312	14,811,585	119	13,234,683	731,120	15,544,261	121
Shasta	12,381,917	3,264,664	17,058,356	185	12,903,255	3,005,966	16,258,584	174
Sierra	573,077	53,906	647,816	4	767,542	35,550	799,967	4
Siskiyou	4,237,787	453,897	5,771,786	41	4,128,863	358,359	4,976,889	38
Solano	21,514,445	1,282,408	24,173,953	209	21,962,851	1,396,564	23,818,229	211
Sonoma	25,219,543	2,143,567	28,340,830	174	25,223,421	2,409,190	30,370,861	167
Stanislaus	21,003,191	1,762,565	24,108,898	206	21,783,366	1,798,887	24,199,877	217
Sutter	5,102,427	566,004	5,842,548	50	5,316,513	434,870	6,115,254	52
Tehama	3,835,769	153,247	4,380,565	37	3,745,414	990,322	4,834,537	37
Trinity	1,642,924	75,097	1,933,416	15	1,742,523	36,120	1,868,695	15
Tulare	19,077,761	4,441,922	23,707,714	222	19,745,752	4,448,411	24,400,507	222
Tuolumne	3,475,464	235,825	4,082,013	36	3,441,265	185,932	3,670,978	35
Ventura	34,992,291	8,966,467	46,253,280	352	36,712,700	9,435,696	46,732,377	348
Yolo	10,220,377	1,193,543	12,905,619	93	10,320,458	1,398,873	12,242,124	99
Yuba	4,416,852	725,515	5,208,233	48	4,636,537	586,195	5,643,212	46
Total	2,073,613,114	188,234,183	2,375,130,109	16,951	2,137,225,924	195,607,171	2,461,456,849	16,802
Pending Allocations ⁴								
Return of 2% Set-Aside Reserve ⁵	-	-	-	-	37,882,840	-	-	-
Criminal Justice Realignment Funding ⁶	-	-	-	-	4,611,500	-	-	-
Funds not included in the distribution to the courts ⁷								
Direct Payments for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel ⁸	70,968,934	-	-	-	70,022,922	-	-	-
State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Statewide Projects/Programs	46,444,418	-	-	-	45,916,700	-	-	-
Compensation of Superior Court Judges - Non-Trial Court Reimbursement ⁹	203,987,989	-	-	-	200,899,737	-	-	-
Assigned Judges	25,496,371	-	-	-	26,047,000	-	-	-
Court-Appointed Special Advocate Program	2,213,000	-	-	-	2,213,000	-	-	-
Equal Access Fund	15,599,900	-	-	-	15,874,000	-	-	-
Other ¹⁰	(835,725)	-	-	-	(2,576,623)	-	-	-
State Trial Court Funding Total ¹¹	2,437,488,000				2,538,117,000			

¹ Reflects the FY 2013-14 4th quarter Quarterly Financial Statement information submitted by the Superior Courts. A detailed breakdown of this data can be found in the Report of Trial Court Revenue, Expenditure, and Fund Balance Constraints for Fiscal Year 2013-14. Non-state funding includes local fees and non-fee revenue, enhanced collections and other reimbursements, grants from non-state entities, etc.

² Reflects the filled full-time equivalent positions reported on the Schedule 7As submitted by the superior courts. Does not include judges who are constitutional officers and not court employees.

³ Reflects the budgets of all 58 superior courts based on courts' FY 2014-15 Schedule 1 submissions as of December 10, 2014.

⁴ Reflects funding pending allocation from the Judicial Council. Courts may have budgeted for some of these funds in anticipation of their allocation above.

⁵ GC section 88502(c)(2)(B) requires 2 percent of the amount appropriated to Program 45.10 in the Budget Act to be set-aside by the Judicial Council for allocation to the trial courts "for unforeseen emergencies, unanticipated expenses for existing programs, or unavoidable funding shortfalls." Any amounts unallocated by March 15 are to be returned to the courts pro-rata.

⁶ Reflects only half of total funding (\$9.223 billion). Allocation pending updated workload metrics from the courts related to FY 2014-15.

⁷ Funds disbursed on behalf of trial courts, for statewide programs, for judges compensation, or to non-court entities, and therefore are not included the superior courts funding.

⁸ Reflects actual or estimated payments made directly to court-appointed dependency counsel from the Trial Court Trust Fund on behalf of superior courts participating in the Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) Program. Under DRAFT, courts retain responsibility for juvenile dependency counsel selection while the Judicial Council staff are responsible for direct attorney contracting and service administration.

⁹ This amount excludes any reimbursement amounts courts reported in their state funding amounts above related to judicial compensation (\$106.8 million in FY 2013-14 and \$112.9 million in FY 2014-15). Judges from the Los Angeles, Riverside, and Ventura Superior Courts are compensated locally and reimbursed by the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). In addition, 27 courts in FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15, participate in the local salary reimbursement program in which a small portion of the judges' salary is paid locally and reimbursed by the TCTF.

¹⁰ For the prior year, primarily recognizes that the revenues courts report individually as received or to be received from the state will not be equal to the "State Trial Court Funding" expenditure amount reported at the state level due to timing and accounting differences. For the current year, this category reflects other differences in local versus state revenue projections, pending budgets, or unallocated appropriation.

¹¹ Total state funding for trial courts ties to actual expenditures for FY 2013-14 and estimated expenditures for FY 2014-15 for the "0150 State Trial Court Funding" program included in the 2015-16 Governor's Budget.

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.
† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued**PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS****0130 - SUPREME COURT**

The Supreme Court is the highest court in the California judicial system. Its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The Chief Justice of California and the six Associate Justices entertain petitions seeking review of decisions from the Courts of Appeal, original petitions for extraordinary relief (such as writs of mandate or habeas corpus), and recommendations for discipline of judicial officers and attorneys. The Court grants review and issues opinions in order to settle legal questions of statewide importance. In addition, under the California Constitution, all death penalty judgments are appealed directly to the Supreme Court.

0135 - COURTS OF APPEAL

Established by a constitutional amendment in 1904, the Courts of Appeal are California's intermediate courts of review. The six District Courts of Appeal hear appeals and original proceedings at nine different locations around the state. Cases before the Courts of Appeal involve every area of civil and criminal law.

0140 - JUDICIAL COUNCIL

The Judicial Council of California is the constitutional policy-making body for the state judiciary. The Council consists of 21 voting members and 12 advisory members; the Chief Justice of California serves as chair. The Judicial Council staff serve as the administrative arm of the Council. Among its duties staff provide policy support to the Council, administrative accountability in the operation of the courts as specified by law, strategic planning for capital outlay, design, and construction of court facilities; and administrative support for courts in areas such as budget, fiscal services, coordination of the assignment of retired judges, technology, education, legal advice and services, human resources, legislative advocacy, and research.

Consistent with the judiciary's mission, the Judicial Council is guided by the following principles:

- To make decisions in the best interests of the public and the court system as a whole.
- To conduct the Council's business based on an underlying commitment to equal and timely justice and public access to an independent forum for the resolution of disputes.
- To provide leadership in the administration of justice by planning and advocating for policies and resources that are necessary for courts to fulfill their mission.
- To ensure the continued development of an accessible, independent court system through planning, research, and evaluation programs, and through the use of modern management approaches and technological developments.
- To provide leadership in the administration of justice by establishing broad and consistent policies for the operation of the courts and appropriate uniform statewide rules and forms.
- To promote a competent, responsive, and ethical judiciary and staff through a comprehensive program of judicial education and training for court employees.
- To contribute to the public's understanding of the judicial process through a continuing program of public education.
- To provide assistance to the courts in developing action plans that are consistent with the Council's Strategic Plan and that address local needs and priorities.

0145 - JUDICIAL BRANCH FACILITY PROGRAM

The Judicial Branch Facility Program administers the acquisition, planning, construction, operations, and maintenance of judicial branch facilities. This program is responsible for the development of long-term facilities master plans, facility and real estate management, and new courthouse planning, design, and construction.

0150 - STATE TRIAL COURT FUNDING**0150010 - SUPPORT FOR THE OPERATION OF THE TRIAL COURTS**

This program's objective is to provide the resources necessary for the statewide trial court system to adjudicate civil and criminal cases. This program includes all allowable trial court administrative costs under Chapter 850, Statutes of 1997, except salaries and benefits of Superior Court judges, compensation for assigned judges, and support for language interpreters.

0150019 - COMPENSATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

This program provides funding for the salaries and state benefits for Superior Court judges.

0150028 - ASSIGNED JUDGES

This program provides support for the salaries and related costs of retired as well as active judges who are assigned by the Chief Justice to positions in courts which require assistance due to caseload backlogs or other factors impacting the ability of a court to avoid case delay.

0150037 - COURT INTERPRETERS

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

This program supports the provision of qualified language interpreters in criminal or juvenile proceedings as required by statute.

0155 - HABEAS CORPUS RESOURCE CENTER

The Habeas Corpus Resource Center provides legal representation for indigent petitioners in death penalty habeas corpus proceedings before the Supreme Court of California and the federal courts. The Center also recruits and trains attorneys to expand the pool of private counsel qualified to accept appointments in death penalty habeas corpus proceedings, serves as a resource to them, and thereby helps to reduce the number of unrepresented indigents on California's death row.

DETAILED EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM

		2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0130	SUPREME COURT			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$43,105	\$44,805	\$44,937
3060	Appellate Court Trust Fund	391	1,168	1,158
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-56	-	-
	Totals, State Operations	\$43,440	\$45,973	\$46,095
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0135	COURTS OF APPEAL			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$199,438	\$210,572	\$211,027
0995	Reimbursements	-	1	1
3060	Appellate Court Trust Fund	5,189	5,639	5,598
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-83	-	-
	Totals, State Operations	\$204,544	\$216,212	\$216,626
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0140	JUDICIAL COUNCIL			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$87,350	\$86,140	\$86,506
0044	Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund	195	199	198
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	13,374	10,983	9,533
0327	Court Interpreters Fund	165	164	163
0587	Family Law Trust Fund	1,346	1,705	1,813
0890	Federal Trust Fund	2,814	3,286	3,295
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	22,674	21,766	17,877
0942	Special Deposit Fund	32	99	-
0995	Reimbursements	6,029	6,014	6,016
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	5,427	7,247	7,225
3066	Court Facilities Trust Fund	-8,053	-	-
3085	Mental Health Services Fund	1,039	1,058	1,050
8059	State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund	1,085	1,206	1,000
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-511	2	2
	Totals, State Operations	\$132,966	\$139,869	\$134,678
SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0140010	Judicial Council			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$87,350	\$86,140	\$86,506
0044	Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund	195	199	198

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

		2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	13,374	10,983	9,533
0327	Court Interpreters Fund	165	164	163
0587	Family Law Trust Fund	1,346	1,705	1,813
0890	Federal Trust Fund	2,814	3,286	3,295
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	3,766	3,624	4,852
0942	Special Deposit Fund	32	99	-
0995	Reimbursements	6,029	6,014	6,016
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	5,427	7,247	7,225
3066	Court Facilities Trust Fund	-8,053	-	-
3085	Mental Health Services Fund	1,039	1,058	1,050
8059	State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund	1,085	1,206	1,000
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-511	2	2
	Totals, State Operations	\$114,058	\$121,727	\$121,653
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0140019	Trial Court Operations			
	State Operations:			
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	\$18,908	\$18,142	\$13,025
	Totals, State Operations	\$18,908	\$18,142	\$13,025
	PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0145	JUDICIAL BRANCH FACILITY PROGRAM			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$419	\$8,500	\$8,623
0995	Reimbursements	12,201	17,002	17,002
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	56,557	123,215	133,593
3066	Court Facilities Trust Fund	112,725	107,899	103,681
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	54,208	81,912	97,805
	Totals, State Operations	\$236,110	\$338,528	\$360,704
	PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150	STATE TRIAL COURT FUNDING			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$865,312	\$1,081,513	\$1,221,156
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	17,797	16,690	16,141
0890	Federal Trust Fund	1,166	2,275	2,275
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	1,449,103	1,352,132	1,351,519
0995	Reimbursements	55,415	60,507	60,507
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	50,000	10,000	50,000
3259	Recidivism Reduction Fund	-	15,000	-
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-1,305	-	-
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$2,437,488	\$2,538,117	\$2,701,598
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150010	Support for Operation of Trial Courts			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$416,940	\$617,645	\$755,413

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

		2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	17,797	16,690	16,141
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	1,447,753	1,352,132	1,351,519
0995	Reimbursements	-	1	1
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	50,000	10,000	50,000
3259	Recidivism Reduction Fund	-	15,000	-
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-325	-	-
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$1,932,165	\$2,011,468	\$2,173,074
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150019	Compensation of Superior Court Judges			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$310,789	\$323,645	\$323,784
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	1,350	-	-
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-980	-	-
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$311,159	\$323,645	\$323,784
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150028	Assigned Judges			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$25,496	\$26,047	\$26,047
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$25,496	\$26,047	\$26,047
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150037	Court Interpreters			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$90,984	\$92,795	\$94,531
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$90,984	\$92,795	\$94,531
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150051	Child Support Commissioner Program (AB 1058)			
	Local Assistance:			
0995	Reimbursements	\$53,243	\$54,332	\$54,332
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$53,243	\$54,332	\$54,332
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150055	California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$1,160	\$1,160	\$1,160
0995	Reimbursements	877	4,588	4,588
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$2,037	\$5,748	\$5,748
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150059	Federal Child Access and Visitation Grant Program			
	Local Assistance:			
0890	Federal Trust Fund	\$669	\$800	\$800
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$669	\$800	\$800
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150063	Federal Court Improvement Grant Program			
	Local Assistance:			
0890	Federal Trust Fund	\$18	\$700	\$700
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$18	\$700	\$700
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

		2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0150067	Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Program			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$2,213	\$2,213	\$2,213
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$2,213	\$2,213	\$2,213
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150071	Model Self-Help Program			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$957	\$957	\$957
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$957	\$957	\$957
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150075	Grants-Other			
	Local Assistance:			
0995	Reimbursements	\$1,295	\$1,586	\$1,586
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$1,295	\$1,586	\$1,586
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150079	Federal Grants-Other			
	Local Assistance:			
0890	Federal Trust Fund	\$479	\$775	\$775
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$479	\$775	\$775
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150083	Equal Access Fund			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$15,600	\$15,874	\$15,874
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$15,600	\$15,874	\$15,874
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150087	Family Law Information Centers			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$345	\$345	\$345
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$345	\$345	\$345
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150091	Civil Case Coordination			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$828	\$832	\$832
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$828	\$832	\$832
	PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0155	HABEAS CORPUS RESOURCE CENTER			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$12,601	\$13,207	\$13,216
0890	Federal Trust Fund	-	1,026	1,026
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-13	-	-
	Totals, State Operations	\$12,588	\$14,233	\$14,242
	TOTALS, EXPENDITURES			
	State Operations	629,648	754,815	772,345
	Local Assistance	2,437,488	2,538,117	2,701,598
	Totals, Expenditures	\$3,067,136	\$3,292,932	\$3,473,943

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.
† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORY

1 State Operations	Positions			Expenditures		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
PERSONAL SERVICES						
Authorized Positions (Equals Sch. 7A)	1,693.9	1,964.0	1,964.0	\$176,745	\$200,067	\$200,067
Total Adjustments	-	-1.2	-1.7	-	2,463	4,902
Net Totals, Salaries and Wages	1,693.9	1,962.8	1,962.3	\$176,745	\$202,530	\$204,969
Staff Benefits	-	-	-	64,324	80,074	79,377
Totals, Personal Services	1,693.9	1,962.8	1,962.3	\$241,069	\$282,604	\$284,346
OPERATING EXPENSES AND EQUIPMENT				\$294,072	\$392,421	\$408,209
SPECIAL ITEMS OF EXPENSES				94,507	79,790	79,790
TOTALS, POSITIONS AND EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (State Operations)				\$629,648	\$754,815	\$772,345

DETAIL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS

1 STATE OPERATIONS	2013-14*†	2014-15*	2015-16*
0001 General Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$335,279	\$343,748	\$351,288
Allocation for employee compensation	-	717	-
Allocation for staff benefits	-	1,350	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	4,372	-
003 Budget Act appropriation	5,150	5,046	4,967
Section 4.30 lease revenue payment adjustment	-	-63	-
011 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund)	994	1	1
012 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Court Facilities Trust Fund)	8,053	8,053	8,053
Totals Available	\$349,476	\$363,224	\$364,309
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-6,563	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$342,913	\$363,224	\$364,309
0044 Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$197	\$195	\$198
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	4	-
Totals Available	\$197	\$199	\$198
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-2	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$195	\$199	\$198
0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$13,410	\$9,216	\$9,533
Allocation for staff benefits	-	17	-
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	-	1,450	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	300	-
Totals Available	\$13,410	\$10,983	\$9,533
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-36	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$13,374	\$10,983	\$9,533

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

1 STATE OPERATIONS	2013-14*†	2014-15*	2015-16*
0327 Court Interpreters Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$166	\$164	\$163
Totals Available	\$166	\$164	\$163
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-1	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$165	\$164	\$163
0587 Family Law Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Family Code Section 1852	\$1,346	\$1,675	\$1,813
Allocation for staff benefits	-	1	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	29	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,346	\$1,705	\$1,813
0890 Federal Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$2,814	\$4,249	\$4,321
Allocation for staff benefits	-	3	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	60	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$2,814	\$4,312	\$4,321
0932 Trial Court Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$35,733	\$24,459	\$17,877
Allocation for staff benefits	-	4	-
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	-	-2,748	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	51	-
Totals Available	\$35,733	\$21,766	\$17,877
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-13,059	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$22,674	\$21,766	\$17,877
0942 Special Deposit Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Government Code Section 16370	\$32	-	-
Carryover for Administration of Justice Fund	-	99	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$32	\$99	\$-
0995 Reimbursements			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Reimbursements	\$18,230	\$23,017	\$23,019
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$18,230	\$23,017	\$23,019
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$64,098	\$78,580	\$79,946
7A FISCAL Current Service Level Adjustment	-	-1	-
Allocation for staff benefits	-	121	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	528	-
003 Budget Act appropriation	4,858	51,097	60,872
Section 4.30 lease revenue payment adjustment	-	137	-
Totals Available	\$68,956	\$130,462	\$140,818
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-6,972	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$61,984	\$130,462	\$140,818
3060 Appellate Court Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.
† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

1 STATE OPERATIONS	2013-14*†	2014-15*	2015-16*
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$6,600	\$6,791	\$6,756
Allocation for staff benefits	-	2	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	14	-
Totals Available	\$6,600	\$6,807	\$6,756
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-1,020	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$5,580	\$6,807	\$6,756
3066 Court Facilities Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$113,008	\$109,809	\$111,734
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	-	6,143	-
Totals Available	\$113,008	\$115,952	\$111,734
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-283	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$112,725	\$115,952	\$111,734
Less funding provided by the General Fund	-8,053	-8,053	-8,053
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$104,672	\$107,899	\$103,681
3085 Mental Health Services Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$1,053	\$1,037	\$1,050
Allocation for staff benefits	-	6	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	-	15	-
Totals Available	\$1,053	\$1,058	\$1,050
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-14	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,039	\$1,058	\$1,050
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$26,229	\$27,177	\$30,239
002 Budget Act appropriation	34,832	54,214	54,214
003 Budget Act appropriation	-	528	13,352
Section 4.30 lease revenue payment adjustment	-	-7	-
Totals Available	\$61,061	\$81,912	\$97,805
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-6,853	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$54,208	\$81,912	\$97,805
8059 State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Penal Code Section 1233.6	\$95	-	-
Carryover for Community Corrections Grant Fund	-	206	-
Penal Code Section 1233.6	990	1,000	1,000
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,085	\$1,206	\$1,000
9728 Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Government Code Section 68114.10	\$330	\$3	\$3
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$330	\$3	\$3
Less funding provided by the General Fund	-993	-1	-1
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$-663	\$2	\$2
Total Expenditures, All Funds, (State Operations)	\$629,648	\$754,815	\$772,345

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

2 LOCAL ASSISTANCE	2013-14*†	2014-15*	2015-16*
0001 General Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$17,753	\$17,753	\$17,753
102 Budget Act appropriation	71,502	71,502	71,502
111 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	742,319	911,419	1,042,492
Allocation for employee compensation	-	9,528	-
Allocation for staff benefits	-	1,702	-
112 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund)	38,709	38,709	38,709
113 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	-	30,900	50,700
Totals Available	\$870,283	\$1,081,513	\$1,221,156
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-4,971	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$865,312	\$1,081,513	\$1,221,156
0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
102 Budget Act appropriation	\$71,309	\$63,000	\$54,850
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	-	-7,601	-
111 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	(20,594)	(20,594)	(594)
Government Code Section 77209(J)	(13,397)	(-)	(-)
Totals Available	\$71,309	\$55,399	\$54,850
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-14,803	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$56,506	\$55,399	\$54,850
Less funding provided by the General Fund	-38,709	-38,709	-38,709
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$17,797	\$16,690	\$16,141
0890 Federal Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$1,166	\$2,275	\$2,275
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,166	\$2,275	\$2,275
0932 Trial Court Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$2,182,473	\$2,335,226	\$2,444,710
Allocation for employee compensation	-	9,528	-
Allocation for staff benefits	-	1,702	-
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	-	-42,409	-
115 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund)	17,062	1	1
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Chapter 193, Statutes of 2011	1	-	-
Chapter 26, Statutes of 2012	1,779	-	-
Chapter 36, Statutes of 2011	1	-	-
Chapter 193, Statutes of 2011	-	1	-
Chapter 26, Statutes of 2012	-	1,632	-
Totals Available	\$2,201,316	\$2,305,681	\$2,444,711
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-8,261	-	-
Balance available in subsequent years	-1,633	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$2,191,422	\$2,305,681	\$2,444,711
Less funding provided by the General Fund	-	-30,900	-50,700
Less funding provided by the General Fund	-742,319	-922,649	-1,042,492
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,449,103	\$1,352,132	\$1,351,519

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.
† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

2 LOCAL ASSISTANCE	2013-14*†	2014-15*	2015-16*
0995 Reimbursements			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Reimbursements	<u>\$55,415</u>	<u>\$60,507</u>	<u>\$60,507</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$55,415	\$60,507	\$60,507
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
111 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	<u>(\$5,486)</u>	<u>(\$5,486)</u>	<u>(\$5,486)</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$-	\$-	\$-
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$50,000
111 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to the General Fund)	<u>(200,000)</u>	<u>(-)</u>	<u>(-)</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$50,000
3259 Recidivism Reduction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	<u>-</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$-	\$15,000	\$-
9728 Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Government Code Section 68114.10	<u>\$15,756</u>	<u>\$1</u>	<u>\$1</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$15,756	\$1	\$1
Less funding provided by the Trial Court Trust Fund	<u>-17,061</u>	<u>-1</u>	<u>-1</u>
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$-1,305	\$-	\$-
Total Expenditures, All Funds, (Local Assistance)	<u>\$2,437,488</u>	<u>\$2,538,117</u>	<u>\$2,701,598</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (State Operations and Local Assistance)	\$3,067,136	\$3,292,932	\$3,473,943

FUND CONDITION STATEMENTS

	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund[§]			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$44,827	\$26,206	\$2,974
Prior Year Adjustments	<u>4,411</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$49,238	\$26,206	\$2,974
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4140000 Document Sales	445	484	484
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	125	89	89
4171400 Escheat - Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds, and Coupons	1	-	-
4172000 Fines and Forfeitures	42,116	37,856	36,815
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	23	3	-
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Government Code Section 77209(j)	-13,397	-13,397	-13,397
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-0159, Budget Acts of 2013, 2014, and 2015	<u>-20,594</u>	<u>-20,594</u>	<u>-594</u>
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$8,720</u>	<u>\$4,441</u>	<u>\$23,397</u>
Total Resources	\$57,958	\$30,647	\$26,371
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	13,373	10,983	9,533

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0250 Judicial Branch (Local Assistance)	56,506	55,399	54,850
0840 State Controller (State Operations)	1	-	-
9900 Statewide General Administrative Expenditures (Pro Rata) (State Operations)	581	-	-
Expenditure Adjustments:			
Less funding provided by the General Fund (Local Assistance)	<u>-38,709</u>	<u>-38,709</u>	<u>-38,709</u>
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$31,752</u>	<u>\$27,673</u>	<u>\$25,674</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$26,206	\$2,974	\$697
Reserve for economic uncertainties	26,206	2,974	697

0327 Court Interpreters Fund ^s

BEGINNING BALANCE	\$334	\$438	\$524
Prior Year Adjustments	<u>22</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$356	\$438	\$524
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4129400 Other Regulatory Licenses and Permits	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$250</u>	<u>\$250</u>	<u>\$250</u>
Total Resources	\$605	\$688	\$774
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	165	164	163
0840 State Controller (State Operations)	1	-	-
8880 Financial Information System for California (State Operations)	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$168</u>	<u>\$164</u>	<u>\$163</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$438	\$524	\$611
Reserve for economic uncertainties	438	524	611

0587 Family Law Trust Fund ^s

BEGINNING BALANCE	\$2,388	\$3,131	\$3,504
Prior Year Adjustments	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$2,389	\$3,131	\$3,504
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	7	7	7
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	<u>2,244</u>	<u>2,072</u>	<u>2,072</u>
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$2,251</u>	<u>\$2,078</u>	<u>\$2,078</u>
Total Resources	\$4,640	\$5,209	\$5,582
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	1,347	1,706	1,813
9900 Statewide General Administrative Expenditures (Pro Rata) (State Operations)	<u>162</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$1,509</u>	<u>\$1,706</u>	<u>\$1,813</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$3,131	\$3,504	\$3,769
Reserve for economic uncertainties	3,131	3,504	3,769

0932 Trial Court Trust Fund ^s

BEGINNING BALANCE	\$82,346	\$21,217	\$16,202
Prior Year Adjustments	<u>-2,689</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$79,657	\$21,217	\$16,202
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
Revenues:			
4135000 Local Agencies - Miscellaneous Revenue	498,600	498,600	498,600
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	95	61	61
4170700 Civil and Criminal Violation Assessment	154,784	146,573	162,148
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	534,053	498,949	486,797
4171400 Escheat - Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds, and Coupons	64	18	18
4172000 Fines and Forfeitures	161,393	161,629	161,591
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	102	168	93
4173000 Penalty Assessments - Other	25,361	23,582	24,683
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Government Code Section 77209(j)	-	-	13,397
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Government Code Section 77209(j)	13,397	13,397	-
Revenue Transfer from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-3037, Budget Acts of 2013, 2014, and 2015	5,486	5,486	5,486
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-0159, Budget Acts of 2013, 2014, and 2015	20,594	20,594	594
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$1,413,928</u>	<u>\$1,369,057</u>	<u>\$1,353,468</u>
Total Resources	\$1,493,585	\$1,390,274	\$1,369,670
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	22,672	21,766	17,877
0250 Judicial Branch (Local Assistance)	2,191,422	2,305,680	2,444,711
0840 State Controller (State Operations)	178	174	174
9900 Statewide General Administrative Expenditures (Pro Rata) (State Operations)	415	-	-
Expenditure Adjustments:			
Less funding provided by the General Fund (Local Assistance)	-742,319	-922,648	-1,042,492
Less funding provided by the General Fund (Local Assistance)	-	-30,900	-50,700
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$1,472,368</u>	<u>\$1,374,072</u>	<u>\$1,369,570</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$21,217	\$16,202	\$100
Reserve for economic uncertainties	21,217	16,202	100
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$80,725	\$132,833	\$224,767
Prior Year Adjustments	<u>7,415</u>	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$88,140	\$132,833	\$224,767
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4135000 Local Agencies - Miscellaneous Revenue	45	18	18
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	174	174	174
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	24,939	21,849	20,548
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	179	50	50
4172900 Penalty Assessments - Criminal Fines	74,177	66,734	63,238
4173000 Penalty Assessments - Other	12,655	12,141	11,838
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-3037, Budget Acts of 2013, 2014, and 2015	-5,486	-5,486	-5,486
Loan Repayment from the General Fund to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund per Item 0250-012-3037, Budget Act of 2011	-	130,000	220,000

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	\$106,684	\$225,480	\$310,380
Total Resources	\$194,824	\$358,313	\$535,147
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	61,983	130,463	140,818
0250 Judicial Branch (Capital Outlay)	-	3,083	-
0840 State Controller (State Operations)	8	-	-
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	\$61,991	\$133,546	\$140,818
FUND BALANCE	\$132,833	\$224,767	\$394,329
Reserve for economic uncertainties	132,833	224,767	394,329
3060 Appellate Court Trust Fund [§]			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$4,243	\$4,592	\$3,734
Prior Year Adjustments	-1	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$4,242	\$4,592	\$3,734
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	13	9	9
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	5,918	5,941	5,941
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	\$5,931	\$5,950	\$5,950
Total Resources	\$10,173	\$10,541	\$9,684
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	5,580	6,808	6,756
0840 State Controller (State Operations)	1	-	-
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	\$5,581	\$6,808	\$6,756
FUND BALANCE	\$4,592	\$3,734	\$2,928
Reserve for economic uncertainties	4,592	3,734	2,928
3066 Court Facilities Trust Fund [§]			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$6,577	\$8,134	\$3,915
Prior Year Adjustments	4,507	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$11,084	\$8,134	\$3,915
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4135000 Local Agencies - Miscellaneous Revenue	96,566	98,513	98,862
4152500 Rental of State Property	4,677	5,079	5,079
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	78	78	78
4171400 Escheat - Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds, and Coupons	394	8	8
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	7	2	2
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	\$101,721	\$103,680	\$104,029
Total Resources	\$112,805	\$111,814	\$107,944
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	112,724	115,952	111,734
Expenditure Adjustments:			
Less funding provided by the General Fund (State Operations)	-8,053	-8,053	-8,053
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	\$104,671	\$107,899	\$103,681
FUND BALANCE	\$8,134	\$3,915	\$4,263

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
Reserve for economic uncertainties	8,134	3,915	4,263
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund [§]			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$108,476	\$86,266	\$67,895
Prior Year Adjustments	26,189	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$134,665	\$86,266	\$67,895
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4152500 Rental of State Property	5	-	-
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	278	278	278
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	27,800	24,263	21,957
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	21,182	20,331	19,717
4172900 Penalty Assessments - Criminal Fines	171,777	156,942	148,214
4173000 Penalty Assessments - Other	25,967	25,358	24,768
4173800 Traffic Violations	27,434	25,538	24,085
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer from the Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund to the General Fund per Item 0250-111-3138, Budget Act of 2013	-200,000	-	-
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	\$74,444	\$252,710	\$239,019
Total Resources	\$209,109	\$338,976	\$306,914
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	54,208	81,912	97,805
0250 Judicial Branch (Local Assistance)	50,000	10,000	50,000
0250 Judicial Branch (Capital Outlay)	18,636	179,169	76,936
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	\$122,843	\$271,081	\$224,741
FUND BALANCE	\$86,266	\$67,895	\$82,173
Reserve for economic uncertainties	86,266	67,895	82,173

CHANGES IN AUTHORIZED POSITIONS

	Positions			Expenditures		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
Totals, Authorized Positions	1,693.9	1,964.0	1,964.0	\$176,745	\$200,067	\$200,067
Salary and Other Adjustments	-	-1.2	-1.7	-	2,463	4,902
Totals, Adjustments	-	-1.2	-1.7	\$-	\$2,463	\$4,902
TOTALS, SALARIES AND WAGES	1,693.9	1,962.8	1,962.3	\$176,745	\$202,530	\$204,969

INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW

The Judicial Council facilities consist of the offices of its staff, the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal, the Habeas Corpus Resource Center, the Commission on Judicial Performance, and all Trial Courts statewide. The Supreme Court is located within the Earl Warren Building of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex in San Francisco (98,155 square feet) and the Ronald Reagan State Building in Los Angeles (7,598 sf). The Courts of Appeal are organized into six districts, operate in nine different locations, and consist of 508,386 sf. The Trial Courts are located in 58 counties statewide consisting of more than 500 buildings and 2,100 courtrooms and approximately 13 million sf of usable area. The space includes public areas, such as courtrooms, waiting areas, clerks' offices, child waiting, records viewing, rooms for jury assembly and deliberation, and centers for self-help, alternative dispute resolution, and mediation, as well as private areas, such as judicial officer chambers, staff workspace, storage space, training rooms, and conference rooms. Judicial Council staff facilities, occupying approximately 261,500 sf, are located in San Francisco (Headquarters), Burbank, Sacramento, and field offices throughout the state. Judicial Council responsibility and management has gradually increased to what is now approximately 20 million square feet of facility space statewide.

SUMMARY OF PROJECTS

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

State Building Program Expenditures		2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0165	CAPITAL OUTLAY			
	Projects			
0000071	Alameda County: New East County Courthouse	-	39,113 ^{As}	-
0000073	Calaveras County, New San Andreas Courthouse	1,189 ^{Cn}	-	-
0000076	El Dorado County: New Placerville Courthouse	-	-	4,780 ^{APs}
0000078	Glenn County: Renovation and Addition to Willows Courthouse	2,600 ^{Ws}	34,793 ^{Cn}	-
0000079	Imperial County: New El Centro Courthouse	-	3,344 ^{Ws}	-
0000080	Inyo County: New Inyo County Courthouse	-	-	1,930 ^{APs}
0000084	Lake County: New Lakeport Courthouse	-	4,450 ^{Ws}	40,803 ^{Cn}
0000086	Los Angeles County: New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse	-	5,119 ^{As}	13,772 ^{As}
0000088	Los Angeles County: Hollywood Courthouse Modernization	-	45,177 ^{DBs}	-
0000092	Mendocino County: New Ukiah Courthouse	-	8,016 ^{APs}	6,068 ^{Ws}
0000093	Merced County: New Los Banos Courthouse	1,974 ^{Ws}	21,889 ^{Cn}	-
0000100	Riverside County: New Mid-County Courthouse	2,700 ^{Cn}	-	-
0000101	Riverside County: New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse	-	3,484 ^{Ws}	-
0000102	Riverside County: New Mid-County Civil Courthouse	-	-	4,673 ^{APs}
0000103	Sacramento County: New Sacramento Courthouse	-	33,347 ^{APWs}	-
0000104	San Benito County: New Hollister Courthouse	1,170 ^{Cn}	-	-
0000106	San Diego County: New San Diego Courthouse	513,668 ^{Cn}	832 ^{Cn}	-
0000107	San Joaquin County: New Stockton Courthouse	243,022 ^{Cn}	-	-
0000108	San Joaquin County: Renovation/Expansion to Juvenile Justice Center	3,205 ^{Cn}	-	-
0000109	Santa Barbara County: New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	-	4,411 ^{Ps}	6,294 ^{WCs}
0000110	Santa Clara County: New Family Justice Center	205,258 ^{Cn}	-	-
0000111	Shasta County: New Redding Courthouse	-	6,028 ^{Ps}	8,849 ^{WCs}
0000112	Siskiyou County: New Yreka Courthouse	3,277 ^{Ps}	4,518 ^{Ws}	56,936 ^{Cn}
0000113	Solano County: Renovation to Old Solano Courthouse	1,119 ^{Cn}	55 ^{Cn}	-
0000114	Sonoma County: New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	-	7,670 ^{Ps}	11,252 ^{Ws}
0000115	Stanislaus County: New Modesto Courthouse	-	12,083 ^{APs}	15,252 ^{Ws}
0000116	Sutter County: New Yuba City Courthouse	51,308 ^{Cn}	-	-
0000117	Tehama County: New Red Bluff Courthouse	3,982 ^{Ws}	46,662 ^{Cn}	-
0000119	Tuolumne County: New Sonora Courthouse	-	3,049 ^{Ps}	4,066 ^{Ws}
	Totals, Projects	\$1,034,472	\$284,040	\$174,675
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL PROJECTS		\$1,034,472	\$284,040	\$174,675
FUNDING		2013-14*	2014-15*	2015-16*
0660	Public Buildings Construction Fund	\$246,117	\$55	\$-
0668	Public Buildings Construction Fund Subaccount	766,443	101,733	97,739
0995	Reimbursements	3,277	-	-
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	-	3,083	-
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	18,635	179,169	76,936
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS		\$1,034,472	\$284,040	\$174,675

DETAIL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

3 CAPITAL OUTLAY	2013-14*†	2014-15*	2015-16*
0660 Public Buildings Construction Fund			
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Item 0250-301-0660, Budget Act of 2010 as reappropriated by Items 0250-490 and 0250-491, BA of 2011 and as partially reappropriated by Item 0250-490, BA of 2013	266,218	-	-
Item 0250-301-0660, Budget Act of 2010 as reappropriated by Items 0250-490 and 0250-491, BA of 2011 and as partially reappropriated by Item 0250-490, BA of 2013	-	299	244
Totals Available	\$266,218	\$299	\$244
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-19,857	-	-244
Balance available in subsequent years	-244	-244	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$246,117	\$55	\$-
0668 Public Buildings Construction Fund Subaccount			
APPROPRIATIONS			
301 Budget Act appropriation	\$511,374	\$101,733	\$97,739
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Item 0250-301-0668, Budget Act of 2012	92,518	41,210	41,210
Item 0250-302-0668, Budget Act of 2012 as added by Chapter 29, Statutes of 2012	208,144	2,886	2,886
Various Projects: Carryover/Reappropriation Adjustments	-	1,497	1,497
Totals Available	\$812,036	\$147,326	\$143,332
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-	-	-44,096
Balance available in subsequent years	-45,593	-45,593	-1,497
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$766,443	\$101,733	\$97,739
0995 Reimbursements			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Reimbursements	\$3,277	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$3,277	\$-	\$-
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
301 Budget Act appropriation	-	\$3,083	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$-	\$3,083	\$-
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
301 Budget Act appropriation	\$26,295	\$142,254	\$51,781
Various Projects: Carryover/Reappropriation Adjustments	-	27,000	-
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Item 0250-301-3138, Budget Act of 2009, as partially reverted by Item 0250-495, BAs of 2010 and 2013, and as reprop by Item 0250-490, BA of 2012	21,139	-	-
Item 0250-301-3138, Budget Act of 2012 as reappropriated by Item 0250-490, Budget Act of 2015 and as reverted by Item 0250-495, Budget Act of 2013	87,424	47,925	-
Item 0250-301-3138, Budget Act of 2013 as reappropriated by Item 0250-490, Budget Act of 2014	-	6,828	-
0000076 - El Dorado County, New Placerville Courthouse - COBCP - A, PP	-	-	4,780
0000080 - Inyo County, New Inyo County Courthouse - COBCP - A, PP	-	-	1,930
0000086 - Los Angeles County, New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse - COBCP - A	-	-	13,772
0000102 - Riverside County, New Mid-County Civil Courthouse - COBCP - A, PP	-	-	4,673
Various Projects: Carryover/Reappropriation Adjustments	-	-10,227	-
Totals Available	\$134,858	\$213,780	\$76,936
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-21,139	-9,456	-
Balance available in subsequent years	-95,084	-25,155	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$18,635	\$179,169	\$76,936

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

3 CAPITAL OUTLAY	<u>2013-14*†</u>	<u>2014-15*</u>	<u>2015-16*</u>
Total Expenditures, All Funds, (Capital Outlay)	\$1,034,472	\$284,040	\$174,675

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.
† Past year appropriations are net of subsequent budget adjustments.

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	FY 2013-14 (Year-End Financial Statement) Col. A	FY 2014-15 (Estimated) - November 5, 2014 Meeting Col. B	FY 2014-15 Expenditure and GF Transfer adjustments Col. C	FY 2014-15 Estimated Savings Col. D	FY 2014-15 (Estimated) - January 15, 2015 Meeting (B + C + D) Col. E	FY 2015-16 (Estimated) Col. F
1	Beginning Balance	82,346,997	21,218,232	-	-	21,218,232	24,176,053
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	(2,688,884)	-	-	2,030,202	2,030,202	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	79,658,114	21,218,232	-	2,030,202	23,248,434	24,176,053
4	Revenue	1,374,450,890	1,329,490,637	90,000	-	1,329,580,637	1,333,991,351
5	<i>Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue</i>	<i>658,755,572</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	-	-	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>
6	<i>Civil Fee Revenue</i>	<i>384,474,327</i>	<i>358,115,125</i>	<i>0</i>	-	<i>358,115,125</i>	<i>355,545,183</i>
7	<i>Court Operations Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>149,578,279</i>	<i>140,834,114</i>	-	-	<i>140,834,114</i>	<i>131,251,329</i>
8	<i>Civil Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>154,784,402</i>	<i>146,573,331</i>	-	-	<i>146,573,331</i>	<i>162,148,023</i>
9	<i>Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>25,360,674</i>	<i>23,582,039</i>	-	-	<i>23,582,039</i>	<i>24,682,669</i>
10	<i>Interest from SMIF</i>	<i>94,882</i>	<i>61,232</i>	-	-	<i>61,232</i>	<i>61,232</i>
11	<i>Sanctions and Contempt Fines</i>	<i>1,237,263</i>	<i>1,088,372</i>	<i>90,000</i>	-	<i>1,178,372</i>	<i>1,140,809</i>
12	<i>Miscellaneous Revenue</i>	<i>165,492</i>	<i>185,923</i>	-	-	<i>185,923</i>	<i>111,604</i>
13	General Fund Transfer	742,319,017	911,419,000	11,230,000	-	922,649,000	1,042,492,000
14	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	-	30,900,000	-	-	30,900,000	50,700,000
15	Reduction Offset Transfers	26,080,000	26,080,000	-	-	26,080,000	6,080,000
16	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	(4,256,953)	(4,427,415)	-	-	(4,427,415)	(3,886,415)
17	Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	2,138,592,954	2,293,462,222	11,320,000	-	2,304,782,222	2,429,376,935
18	Total Resources	2,218,251,067	2,314,680,454	11,320,000	2,030,202	2,328,030,656	2,453,552,988
19	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations						
20	Program 30 - Expenditures/Allocations	22,672,123	21,185,000	728,485	-	21,913,485	15,796,757
21	Program 30.05 - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,764,788	4,369,000	(57,671)	-	4,311,329	4,657,062
22	Program 30.15 - Trial Court Operations	18,907,335	16,816,000	786,156	-	17,602,156	11,139,695
23							
24	Program 45 - Expenditures/Allocations	2,174,214,014	2,276,358,161	10,932,958	(5,600,000)	2,281,691,119	2,423,834,985
25	Program 45.10 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,737,394,306	1,833,681,343	(803,376)	-	1,832,877,967	1,967,279,827
26	Program 45.25 - Comp. of Superior Court Judges	310,788,986	313,229,000	12,330,000	(5,600,000)	319,959,000	326,188,000
27	Program 45.35 - Assigned Judges	25,496,371	26,047,000	-	-	26,047,000	26,047,000
28	Program 45.45 - Court Interpreters	90,983,918	94,559,834	-	-	94,559,834	96,295,834
29	Program 45.55 - Grants	9,550,433	8,840,984	(593,665)	-	8,247,318	8,024,325
30	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	146,697	250,000	-	-	250,000	-
31	Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	2,197,032,835	2,297,793,161	11,661,443	(5,600,000)	2,303,854,604	2,439,631,742
32	Ending Fund Balance	21,218,232	16,887,294	(341,443)	7,630,202	24,176,053	13,921,246
33							
34	Fund Balance Detail						
35	Restricted Fund Balance	18,564,478	16,942,749	(268,159)	-	16,674,589	16,674,589
36	<i>Court Interpreter Program</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>	-	-	<i>14,734,148</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>
37	<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	<i>1,003,276</i>	<i>800,000</i>	<i>(268,159)</i>	-	<i>531,841</i>	<i>531,841</i>
38	<i>Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements</i>	<i>1,632,117</i>	<i>1,382,117</i>	-	-	<i>1,382,117</i>	<i>1,382,117</i>
39	<i>Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services</i>	<i>1,168,453</i>	-	-	-	-	-
40	<i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel</i>	<i>26,484</i>	<i>26,484</i>	-	-	<i>26,484</i>	<i>26,484</i>
41	Unrestricted Fund Balance	2,653,755	(55,455)	(73,284)	7,630,202	7,501,463	(2,753,344)
42							
43	Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	(58,439,881)	(4,330,939)	(341,443)	5,600,000	927,618	(10,254,807)

IMF -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	2012-2013 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2013-2014 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2014-15 (Estimated)	2015-16 (Estimated)
		A	B	C	D
1	Beginning Balance	48,128,575	44,827,741	26,207,006	2,854,369
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	11,547,967	4,410,172	2,349,362	
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	59,676,542	49,237,913	28,556,368	2,854,369
4	<i>Revenues</i>				
5	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	31,920,133	26,873,351	23,384,535	22,898,778
6	2% Automation Fund Revenue	15,753,200	15,242,700	14,471,411	13,916,340
7	Jury Instructions Royalties	518,617	445,365	484,063	484,063
8	Interest from SMIF	201,201	124,878	89,244	89,244
9	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	2,875	24,476	3,097	-
10	<i>Transfers</i>				
11	From State General Fund	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000	38,709,000
12	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	(23,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(594,000)
13	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)
14	Net Revenues and Transfers	50,114,026	47,428,770	43,150,350	62,106,425
15	Total Resources	109,790,568	96,666,683	71,706,718	64,960,794
16	<i>Expenditures</i>				
17	Allocation	71,923,000	73,961,680	71,466,600	71,213,852
18	Less: Unused Allocation	(7,123,067)	(4,082,985)	(2,911,832)	
19	Non-reimbursed VC Costs	-	-	-	6,259,586
20	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	162,894	580,982	297,581	297,581
21	Total Expenditures	64,962,827	70,459,677	68,852,349	77,771,019
22	Fund Balance	44,827,741	26,207,006	2,854,369	(12,810,225)
23	Revenue/Transfers Over/(Under) Exp	(14,848,801)	(23,030,907)	(25,701,999)	(15,664,594)

Item 4
Budget Change Proposal for Funding Trial Court Security Costs
(Action Item)

Issue

Should a growth factor be requested for court-provided security in FY 2016–2017? If so, what should the growth percentage be? What baseline amount should be used to calculate the growth percentage increase?

Background

When Criminal Justice Realignment occurred in 2011, funding for sheriff-provided security was transferred to the counties. As a result, in July of 2011 trial court base budgets were reduced by the total amount for sheriff-provided security – \$484.6 million – while a total of \$41.0 million remained in court base budgets for those with court-provided security costs (private security contracts, court attendants, marshals, and other costs such as alarm systems).

Currently, county-provided sheriff security receives growth funding from the Trial Court Security Growth Special Account, however, courts have not received any funding for increased costs for private security contracts since 2010–2011. Courts do, however, receive funding for benefit adjustments for marshal and court security staff through the benefit funding process.

In May 2014, Judge Earl appointed Shawn Landry to head a Security Growth Funding Working Group (Working Group) to determine a) whether the affected courts should receive growth funding and at what rate and b) what is the best source(s) for any such funding. The other members of the working group are Judge Elizabeth Johnson, David Yamasaki, Mary Beth Todd, Kimberley Flener, and Stephen Nash.

At the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting on September 26, 2014, the Working Group presented three options, which included its recommended options. The TCBAC considered all the options and voted unanimously to approve the Working Group's recommendation to send the security survey to the courts that have court-provided security and to develop a costing justification and/or methodology to support a 2015 spring BCP, based on the data received. Based on the TCBAC recommendation, a survey was sent out on October 22nd with a due date of November 7th. The Working Group met on December 4th to review the results of the survey. The group presented options and its recommendation at the TCBAC meeting on December 9, 2014. The committee voted unanimously to approve the Working Group's recommendation which was to submit a 2015 spring BCP to maintain funding at FY 2010–2011 security levels with the current cost estimated to be \$2.7 million and request a growth percentage increase starting in FY 2016–2017. The Working Group would provide a

recommendation to the TCBAC in January 2015 that defines the growth factor, and determine whether the baseline amount for any growth factor should be restricted in the future to be used only for court-provided security. The option also included more follow-up with courts on the information provided in the security survey in regards to the \$2.7 million current estimate.

The Working Group met on January 8, to consider options for a growth factor, and if the baseline amount for any growth factor should be restricted in the future. Each option reviewed by the Working Group, along with a description of the options, is provided below.

Options

Growth Factor

Option 1: The request for a growth rate increase for courts that provide security starting in 2016–2017, should be the same growth percentage that the county sheriff receives.

Option 2: The request for a growth rate increase for courts that provide security should be delayed until the submission of BCP's for 2016–2017 in September 2015. A 2015 spring BCP would still be submitted to maintain funding at FY 2010–2011 security levels. This option allows the Working Group more time to review the impacts of a growth factor if a 5 percent General Fund augmentation for court operations is to be received in 2016–2017.

Baseline for Growth Factor

Option 3: The baseline amount to calculate the growth factor would be based on funding needed to maintain 2010–2011 security levels. (Staff and private security would be based on court-provided information in the 2010–2011 Security Survey.) Positions and/or private security that were permanently reduced would not be included. Court security staff benefits funding received would be deducted. Equipment costs for screening stations, duress buttons, and wands would also not be included.

Option 4: The baseline amount to calculate the growth factor should be the court-provided security budget of \$41.0 million.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Security Growth Working Group recommends Options 2 and 3. The Working Group recommends that the BCP to be submitted in the spring of 2015 should provide for the maintenance of funding at 2010–2011 security levels and a separate BCP for a growth factor starting in 2016–2017 would be submitted in September 2015. The reason for the Working Group's recommendation that a separate BCP for a growth factor should be submitted in September of 2015 is to assess the impacts in the Workload Allocation Funding Model, if a 5 percent General Fund augmentation is to be received in 2016–2017. This review is important because the growth percentage that the county sheriff has received over the prior three years has

averaged around 2 percent, which is significantly less than a 5 percent General Fund augmentation.

Item 6
Amendments to the Statute Requiring a 2 Percent Reserve Held in the TCTF
(Action Item)

Issue

Should Government Code section 68502.5, the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve, be changed for 2015–2016? If so, what should the amendments be?

Background

On June 27, 2012, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 1021, which repealed the provisions in Government Code section 77209 related to urgent needs funding from the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF) and added Government Code section 68502.5, which requires that the Judicial Council set aside as a reserve an amount equal to 2 percent of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) appropriation in Program 45.10. In response to this new statute, the Judicial Council, at its August 31, 2012 meeting, approved the current policy with regard to the process, criteria, and required information for requesting supplemental funding from the reserve. This process modified what was approved by the council at its October 28, 2011 meeting as it related to requests for supplemental funding for urgent needs from the TCIF.

At the June 3, 2014 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting, Judge Earl appointed Michael Planet to head a 2 Percent Reserve Process Working Group with the goal of bringing options for possible changes back to the TCBAC. The other members of the working group are: Judge Laurie Earl, Presiding Judge Mark Cope, Presiding Judge Barry Goode, Mike Roddy, Sherri Carter, Mary Beth Todd, David Yamasaki, and Zlatko Theodorovic.

The TCBAC discussed options and recommendations at its July 7, 2014 meeting, brought forward by the 2 Percent Methodology Working Group to change the current Judicial Council–approved process for the allocation of the 2 percent state-level reserve in the TCTF. At the council’s business meeting on July 29, 2014, the committee recommended that the Judicial Council make changes to the 2 percent allocation process including the repeal of Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), which establishes the state-level reserve. The Judicial Council deferred the TCBAC recommendations presented for changes to the process for the allocation of the 2 percent state-level reserve until their October meeting, and requested the TCBAC work with other advisory bodies to provide further input to the council on the issues and recommendations presented in those items.

At the TCBAC meeting on September 26, the committee discussed options and recommendations for changes to the supplemental funding process from the 2 percent reserve, all of which originated from its working group, to be presented at the Judicial Council’s October 28 business meeting. The TCBAC recommended changes to expedite the distribution of the unexpended reserve funds to trial courts earlier in the fiscal year, and to

establish a process for courts to apply for funding for emergencies after these funds have been distributed. For 2015–2016, the TCBAC recommended proposing amendments to the statute that establishes the 2 percent state-level. The Judicial Council approved the following recommendations at its October 28, 2014, business meeting¹:

- 1) Starting in 2014–2015, approved the distribution in January, after the Judicial Council’s December business meeting, of 75 percent of the remaining Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) 2 percent reserve funds. From January 1 through March 15, the remaining 25 percent of the 2 percent reserve are available for court requests due to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses. These court requests are to be reviewed and recommended to the Judicial Council by a TCBAC working group. Any remaining funds are to be distributed back to the trial courts after March 15. The Judicial Council’s current approved supplemental funding process is to be updated by staff to reflect these changes.
- 2) Directed that court requests due to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses approved after March 15 and until June 30 be distributed to the court as a cash advance loan until the following fiscal year when the court, if necessary, could apply for supplemental funding from the TCTF 2 percent reserve at the Judicial Council’s October business meeting in order to repay the cash advance loan. These court requests are to be reviewed and recommended to the Judicial Council.
- 3) Directed the TCBAC, working with the Court Executive Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, and the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, to recommend proposed amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve, to be included as trailer bill language to the 2015 Budget Act. These recommended amendments are to be presented at the Judicial Council’s business meeting in either January or February 2015.

The 2 Percent Methodology Working Group met on November 20 and December 17, 2014, to consider options for amendments to the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve statute. Each option reviewed, along with a description of the option, is provided below.

Options for Amendments to the Statute that Establishes the 2 Percent Reserve

Option 1: Review the approved changes to the process for the allocation of the 2 percent state-level reserve by the Judicial Council at its October 28, 2014 meeting, in one year, prior to proposing any amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), which establishes the reserve.

¹ <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemM.pdf>

Option 2: The Judicial Council would set-aside one-half of one percent (.05%) instead of the current two-percent, of the total funds appropriated in TCTF Program 45.10 of the annual Budget Act. This one-half of one percent is based on a historical percentage that was set aside for urgent needs in the Trial Court Improvement Fund. (Government Code section 77209 was repealed and replaced with the current statute.)

Option 2 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

“Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall set aside ~~2~~ .5 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund....”

Option 3: The Judicial Council would determine the amount of the emergency reserve to be set aside annually and the process for managing the funds. The council might consider a percentage or flat amount based on prior years experience, or historical trends based on requests made for prior emergency set asides process. It also gives the council the discretion to determine the process and timing for courts to apply for emergency funding, and for distributing any unexpended funds.

Option 3 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

“Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall establish a percentage or amount to be set aside ~~2 percent~~ of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund...~~Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.~~”

Option 4: The Judicial Council would establish a percentage and/or amount to be set aside for an emergency reserve from the total funds appropriated in TCTF Program 45.10 of the annual Budget Act. This emergency reserve fund would be allocated directly from the TCTF. For this reason, there would be no need to return the monies to the trial courts. If emergency monies were unspent during the fiscal year, the amount in the fund would roll over. The result would be to reduce any additional amount set aside for emergency funding in the subsequent fiscal year and therefore increase the funding available for allocations to the trial

courts. This would replace the current model of allocating the funds, then reducing the allocation and then returning the allocation to the courts.

Option 4 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

~~“Prior to Upon the preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall establish a percentage or amount to be set aside 2 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund. . . . Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.”~~

Option 5: The Judicial Council would set-aside no more than one-half of one percent (.05%) instead of the current two percent, of the total funds appropriated in TCTF Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the 2014 Budget Act. This option also would give the council discretion to determine the process and timing for courts to apply for emergency funding. The emergency reserve set-aside would be capped at no more than \$9.5 million and would remain in the TCTF. Any unspent funds by the end of each fiscal year would be rolled over to the next fiscal year.

Option 5 Amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B):

~~“Prior to Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall set aside no more than 2 0.5 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual 2014 Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund. . . . Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.”~~

Recommendation

The working group recommends Option 5. The working group chose this option because it applies the historical percentage that was set aside for urgent needs in the Trial Court Improvement Fund, caps the amount at the 2014–2015 TCTF appropriation level in order to

eliminate annual allocation adjustments, and gives the Judicial Council discretion to determine the process and timing for courts to apply for emergency funding.

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B)

(B) Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall set aside 2 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund. These funds shall be administered by the Judicial Council and be allocated to trial courts for unforeseen emergencies, unanticipated expenses for existing programs, or unavoidable funding shortfalls. Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.

Item 4
Children's Waiting Room Distributions
(Action Item)

Issue

The Children's Waiting Room Work Group is recommending changes and additions to the Judicial Council's policy regarding children's waiting room distributions.

Background

Government Code section 70640 authorizes the Judicial Council to provide monthly children's waiting room (CWR) distributions to each court where a CWR has been established or where the court has elected to establish such a service. CWR distributions for individual courts are made from the respective court's first paper fee collections, which would otherwise support all courts' Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) base allocations. The distribution to a court must be no less than two dollars and no more than five dollars per paid first paper civil filing fee.

The council first adopted a policy and procedure on court requests for CWR distributions on June 27, 2014. On December 12, 2014, the council amended the process for courts to request CWR distributions to specify that courts applying for new CWR distributions can request that distributions begin no more than one year in advance of the planned opening date of the CWR, unless there are extenuating circumstances. In addition, it amended the process for courts to request CWR distributions to specify that once any court's request to decrease its existing CWR distribution is approved by the Judicial Council, the request can be implemented by Judicial Council staff, effective either January 1 or July 1. Attachment 4B displays the current policy.

On November 5, 2014, the TCBAC asked the work group to revisit the following recommended policy that was provided to the TCBAC for consideration on November 5, 2014:

If a court ceases to operate any CWRs, but has a plan to reopen at least one CWR within two years of the most recent cessation date, the court can retain any unspent CWR distributions. However, if the court does not have plans to reopen at least one CWR within two years, the court must return any unspent CWR distributions to the Trial Court Trust Fund within 90 days of the most recent cessation date.

The CWR Work Group members are Judges Laurie Earl and Elizabeth Johnson and Court Executive Officers Kimberly Flener (chair), Brian Taylor, Mary Beth Todd, Christina Volkers, and David Yamasaki.

Recommendations

The work group met on December 3 and 17, 2014 and are proposing three recommendations. The proposed changes and additions to the current policy are displayed in Attachment 4C.

1. Replace the language in section C of the current policy with the following language:
 - C. Temporarily or Permanently Ceasing CWR Operations

- Courts that cease operating all CWRs must notify the director of the JC Finance Office within 60 days of the cessation date. Unless a court provides notification and submits an application to continue receiving distributions while not operating a CWR within 60 days of the cessation date, the court's CWR distributions will be stopped as soon as practicable and the court will be required to return any unspent funds to the TCTF through a reduction to the court's TCTF allocation.
- An application for a continued distribution must include all the information required of courts applying for a new distribution (see section An above) as well as the amount of any unspent distributions.
- The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the Judicial Council on each court's application.
- For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the Judicial Council, any unspent CWR distributions shall be returned to the TCTF.

The main change to the current policy is to require courts to return any unspent CWR distributions if they do not choose to apply for a continued distribution.

2. Add section D, which would place a cap on the amount of unspent CWR distributions that courts can accumulate, as follows:

D. Cap on CWR Fund Balance

- In general, courts should request a distribution amount that will not result in accumulating CWR fund balances.
- Effective July 1, 2015, there shall be a cap on the amount of CWR fund balance that courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next. The cap shall be the amount of the highest annual distribution within the three most recent fiscal years.
- Courts that have a CWR fund balance greater than the cap (as described above) at the end of the fiscal year will have their allocation reduced by the amount above the cap in the subsequent fiscal year.
- The cap applies only to courts that have received at least 12 months of distributions in a fiscal year while operating a CWR.
- If a court wants a cap adjustment, it must submit a request explaining the extenuating circumstance and including its CWR expenditure plan to the director of the JC Finance Office for consideration by the TCBAC and the Judicial Council. The request must be received by the Finance Director within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year for which the adjustment is being requested.
- JC staff will report any allocation reductions to the TCBAC and the Judicial Council.

3. Add section E, which would be a one-time policy that would apply only to two courts, El Dorado and San Luis Obispo superior courts, that received distributions between January 1, 2006 and June 30, 2014 but did not operate a CWR during that time period, and require them to either return any unspent CWR distributions or apply for a continued distribution, as follows:

- E. Courts that have Received a Distribution but Never Operated a CWR
- Courts that received distributions between January 1, 2006 and June 30, 2014 but did not operate a CWR during that time period must either apply for a continued distribution by April 1, 2015 or have their distributions stopped as soon as practicable and return to the TCTF any unspent CWR distributions.

Current Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Policy

A. Applying for a New CWR Distribution

- A court's presiding judge or executive officer must submit a request to the director of the Judicial Council Finance Office 45 days prior to the date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
- The request must include the following information:
 - Date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
 - Requested effective date of the distribution (July 1 or January 1). If a court wants to begin receiving distributions more than one year in advance of the planned opening date of a CWR, the request should include an explanation of the extenuating circumstance(s).
 - The scheduled opening date of the CWR(s).
 - Description of the CWR(s).
 - The date when the court intends to make expenditures related to operating its CWR(s).
 - The requested distribution amount between \$2 and \$5. Courts can request the Judicial Council Finance Office to provide an estimate of annual distributions.
- The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.
- If the council approves that distributions begin prior to the operating of a CWR but the court does not operate a CWR six months after their planned opening date, the court must apply for a continued distribution.

B. Requesting a Decreased CWR Distribution Amount

- Any court's request to decrease its existing CWR distribution is approved by the Judicial Council and the request can be implemented by Judicial Council staff, effective either January 1 or July 1.

C. Applying to Continue Receiving a CWR Distribution While Not Operating a CWR

- Courts must apply to continue receiving a CWR distribution if they:
 - are currently receiving a distribution but have not operated a CWR since June 27, 2014.
 - received a distribution effective July 1, 2014 or after but have not operated a CWR six months after their planned opening date of the CWR.
- The request must follow the process for requesting a new distribution (see A above). In addition, a court must include in its request the amount of any unspent distributions.
- The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.
- For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the council, the council reserves the option of directing courts to return any unspent CWR distributions to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF).

Proposed Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Distribution and Fund Balance Policy

A. Applying for a New CWR Distribution

- A court's presiding judge or executive officer must submit a request to the director of the Judicial Council Finance Office 45 days prior to the date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
- The request must include the following information:
 - Date of the council meeting at which the court is requesting consideration.
 - Requested effective date of the distribution (July 1 or January 1). If a court wants to begin receiving distributions more than one year in advance of the planned opening date of a CWR, the request should include an explanation of the extenuating circumstance(s).
 - The scheduled opening date of the CWR(s).
 - Description of the CWR(s).
 - The date when the court intends to make expenditures related to operating its CWR(s).
 - The requested distribution amount between \$2 and \$5. Courts can request the Judicial Council Finance Office to provide an estimate of annual distributions.
- The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.
- If the council approves that distributions begin prior to the operating of a CWR but the court does not operate a CWR six months after their planned opening date, the court must apply for a continued distribution.

B. Requesting a Decreased CWR Distribution Amount

- Any court's request to decrease its existing CWR distribution is approved by the Judicial Council and the request can be implemented by Judicial Council staff, effective either January 1 or July 1.

~~C. Applying to Continue Receiving a CWR Distribution While Not Operating a CWR~~

- ~~• Courts must apply to continue receiving a CWR distribution if they:

 - are currently receiving a distribution but have not operated a CWR since June 27, 2014.
 - received a distribution effective July 1, 2014 or after but have not operated a CWR six months after their planned opening date of the CWR.~~
- ~~• The request must follow the process for requesting a new distribution (see A above). In addition, a court must include in its request the amount of any unspent distributions.~~
- ~~• The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the council on each court's request.~~
- ~~• For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the council, the council reserves the option of directing courts to return any unspent CWR distributions to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF).~~

C. Temporarily or Permanently Ceasing CWR Operations

- Courts that cease operating all CWRs must notify the director of the JC Finance Office within 60 days of the cessation date. Unless a court provides notification and submits an application to continue receiving distributions while not operating a CWR within 60 days of the cessation date, the court's CWR distributions will be stopped as soon as practicable and the court will be required to return any unspent funds to the TCTF through a reduction to the court's TCTF allocation.
- An application for a continued distribution must include all the information required of courts applying for a new distribution (see section An above) as well as the amount of any unspent distributions.
- The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the Judicial Council on each court's application.
- For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the Judicial Council, any unspent CWR distributions shall be returned to the TCTF.

D. Cap on CWR Fund Balance

- In general, courts should request a distribution amount that will not result in accumulating CWR fund balances.
- Effective July 1, 2015, there shall be a cap on the amount of CWR fund balance that courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next. The cap shall be the amount of the highest annual distribution within the three most recent fiscal years.
- Courts that have a CWR fund balance greater than the cap (as described above) at the end of the fiscal year will have their allocation reduced by the amount above the cap in the subsequent fiscal year.
- The cap applies only to courts that have received at least 12 months of distributions in a fiscal year while operating a CWR.
- If a court wants a cap adjustment, it must submit a request explaining the extenuating circumstance and including its CWR expenditure plan to the director of the JC Finance Office for consideration by the TCBAC and the Judicial Council. The request must be received by the Finance Director within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year for which the adjustment is being requested.
- JC staff will report any allocation reductions to the TCBAC and the Judicial Council.

E. Courts that have Received a Distribution but Never Operated a CWR

- Courts that received distributions between January 1, 2006 and June 30, 2014 but did not operate a CWR during that time period must either apply for a continued distribution by April 1, 2015 or have their distributions stopped as soon as practicable and return to the TCTF any unspent CWR distributions.