



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE SUBCOMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: December 14-15, 2015
Time: 10 am – 5 pm, December 14
9 am – 3 pm, December 15
Location: Veranda B Room, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95833
Public Call-In Number 877-820-7831 (listen-only passcode: 3775936)

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of November 12, 2015 Meeting Minutes

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Public Comment

The public may submit written comments for this meeting. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. Comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by December 11, 2015 at 10 am will be provided to advisory body members. The chair may elect to receive and consider comments that are received late. Written comments received in a timely manner will be provided to advisory members before the

start of the meeting or as soon as reasonably practicable during the meeting. Written comments are also posted to www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

December 14, 2015

10:10 – 10:30 am

Item 1

TCTF and IMF Encumbrance Report (Action Item)

Discussion of the report regarding encumbrances in the Trial Court Trust Fund and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as of June 30, 2015.

Presenters: Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Finance Office, JCC; Colin Simpson, Senior Budget Analyst, Finance Office, JCC

10:30 – 11:30 am

Item 2

FY 2016–2017 Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations from the Judicial Council, Trial Court Operations, and Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriations (Action Item)

Consideration of 2016–2017 allocation options for various programs funded from the TCTF.

Presenters: Zlatko Theodorovic; Colin Simpson

11:30 – 12:15 pm

Item 3

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Survey (Discussion Item)

Discussion of the results of the responses from trial courts.

Presenters: Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Cochair, Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee; Sherri R. Carter, Cochair, Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee; Lucy Fogarty, Senior Manager, Finance Office, JCC

12:15 – 1:00 pm

Break

1: 00 – 2:00 pm

Item 4

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund – Fiscal Status and Other Information (Discussion Item)

Discussion of the fiscal status of the IMF, including estimated fund balance for 2015–2016 and 2016–2017, and other information.

Presenters: Steven Chang, Manager, Finance Office, JCC; Catrayel Wood, Senior Budget Analyst, Finance Office, JCC

2:00 – 2:30 pm

Item 5

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Allocation Reduction Scenarios (Discussion Item)

Discussion of the allocation reduction scenarios provided by Judicial Council staff.

Presenters: Lucy Fogarty, Steven Chang, Catrayel Wood

2:30 – 5:00 pm

Item 6

Preliminary State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund 2016–2017 Allocation Recommendations (Action Item)

Deliberation on and adoption of preliminary recommendations.

Facilitators: Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Sherri R. Carter

December 15, 2015

Item 6 (continuation from December 14, if needed)

Preliminary State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund 2016–2017 Allocation Recommendations (Action Item)

Deliberation on and adoption of preliminary recommendations.

Facilitators: Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Sherri R. Carter

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Materials for December 14,-15 2015 Meeting
Table of Contents**

Draft Minutes from November 12, 2015 Meeting	1
<u>Discussion and Action Items</u>	
Item 1 – TCTF and IMF Encumbrance Report (Discussion Item)	3
Item 2 – FY 2016–2017 Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations from the Judicial Council, Trial Court Operations, and Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriations (Action Item)	59
Item 3 – State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Survey (Discussion Item)	92
Attachment 3B – Survey Questions	93
Attachment 3C – Court Clusters	94
Attachment 3D – Benefit Provided to the Judicial Branch, by Cluster (1-10 Scale), Sorted by Statewide Average	95
Attachment 3E – Number of Courts Receiving Benefit, by Cluster, Sorted by Total.....	96
Attachment 3F – Benefit Provided to Court, by Cluster (1-10 Scale), Sorted by Statewide Average.....	97
Attachment 3G – Survey Results for each individual Program/Project	98
Item 4 – State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund – Fiscal Status and Other Information (Discussion Item)	159
Attachment 4A1 – IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances, Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016–17 to 2019–20	161
Attachment 4A2 – IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances, Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016–17 to 2019–20	162
Attachment 4B – IMF – Pro Rata Reduction Scenarios.....	163
Attachment 4C –IMF – Fund Condition Statement	164

Item 6 – Preliminary State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund 2016–2017	
Allocation Recommendations (Action Item)	165
Item 4 – State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund – Fiscal Status and	
Other Information (Discussion Item)	
Attachment 4A1 Revised – IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances,	
Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016–17 to 2019–20	166
Attachment 4A2 Revised – IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances,	
Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016–17 to 2019–20	167
Attachment 4D – “Use” of IMF Funds by Courts	168
Attachment 4E – PowerPoint Slides: Telecommunications Program – LAN	
WAN Technology Refresh	169
Attachment 4F – Telecommunications Support	187
Attachment 4G – California Courts Protective Order Registry	190
Attachment 4H – California Courts Technology Center	192
Attachment 4I – Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health Case	
Management System	194
Attachment 4J – Data Integration	196
Attachment 4K – Enterprise Policy/Planning	198
Attachment 4L – Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite	200
Attachment 4M – Interim Case Management System	202
Attachment 4N – Jury Management System Grants	204
Attachment 4O – Uniform Civil Fee System	206



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REVENUE & EXPENDITURE SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 12, 2015
12:04 p.m. to 12:48 p.m.
Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Laurie M. Earl (Co-Chair), Hon. Cynthia Ming-mei Lee, Hon. Paul M. Marigonda, Hon. Brian L. McCabe.

Executive Officers: Ms. Sherri R. Carter (Co-Chair), Mr. Richard d. Feldstein, Mr. José Octavio Guillén, Mr. Michael D. Planet, and Mr. David H. Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Barry P. Goode, Hon. James E. Herman, Hon. Winifred Younge Smith, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, and Mr. Brian Taylor.

Others Present: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin; Zlatko Theodorovic; Mr. Steven Chang.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m. and roll was taken.

Approval of Minutes

The July 29, 2015 meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comment

No written comments were received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Proposed Change to the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 30.15 (Trial Court Operations) State Operations Appropriation and New Special Display Related to State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts (Action Item)

Action: A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to recommend that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee support the following recommendations:

1. Have the Judicial Council of California (JCC) continue to use (i) state operations appropriations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund and the Trial Court Trust Fund for JCC staff costs (including operating expenses and overhead) related to providing services to trial courts and (ii) local assistance appropriations related to state trial court funding from all funds for (a) direct distributions to court, (b) direct distributions to non-trial-court local entities, and (c) expenses made on behalf of the courts by JCC staff.
2. Consistent with Recommendation 1, have the JCC request that the Department of Finance change the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 30.15 (Trial Court Operations and Fi\$CAL program code 0140019) state operations appropriation reference item 001 to a new state trial court funding Fi\$CAL program code schedule, with the label to be determined by the DOF (possibly “Expenses on Behalf of Trial Courts), and a local assistance appropriation, with the reference item to be determined by the DOF.
3. Have JCC Finance staff request that the Governor include a new special display in the Governor’s Proposed Budget starting with the Governor’s Proposed Budget for 2016–2017 that provides additional detail on state trial court funding not distributed to trial courts, as provided in Attachment G.
4. Have JCC Finance staff revise the special display in the Governor’s Proposed Budget for 2015–2016 so that its relationship to the proposed new additional special display is clear or at least clearer to the public, as provided in Attachment F.
5. Have the JCC post additional information on the California Courts website that further elaborates on state trial court funding that is not distributed to courts.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on [Date].

Item 1
TCTF and IMF Encumbrance Report
(Action Item)

Issue

Does the TCBAC need the encumbrance report that is due March 31, 2016 before that date and through which date should the encumbrance information be provided? Attachment 1B contains the encumbrance report that the Judicial Council in August 2015 directed Judicial Council of California (JCC) staff to provide by September 30, 2015. The report was provided to the Chair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) on October 2, 2015. Attachment 1C is an additional table providing summary information by program regarding open contract amounts and preliminary estimated savings by fund source that was requested by the co-chairs of the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee.

Previous Judicial Council and Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Action

At its August 21, 2015, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation from the TCBAC requiring Judicial Council staff to provide the following reports to the TCBAC:

- a. By September 30th of each year, an annual report of outstanding encumbrances for all programs funded from the TCTF and/or IMF that support the trial courts, which should identify the amount and purpose of each encumbrance, the name of the vendor/contractor for which the funds are encumbered, the equipment or services related to each encumbrance, and estimated time frames for expenditure or disencumbrance; and
- b. By March 31st of each year, an updated encumbrance report, containing the same information as the September report and adding updates on the status of encumbrances contained in the September report as well as any new encumbrances that have occurred since the previous September.

The Judicial Council directed that open encumbrance information be provided for TCTF- and IMF-funded programs “that support the trial courts.” JCC staff assumed that all TCTF and IMF expenditures support the trial courts and, therefore, this report reflects all of the open encumbrances related to the TCTF and IMF as of June 30, 2015.

Options Regarding the March 31 Report Update

It is possible that the TCBAC will find it useful to have updated encumbrance information that is due March 31, 2016 before that date. The JCC Finance office has identified two options for the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee to consider recommending to the TCBAC regarding through what date information will be gathered for the updated encumbrance report due to the TCBAC on March 31:

1. If the report is to be submitted to the TCBAC on March 31, reflect the status of encumbrances through the month of February.

- a. The annual report provided for September 30 reflects information as of June 30, 2015 which was the intention of the working group that recommended the semi-annual reporting on encumbrances to the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee per its Chair. Though this meant the information was not as current or timely as information provided as of August 31, it served the function of tying the contract information to the fiscal year-end date, a significant fiscal year milestone.
 - b. As there are no fiscal year markers with as much significance at the halfway point of the fiscal year, staff suggest it would be most useful to provide the timeliest information as practicable for March 31. JCC Finance staff believe there is sufficient time for the encumbrance information through February to be compiled and disseminated to the JCC offices, allow the JCC offices two weeks to provide any necessary information, and to compile the offices' responses and finalize the report for submission to the TCBAC by March 31.
2. If the report needs to be submitted to the TCBAC before March 31, reflect the status of encumbrances through the most recent closed month to thirty days prior to the due date.
 - a. JCC Finance staff believe thirty days are needed for the encumbrance information to be compiled and disseminated to the JCC offices, allow the JCC offices two weeks to provide any necessary information, and to compile the offices' responses and finalize the report for submission to the TCBAC. Through the last closed month is recommended as month-end information can much more easily be recreated, if necessary, in the future to reconcile to an encumbrance report than information contained for a partial month.



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
October 2, 2015	Please Review
To	Deadline
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	N/A
From	Contact
Zlatko Theodorovic Director, JCC Finance	Steven Chang, Manager Judicial Council Finance Office 415-865-7195 phone steven.chang@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Report on Trial Court Trust Fund and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Open Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015	

As directed by the Judicial Council, Judicial Council staff submit this report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) on Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) open encumbrances as of June 30, 2015. At its August 21, 2015, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation from the TCBAC requiring Judicial Council staff to provide the following reports to the TCBAC:

- a. By September 30th of each year, an annual report of outstanding encumbrances for all programs funded from the TCTF and/or IMF that support the trial courts, which should identify the amount and purpose of each encumbrance, the name of the vendor/contractor for which the funds are encumbered, the equipment or services related to each encumbrance, and estimated time frames for expenditure or disencumbrance; and
- b. By March 31st of each year, an updated encumbrance report, containing the same information as the September report and adding updates on the status of encumbrances

Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin

October 2, 2015

Page 2

contained in the September report as well as any new encumbrances that have occurred since the previous September.

The Judicial Council directed that open encumbrance information be provided for TCTF- and IMF-funded programs “that support the trial courts.” Judicial Council staff assumed that all TCTF and IMF expenditures support the trial courts and, therefore, this report reflects all of the open encumbrances related to the TCTF and IMF as of June 30, 2015. The three attached tables provide, at a detail and summary level, the information required by the Judicial Council as well as additional information considered consistent with the intent of the report or beneficial in helping the TCBAC better contextualize the information. Table A provides detailed line-by-line information related to the open encumbrances and two summary tables provide summary information regarding the number of open contracts, amounts, and preliminary estimated savings by fund (Table B) and by Judicial Council office (Table C). Columns E, G, H, I, J, and L of Table A provide the required vendor, good or service, purpose and description, amount, and time frame information. Each line item in Table A also identifies the following:

- Judicial Council office;
- Program title;
- Fiscal year in which the contract was encumbered;
- Court/county/entity it is encumbered on behalf of;
- Fund source;
- “Restricted” contract items when funds are restricted by statute, council policy, or charges to be refunded to courts;
- Whether or not there is a preliminary estimate of savings related to the encumbrance, the date savings would be realized, and the amount; and
- Additional comments.

The preliminary savings estimates provided by the offices reflect only those amounts the offices have a high confidence level for (e.g., amounts already disencumbered after June 30, the final invoice has been received from the vendor, etc.). Additional savings are expected but, due to a variety of reasons (e.g., work is still in progress, invoicing is still in progress, vendor has up to a year to submit billing for extraordinary expenses, etc.) some savings cannot reliably be estimated at this point in time. More information about the programs listed in this report can be found in their program descriptions provided through the following links to fiscal year 2014–2015 reports to the Judicial Council:

- For TCTF-funded programs, see Attachment D beginning on page 14 of this TCBAC report of recommendations provided to the Judicial Council at its June 27, 2014, business meeting <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140627-itemG.pdf>.

Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin

October 2, 2015

Page 3

- For IMF-funded programs, see Attachment D beginning on page 20 of this TCBAC report of recommendations provided to the Judicial Council at its April 25, 2014, business meeting <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140425-item2.pdf>.

Attachments

1. Table A: FY 2013–14 and FY 2014–15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015
2. Table B: Summary of FY 2013–14 and FY 2014–15 TCTF and IMF Contracts/Encumbrances by Fund as of June 30, 2015
3. Table C: Summary of FY 2013–14 and FY 2014–15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances by JCC Office as of June 30, 2015

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Audit Services	Audit Services	2014-15	IMF	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	Not Specific	Office Supplies	Goods
2	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Bernardino	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
3	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
4	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
5	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Bernardino	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
6	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Diego	Facility Modification	Services
7	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
8	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
9	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
10	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Diego	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
11	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
12	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
13	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	CARDNO ATC	San Bernardino	Facility Modification	Services
14	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	CHAMBLIN-LANDES CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Kern	Facility Modification	Services
15	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Napa	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
16	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Santa Cruz	Facility Modification	Services
17	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Lake	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
18	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	San Mateo	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
19	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	San Benito	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
20	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Humboldt	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
21	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Contra Costa	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Dis-encumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1		38.39	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
2	Maintenance encumbrance for approved court-funded lease.	51.09	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	51	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
3		221.04	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
4		747.73	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
5	Maintenance encumbrance for approved court-funded lease.	412.84	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	413	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
6		715.99	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
7		11,264.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
8		12,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
9		72,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
10		57,754.02	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	57,754	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
11		96,582.12	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
12		175,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
13		3,288.65	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
14		1,726,533.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
15		330.24	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	330	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
16		402.65	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
17		654.08	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	654	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
18		865.26	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	865	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
19		1,493.31	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	1,493	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
20		4,057.46	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	4,057	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
21		10,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	10,000	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
22	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	San Francisco	Facility Modification	Services
23	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	San Francisco	Facility Modification	Services
24	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Solano	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
25	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Santa Cruz	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
26	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Alameda	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
27	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	FRASER SEIPLE ARCHITECTS	San Luis Obispo	Facility Modification	Services
28	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	HPM ENGINEERING & INSPECTION	San Luis Obispo	Facility Modification	Services
29	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	KITCHELL CONTRACTORS, INC.	San Benito	Facility Modification	Services
30	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Merced	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
31	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Sacramento	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
32	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	El Dorado	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
33	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Butte	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
34	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Kings	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
35	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Tehama	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
36	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	El Dorado	Facility Modification	Services
37	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Stanislaus	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
38	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Yolo	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
39	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Placer	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
40	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	El Dorado	Facility Modification	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
22		10,610.57	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
23		12,533.95	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
24		21,777.90	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	21,778	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
25		27,268.98	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	27,269	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
26		66,707.04	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	66,707	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
27		2,665.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
28		9,583.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
29		9.82	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
30		204.18	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	204	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
31		334.04	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	334	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
32		1,394.50	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	1,395	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
33		2,388.91	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	2,389	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
34		2,500.00	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	2,500	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
35		3,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	3,000	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
36		3,816.63	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
37		9,458.75	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	9,459	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
38		9,805.41	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	9,805	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
39		19,379.81	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	19,312	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
40		21,350.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
41	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Fresno	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
42	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Fresno	Facility Modification	Services
43	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
44	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
45	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
46	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
47	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
48	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
49	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	San Bernardino	Facility Modification	Services
50	REFM	Court Facilities	2013-14	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
51	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Bernardino	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
52	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Bernardino	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
53	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Bernardino	Facility Modification	Services
54	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Diego	Facility Modification	Services
55	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Bernardino	Facility Modification	Services
56	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
57	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
58	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	San Diego	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
59	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
60	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ABM ONSITE SERVICES-WEST, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
61	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ALLSTEEL, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Goods & Services
62	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ALLSTEEL, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Goods & Services
63	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ALLSTEEL, INC.	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Goods & Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
41		53,851.52	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	2/1/2016	53,801	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
42		74,229.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
43		2.74	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
44		4.20	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
45		6.28	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
46		198.82	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
47		447.53	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
48		504.89	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
49		3,632.67	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
50		100,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
51		5.31	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	5	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
52		43.15	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	43	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
53		18,792.43	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
54		25,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
55		31,371.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
56		42,775.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
57		49,000.50	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
58		67,146.65	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	66,179	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
59		116,675.49	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
60		548,968.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
61		30,342.60	Restricted	TBD	N			
62		53,996.54	Restricted	TBD	Y	1/1/2016	53,997	Court elected to cancel this PO. Will be disencumbered.
63		87,243.98	Restricted	TBD	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
64	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	CHAMBLIN-LANDES CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Kern	Facility Modification	Services
65	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	DESIGN SPACE MODULAR BUILDINGS, INC.	Inyo	Facility Modification	Services
66	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	San Mateo	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
67	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Mendocino	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
68	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	San Francisco	Facility Modification	Services
69	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Lake	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
70	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Humboldt	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
71	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Napa	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
72	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Contra Costa	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
73	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Solano	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
74	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Alameda	Facility Modification	Services
75	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	San Francisco	Facility Modification	Services
76	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Santa Cruz	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
77	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Alameda	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
78	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Monterey	Facility Modification	Services
79	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ENOVITY, INC.	Alameda	Facility Modification	Services
80	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	GUNLOCKE COMPANY, LLC	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Goods
81	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	MARK CAVAGNERO ASSOCIATES	Monterey	Facility Modification	Services
82	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	MARK SCOTT CONSTRUCTION, INC.	San Francisco	Facility Modification	Services
83	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	San Joaquin	Facility Modification	Services
84	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Kings	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
64		792,364.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
65		42,950.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract is task order under a master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
66		63.78	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	64	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
67		2,860.66	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	2,544	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
68		4,516.90	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
69		5,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	5,000	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
70		9,785.03	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	9,785	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
71		13,439.62	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	11,501	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
72		19,969.15	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	19,969	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
73		24,433.17	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	23,866	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
74		26,690.40	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
75		30,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
76		33,149.17	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	31,843	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
77		84,945.25	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	73,260	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
78		97,500.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
79		221,338.60	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
80		196,223.95	Restricted	TBD	Y	1/1/2016	196,224	Court elected to cancel this PO. Will be disencumbered.
81		52,500.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
82		179,117.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
83		75.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
84		2,500.00	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	2,500	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
85	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Tehama	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
86	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Shasta	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
87	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	El Dorado	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
88	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Butte	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
89	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Yolo	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
90	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Merced	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
91	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Stanislaus	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
92	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Fresno	Facility Modification	Services
93	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Placer	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
94	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Placer	Facility Modification	Services
95	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Sacramento	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
96	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Fresno	Facility Modification	Services
97	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Fresno	Expenditures for services including minor (less than \$5,000) maintenance and repairs to facilities and/or equipment	Services
98	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Fresno	Facility Modification	Services
99	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE, INC.	Sacramento	Facility Modification	Services
100	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Diego	Facility Modification	Services
101	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Diego	Facility Modification	Services
102	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Diego	Facility Modification	Services
103	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Diego	Facility Modification	Services
104	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SWINERTON BUILDERS	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
105	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SWINERTON BUILDERS	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
106	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SWINERTON BUILDERS	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
85		3,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	3,000	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
86		3,396.17	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	3,196	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
87		8,497.60	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	8,008	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
88		8,698.29	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	7,596	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
89		9,835.31	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	9,779	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
90		12,922.14	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	8,090	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
91		14,848.76	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	14,100	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
92		17,631.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
93		23,814.80	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	23,140	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
94		25,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
95		33,420.78	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	26,700	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
96		50,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
97		55,926.18	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	55,395	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
98		59,500.00	Unrestricted	TBD	Y	6/1/2016	59,500	Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
99		358,599.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Estimated date of contract is unknown, because contract is ongoing with options to renew.
100		11,849.00	Restricted	TBD	N			
101		36,442.00	Restricted	TBD	N			
102		67,849.00	Restricted	TBD	N			
103		108,782.00	Restricted	TBD	N			
104		298,178.90	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
105		387,578.75	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
106		404,863.20	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
107	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SWINERTON BUILDERS	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
108	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SWINERTON BUILDERS	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
109	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	SWINERTON BUILDERS	Los Angeles	Facility Modification	Services
110	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	VINCOR CONSTRUCTION, INC.	San Bernardino	Facility Modification	Services
111	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ZUMWALT CONSTRUCTION, INC.	San Bernardino	Facility Modification	Services
112	REFM	Court Facilities	2014-15	TCTF	ZUMWALT CONSTRUCTION, INC.	San Bernardino	Facility Modification	Services
113	CFCC	CAC Training	2014-15	TCTF	JUVENILE LAW SOCIETY	Judicial Council	Consultants-Speakers	Services
114	CFCC	CAC Training	2014-15	TCTF	PARTY UNLIMITED RENTAL	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
115	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	ALAMEDA COUNTY HEALTHCARE SER./ALAMEDA COUNTY CASA	Alameda	Governmental Grants	Services
116	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	ALLIANCE FOR COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATIONS	Mariposa	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
117	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	AMADOR COMMUNITY FOUNDATION	Amador	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
118	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA A VOICE FOR CHILDREN	Napa	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
119	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF CONTRA COSTA CO	Contra Costa	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
120	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF DEL NORTE CO	Del Norte	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
121	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF EL DORADO COUNTY	El Dorado	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
122	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF FRESNO & MADERA COUNTIES, INC.	Fresno	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
123	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF HUMBOLDT CO	Humboldt	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
124	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF IMPERIAL COUNTY	Imperial	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
125	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF KERN CO	Kern	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
126	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF KINGS COUNTY, INC.	Kings	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
127	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF LOS ANGELES	Los Angeles	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
128	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF MENDOCINO COUNTY	Mendocino	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
129	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF MERCED COUNTY	Merced	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
130	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF MONTEREY COUNTY	Monterey	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
131	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF ORANGE COUNTY	Orange	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
132	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SACRAMENTO COUNTY	Sacramento	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
133	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SAN BENITO COUNTY, INC.	San Benito	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
134	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, INC.	San Luis Obispo	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
135	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SAN MATEO COUNTY	San Mateo	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
136	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	Santa Barbara	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
137	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	Santa Cruz	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
138	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SISKIYOU COUNTY	Siskiyou	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
139	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SOLANO COUNTY	Solano	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
140	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF SONOMA COUNTY	Sonoma	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
141	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF STANISLAUS COUNTY	Stanislaus	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
142	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF TULARE COUNTY	Tulare	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
143	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CASA OF VENTURA COUNTY	Ventura	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
144	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CHILD ADVOCATES OF NEVADA COUNTY	Nevada	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
145	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CHILD ADVOCATES OF PLACER COUNTY	Placer	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
146	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CHILD ADVOCATES OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	San Bernardino	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
147	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	CHILD ADVOCATES OF SILICON VALLEY	Santa Clara	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
148	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	LASSEN FAMILY SERVICES, INC.	Lassen	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
149	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	MARIN ADVOCATES FOR CHILDREN	Marin	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
107		469,560.94	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
108		2,255,156.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
109		2,379,808.40	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
110		158,129.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
111		222,296.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
112		225,704.00	Restricted	TBD	N			Contract completion estimate based on task order under master agreement. Task order expiration may be extended.
113		5,000.00	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	N			
114		209.15	Unrestricted	11/17/2015	Y	11/17/2015	209	Request to Final Close 9/17/15
115		16,900.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
116		25,600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
117		25,600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
118		24,400.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
119		21,275.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
120		15,650.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
121		19,150.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
122		28,875.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
123		12,600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
124		19,150.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
125		21,275.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
126		11,700.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
127		21,275.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
128		28,325.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
129		18,800.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
130		29,250.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
131		27,600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
132		16,900.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
133		12,600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
134		18,250.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
135		18,250.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
136		18,250.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
137		14,975.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
138		20,150.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
139		14,300.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
140		14,300.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
141		14,300.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
142		18,250.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
143		14,300.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
144		20,150.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
145		19,900.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
146		16,900.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
147		24,475.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
148		15,650.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
149		30,600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
150	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	NORTHERN VALLEY CATHOLIC SOCIAL SERVICE	Shasta	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
151	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	NORTHERN VALLEY CATHOLIC SOCIAL SERVICE	Butte	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
152	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	PLUMAS CRISIS INTERVENTION & RESOURCE CENTER	Plumas	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
153	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	SAN FRANCISCO CASA	San Francisco	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
154	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION COUNCIL	San Joaquin	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
155	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	TRAINING EMPLOYMENT & VOICES FOR CHILDREN, INC., SAN DIEGO COUNTY CASA	Modoc	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
156	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	VOICES FOR CHILDREN, INC., SAN DIEGO COUNTY CASA	San Diego	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
157	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	WILD IRIS FAMILY COUNSELING & CRISIS CENTER	Inyo	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
158	CFCC	CASA	2014-15	TCTF	YOLO COUNTY COURT APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATES PROGRAM	Yolo	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
159	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	ATTORNEYS FOR FAMILIES & CHILDREN	San Joaquin	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
160	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	BENTLEY, KELLY S.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
161	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	BRIMER, DENNIS	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
162	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	BROOKS, DAVID A.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
163	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	CHILDREN'S LAW CENTER OF CALIFORNIA	Sacramento	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
164	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	CHILDREN'S LAW CENTER OF CALIFORNIA	Los Angeles	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
165	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	DAY, RENEE C.	Amador	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
166	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	DEPENDENCY ADVOCACY CENTER	Santa Clara	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
167	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL GROUP OF SAN DIEGO	San Diego	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
168	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL SERVICES	Stanislaus	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
169	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL SERVICES	Sonoma	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
170	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL SERVICES	Marin	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
171	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	HUNT, KIMBERLY G.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
172	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	JULIE BACHMAN A LAW CORP.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
173	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	LAW OFFICE OF DAVID T. LUDINGTON	Plumas	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
174	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	LEGAL AID OF MARIN	Marin	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
175	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	LONDON, LORI G.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
176	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	PASSALACQUA, JOHN P.	Lake	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
177	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	PASSALACQUA, JOHN P.	Lake	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
178	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	PROUTY, DOUGLAS M.	Plumas	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
179	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	PROUTY, DOUGLAS M.	Plumas	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
180	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	TEARPAK, KORI A.	Amador	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
181	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	TINGLER, JULIE A.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
182	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2013-14	TCTF	WILSON-TANCRETO, JENNIFER LYNN	Mendocino	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
183	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	ATTORNEYS FOR FAMILIES & CHILDREN	San Joaquin	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
184	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	BENTLEY, KELLY S.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
185	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	BRIMER, DENNIS	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
186	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	BRIMER, DENNIS	Amador	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
187	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	BROOKS, DAVID A.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
188	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	CARTY, MICHAEL A.	Santa Barbara	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
189	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	CHILDREN'S LAW CENTER OF CALIFORNIA	Los Angeles	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
190	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	CHILDREN'S LAW CENTER OF CALIFORNIA	Sacramento	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
191	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	CHILDREN'S LAW CENTER OF CALIFORNIA	Los Angeles	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
192	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	DEPENDENCY ADVOCACY CENTER	Santa Clara	Payments to Private Counsel	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Dis-encumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
150		17,900.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
151		21,775.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
152		15,650.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
153		14,300.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
154		14,300.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
155		12,600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
156		41,275.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
157		20,900.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
158		11,700.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
159		6,358.75	Unrestricted	8/31/2014	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
160		1,500.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
161		1,200.00	Unrestricted	4/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
162		1,500.00	Unrestricted	4/30/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
163		30,854.06	Unrestricted	4/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
164		73,385.93	Unrestricted	8/30/2014	N			Conflict expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
165		1,900.88	Unrestricted	1/31/2014	N			Service compensation - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
166		10,236.21	Unrestricted	8/31/2014	N			Conflict expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
167		191,696.47	Unrestricted	8/31/2014	N			Extraordinary expense and adjustment to compensation - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
168		455.00	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
169		600.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			Conflict expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
170		1,200.00	Unrestricted	5/31/2016	N			Conflict expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
171		2,248.50	Unrestricted	4/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
172		3,000.00	Unrestricted	4/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
173		4,000.00	Unrestricted	4/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
174		452.07	Unrestricted	12/31/2013	Y	11/30/2015	452	Request to Final Close 9/22/15
175		3,000.00	Unrestricted	4/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
176		0.04	Unrestricted	5/31/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
177		1,440.63	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
178		95.00	Unrestricted	7/31/2014	Y	11/30/2015	95	Request to Final Close 9/22/15
179		8,000.00	Unrestricted	5/31/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
180		6,141.70	Unrestricted	4/30/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
181		1,500.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2016	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
182		910.11	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
183		613,657.18	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
184		35,632.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
185		25,240.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
186		30,480.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
187		25,240.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
188		112,416.69	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
189		32,025.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
190		271,547.53	Unrestricted	8/31/2016	N			Conflict and Extraordinary Expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
191		2,191,579.11	Unrestricted	8/31/2015	N			Conflict and Extraordinary Expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
192		630,395.67	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			Conflict and Extraordinary Expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
193	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL GROUP OF SAN DIEGO	San Diego	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
194	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL SERVICES	Stanislaus	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
195	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL SERVICES	Marin	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
196	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	DEPENDENCY LEGAL SERVICES	Sonoma	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
197	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	EAST BAY CHILDREN'S LAW OFFICES, INC.	Alameda	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
198	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	GILLESPIE, JACQUELINE D.	Sonoma	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
199	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	HUNT, KIMBERLY G.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
200	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	IMPERIAL COUNTY	Imperial	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
201	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	JULIE BACHMAN A LAW CORP.	El Dorado	Other CAC Costs	Services
202	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	JUVENILE DEPENDENCY COUNSELORS	Alameda	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
203	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	KELLY & HUBNER, LLP	Santa Barbara	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
204	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	KIRK, KAROLYN D.	Amador	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
205	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	KLEIN, THERESA G.	San Luis Obispo	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
206	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	LAW FOUNDATION OF SILICON VALLEY	Santa Clara	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
207	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	LAW OFFICE OF DALE S. WILSON	Stanislaus	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
208	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	LAW OFFICE OF DALE S. WILSON	Sacramento	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
209	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	LAW OFFICE OF DAVID T. LUDINGTON	Plumas	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
210	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	LONDON, LORI G.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
211	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	LOS ANGELES DEPENDENCY LAWYERS, INC.	Los Angeles	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
212	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	MAHONEY, MARIANNE	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
213	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	MASON & MORRISON	Mendocino	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
214	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	MELTZER, JEREMY	Mendocino	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
215	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	NORTH COUNTY DEFENSE TEAM	Santa Barbara	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
216	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	PASSALACQUA, JOHN P.	Lake	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
217	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	PASSALACQUA, JOHN P.	Mendocino	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
218	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	PATTERSON, ROBERT M.	Santa Cruz	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
219	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	PERRY & ASSOCIATES	Stanislaus	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
220	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	PROUTY, DOUGLAS M.	Plumas	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
221	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	RAPER, FREDERICK S.	Lake	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
222	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	RUNKLE, ROGER A.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
223	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	San Joaquin	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
224	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	SNYDER, JACQUELINE	Lake	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
225	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	SOLANO COUNTY	Solano	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
226	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	SPICER, ADAM T.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
227	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	STAHNKE & ASSOCIATES	Solano	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
228	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	STANISLAUS COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER	Stanislaus	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
229	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	STOREY, THOMAS W.	Imperial	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
230	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	TEARPAK, KORI A.	Amador	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
231	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	TINGLER, JULIE A.	El Dorado	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
232	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	VATCHKOVA, EVGUENIA	Santa Cruz	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
233	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	2014-15	TCTF	WILSON-TANCRETO, JENNIFER LYNN	Mendocino	Payments to Private Counsel	Services
234	CFCC	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	TRANSCEND	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
235	CFCC	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	TRANSCEND	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
236	CFCC	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	TRANSCEND	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
237	CFCC	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	TRANSCEND	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
193		2,222,292.20	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
194		44,548.75	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
195		108,583.18	Unrestricted	11/30/2016	N			
196		187,901.72	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
197		530,263.19	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
198		189,540.36	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
199		20,788.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
200		99,658.36	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
201		20,788.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
202		458,884.78	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
203		273,672.50	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
204		30,479.17	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
205		240,666.68	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
206		548,175.51	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
207		141,303.36	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
208		261,647.91	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
209		46,096.00	Unrestricted	7/31/2016	N			
210		20,788.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
211		1,508,736.33	Unrestricted	8/31/2015	N			Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
212		17,816.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
213		107,991.62	Unrestricted	2/28/2016	N			
214		77,487.40	Unrestricted	2/28/2016	N			
215		288,059.25	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
216		105,044.00	Unrestricted	7/31/2016	N			
217		149,135.00	Unrestricted	2/28/2016	N			
218		216,253.38	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
219		119,286.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
220		67,472.00	Unrestricted	7/31/2016	N			
221		95,044.00	Unrestricted	7/31/2016	N			
222		35,632.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
223		49,106.02	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
224		99,642.82	Unrestricted	7/31/2016	N			
225		200,931.50	Unrestricted	2/28/2016	N			
226		20,788.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
227		234,421.25	Unrestricted	2/28/2016	N			
228		58,737.36	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
229		100,198.76	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			
230		30,479.17	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
231		37,132.00	Unrestricted	11/30/2015	N			Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
232		172,382.13	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			Conflict & Extraordinary expense - Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
233		75,322.00	Unrestricted	2/28/2016	N			Vendor has up to a year to submit billing.
234	Translation of DV materials	262.50	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
235	Translation of DV materials	1,775.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
236	Translation of DV materials to be adopted by JC 10/15	4,037.50	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
237	Translation of DV materials to be adopted by JC 10/15	15,602.38	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
238	CFCC	Educational Programs	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
239	CFCC	Educational Programs	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
240	CFCC	Educational Programs	2014-15	IMF	CALIF. ASSOCIATION OF YOUTH COURTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
241	CFCC	Equal Access Fund	2014-15	TCTF	STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA	Judicial Council	Other Non-Governmental Grants	Services
242	CFCC	Equal Access Fund	2014-15	TCTF	TRANSCEND	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
243	CFCC	Family Law Information Center	2013-14	TCTF	FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Fresno	Governmental Grants	Services
244	CFCC	Family Law Information Center	2014-15	TCTF	FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Fresno	Governmental Grants	Services
245	CFCC	Family Law Information Center	2014-15	TCTF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Governmental Grants	Services
246	CFCC	Family Law Information Center	2014-15	TCTF	SUTTER COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Sutter	Governmental Grants	Services
247	CFCC	Interactive Software - Self-Represented Litigants Electronic Forms	2014-15	IMF	CAPSTONE PRACTICE SYSTEM, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
248	CFCC	Interactive Software - Self-Represented Litigants Electronic Forms	2014-15	IMF	PRO BONO NET, INC.	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Software	Services
249	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2013-14	TCTF	BUTTE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Butte	Governmental Grants	Services
250	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2013-14	TCTF	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Contra Costa	Governmental Grants	Services
251	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2013-14	TCTF	FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Fresno	Governmental Grants	Services
252	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2013-14	TCTF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Governmental Grants	Services
253	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2014-15	TCTF	BUTTE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Butte	Governmental Grants	Services
254	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2014-15	TCTF	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Contra Costa	Governmental Grants	Services
255	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2014-15	TCTF	FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Fresno	Governmental Grants	Services
256	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2014-15	TCTF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Governmental Grants	Services
257	CFCC	Model Self-Help	2014-15	TCTF	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Francisco	Governmental Grants	Services
258	CFCC	Publications	2014-15	IMF	TEXAS LAWYERS FOR CHILDREN	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Software	Services
259	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2013-14	TCTF	GREATER BAKERSFIELD LEGAL ASSISTANCE, INC.	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
260	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	FLYNN, MARY LAVERY	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
261	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	GREATER BAKERSFIELD LEGAL ASSISTANCE, INC.	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
262	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil Representation	2014-15	TCTF	JUSTICE & DIVERSITY CENTER OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF S.F.	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
263	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Kern	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
264	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil Representation	2014-15	TCTF	LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
265	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF SAN DIEGO, INC.	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
266	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
267	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	LOS ANGELES CENTER FOR LAW & JUSTICE	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
268	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
269	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
270	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
271	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	NORTHWEST PROFESSIONAL CONSORTIUM, INC.	Not Specific	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
272	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Diego	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
273	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Francisco	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
274	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil	2014-15	TCTF	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Santa Barbara	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
275	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	ALAMEDA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Alameda	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
276	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	ALPINE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Alpine	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
238		11,064.48	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	11/30/2015	11,064	Final invoice submitted 12/14; Request to Final Close 9/21/15
239		50,385.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			Final invoice submitted 8/31/15 with request to final close after payment
240		2,500.00	Unrestricted	8/31/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/21/15
241	Funds to be distributed to legal services agencies for civil legal aid	1,346,494.66	Restricted	6/30/2015	N			The contract is based on presumed filing fees, which have been lower than originally projected. Once final revenue has been determined, those funds will be paid to the State Bar and any remaining contractual amount will be disencumbered. This will not provide any funds since it will merely be matching an encumbrance to the fees collected.
242	Preparation of materials and translations for partnerships between courts and legal services agencies	16,625.00	Restricted	12/31/2015	N			
243	Court provides self help services	3,297.32	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	Y	11/30/2015	3,297	
244	Court provides self help services	21,964.58	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
245	Court provides self help services	49,652.93	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
246	Court provides self help services	16,757.85	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
247	Adaptation of Hotdocs programs for local courts	4,400.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
248	Provision of server, middleware and technical support for Hotdocs programs.	36,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
249	Court provides self help services	2,929.48	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	N			
250	Court provides self help services	24,988.06	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	N			
251	Court provides self help services	310.75	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	N			
252	Court provides self help services	23,732.67	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	N			
253	Court provides self help services	116,002.66	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	N			
254	Court provides self help services	191,400.00	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	N			
255	Court provides self help services	76,560.68	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	N			
256	Court provides self help services	93,535.68	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	N			
257	Court provides self help services	75,641.60	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	N			
258	Licensing fee for CalDog website	9,500.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
259		0.01	Restricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/21/15
260		25,425.00	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
261		127,045.83	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
262		203,061.13	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
263		50,244.12	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
264		252,167.95	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
265		946,049.35	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
266		123,643.58	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
267		407,772.15	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
268		11,581.19	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
269		50,331.22	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
270		1,102,397.49	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
271		150,000.00	Restricted	12/31/2015	N			
272		279,430.01	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
273		17,391.08	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
274		132,111.34	Restricted	9/30/2015	N			
275		17,429.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
276		167.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	Y	12/31/2015	167	

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
277	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	AMADOR SUPERIOR COURT	Amador	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
278	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	BUTTE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Butte	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
279	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	CALAVERAS COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Calaveras	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
280	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Contra Costa	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
281	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	DEL NORTE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Del Norte	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
282	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Fresno	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
283	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Kern	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
284	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	LASSEN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Lassen	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
285	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
286	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	MADERA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Madera	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
287	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	MARIPOSA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Mariposa	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
288	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	MERCED COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Merced	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
289	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	MODOC COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Modoc	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
290	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	MONO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Mono	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
291	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	ORANGE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Orange	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
292	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	PLACER COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Placer	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
293	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	PLUMAS COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Plumas	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
294	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Riverside	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
295	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SACRAMENTO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Sacramento	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
296	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SAN BENITO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Benito	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
297	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Diego	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
298	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Francisco	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
299	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Joaquin	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
300	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Mateo	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
301	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Santa Barbara	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
302	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SHASTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Shasta	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
303	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SIERRA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Sierra	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
304	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SISKIYOU COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Siskiyou	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
305	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SOLANO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Solano	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
306	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SONOMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Sonoma	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
307	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	STANISLAUS COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Stanislaus	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
308	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	SUTTER COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Sutter	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
309	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	TEHAMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Tehama	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
310	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	TRINITY COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Trinity	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
311	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	TULARE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Tulare	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
312	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	TUOLUMNE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Tuolumne	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
313	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	VENTURA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Ventura	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
314	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	2014-15	IMF	YOLO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Yolo	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
315	CFCC	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	2014-15	IMF	LLOP, CRISTINA	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
316	CFCC	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	2014-15	IMF	TRANSCEND	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
317	CFCC	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	2014-15	IMF	TRANSCEND	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
318	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Assignments	Services
319	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
320	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
321	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Assignments	Services
322	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Assignments	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
277		5,130.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
278		20,499.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
279		1,292.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
280		138,462.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
281		3,928.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	Y	12/31/2015	3,928	
282		19,140.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
283		84,684.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
284		4,768.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
285		304,175.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
286		5,375.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
287		2,450.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
288		23,972.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
289		1,324.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
290		1,828.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
291		1.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
292		1.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
293		2,884.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
294		81,955.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
295		2.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
296		2,643.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
297		194,582.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
298		50,226.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
299		34,319.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
300		36,278.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
301		5,139.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
302		24,412.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
303		470.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
304		6,208.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
305		47,320.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
306		1.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
307		1.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
308		12,300.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
309		8,276.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
310		1,886.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
311		470.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
312		2,231.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
313		27,874.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			
314		8,270.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Request to Final Close 9/22/15
315		46,175.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	N			
316		875.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
317		20,000.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
318	Lodging for Assigned Judges for training event	150.00	Unrestricted	10/20/2014	Y	6/30/2015	150	
319	Lodging for Assigned Judges for training event	2,005.10	Unrestricted	10/15/2014	Y	6/30/2015	2,005	
320	Lodging for Assigned Judges for training event	2,157.20	Unrestricted	10/20/2014	Y	6/30/2015	2,157	
321	Lodging for Assigned Judges for training event	4,297.44	Unrestricted	5/27/2014	Y	6/30/2015	4,297	
322	Lodging for Assigned Judges for training event	7,274.40	Unrestricted	10/17/2014	Y	6/30/2015	7,274	

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
323	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	All Travel Expenditures-In State	Services
324	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	CONCERN: EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROG.	Judicial Council	Health and Medical	Services
325	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	LEXISNEXIS	Judicial Council	Assignments	Services
326	COSSO	Assigned Judges	2014-15	TCTF	SACRAMENTO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Sacramento	Assignments	Services
327	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2013-14	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
328	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2013-14	IMF	PROMETRIC, INC.	Judicial Council	Administrative	Services
329	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
330	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Minor Equipment-Audio Visual (Costing Less than \$5,000)	Goods
331	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	CHAIR PLACE	Judicial Council	Special Accommodation	Goods
332	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	IMAGE SALES, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Speakers	Goods
333	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	MOSSER HOTEL	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
334	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	2014-15	IMF	PROMETRIC, INC.	Judicial Council	Administrative	Services
335	COSSO	Court Interpreters	2013-14	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
336	COSSO	Court Interpreters	2014-15	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
337	COSSO	JusticeCorps	2013-14	IMF	ALAMEDA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Alameda	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
338	COSSO	JusticeCorps	2013-14	IMF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
339	COSSO	JusticeCorps	2013-14	IMF	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Diego	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
340	COSSO	JusticeCorps	2014-15	IMF	ALAMEDA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Alameda	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
341	COSSO	JusticeCorps	2014-15	IMF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
342	COSSO	JusticeCorps	2014-15	IMF	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
343	COSSO	Replacement Screening Stations	2014-15	TCTF	SMITHS DETECTION, INC.	San Joaquin	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Services
344	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2013-14	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Mateo	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
345	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Not Specific	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Services
346	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Mendocino	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
347	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Tulare	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
348	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Solano	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
349	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Mateo	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
350	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Stanislaus	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
351	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Stanislaus	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
352	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Santa Cruz	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
353	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Tehama	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
354	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Benito	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
355	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Santa Cruz	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
356	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Yuba	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
357	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Solano	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
358	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Joaquin	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
359	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Merced	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
360	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Imperial	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
361	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	El Dorado	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
362	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Santa Cruz	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
363	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Nevada	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
364	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	Solano	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
365	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.	San Mateo	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Dis-encumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
323	Room block for Assigned Judges Conference in Sacramento	26,044.88	Unrestricted	12/30/2014	Y	6/30/2015	26,045	Conference lodging needs were less than anticipated, but we did reach the minimum to avoid any penalty. Conference is held every three years, so this item will not be in the budget for this year or next.
324	Employee Assistance Services to Assigned Judges	438.17	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	6/30/2015	438	
325	Lexus/Nexus services access for all Assigned Judges	9,616.57	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	6/30/2015	9,617	
326	Trial Court Research Attorney Project with Sacramento Superior Court	28,028.59	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y		28,029	Contract for FY13-14 was \$50,000 and expenditures exceeded the contract, so it was increased to \$60,000 for FY 14-15, which finished the year under budget by 28,000. This was the result of unanticipated staffing and resource issues. Budget has again been set at \$60,000 for FY 15-16, with possible addition of another court to the program.
327		525.80	Unrestricted	4/1/2014	Y	12/2/2014	529	
328		4,400.00	Unrestricted	7/1/2016	N			
329		54.00	Unrestricted	8/1/2014	Y	pending	54	
330		2,700.00	Unrestricted	12/1/2015	N			
331		532.88	Unrestricted	11/1/2015	N			Late billing for accomodation chair
332		2,733.15	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	pending	2,733	
333		0.01	Unrestricted	Complete	Y	pending	0	
334		82,200.00	Unrestricted	5/1/2016	N			
335		7,124.16	Unrestricted	Complete	Y	4/15/2015	7,124	
336		34,643.10	Unrestricted	12/1/2015	N			
337	JusticeCorps Program Operations	6,542.42	Unrestricted	9/22/2014	Y	10/1/2015	6,542	
338	JusticeCorps Program Operations	25,432.53	Unrestricted	9/22/2014	N			
339	JusticeCorps Program Operations	488.38	Unrestricted	9/22/2014	Y	10/1/2015	488	
340	JusticeCorps Program Operations	96,009.47	Unrestricted	8/17/2015	N			Court can bill until 1/31/16
341	JusticeCorps Program Operations	87,073.82	Unrestricted	8/17/2015	N			Court can bill until 1/31/16
342	JusticeCorps Program Operations	31,612.59	Unrestricted	8/17/2015	N			Court can bill until 1/31/16
343	Transfer x-ray machine from Plumas to San Joaquin	4,500.00	Unrestricted	June 2015	N			completed and paid
344	San Mateo-Traffic Court-IP camera and equipment rack	5,049.93	Unrestricted	TBD	N			completed-received invoice-pending processing
345	CCTV & Access time and materials service on court systems	8.36	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	6/30/2015	8	pending PO closure
346	Mendocino-Ft. Bragg-CCTV	1,000.00	Unrestricted	April 2015	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
347	Tulare-Porterville-CCTV	1,622.02	Unrestricted	TBD	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
348	Solano-Fairfield-CCTV	2,206.30	Unrestricted	July 2015	N			completed and paid
349	San Mateo-Traffic Court-CCTV	3,090.00	Unrestricted	August 2015	N			completed-received invoice-pending processing
350	Stanislaus-Modesto-Traffic-access system	4,100.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
351	Stanislaus-Modesto-Traffic-CCTV	4,390.73	Unrestricted	TBD	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
352	Santa Cruz-Felton-access-locks	4,500.65	Unrestricted	September 2015	N			project in progress
353	Tehama-Red Bluff-CCTV	5,092.30	Unrestricted	July 2015	N			completed and paid
354	San Benito-Hollister-CCTV	5,309.91	Unrestricted	TBD	N			project on hold
355	Santa Cruz-Felton-CCTV	5,910.49	Unrestricted	July 2015	N			completed and paid
356	Yuba-Marysville-CCTV-replace DVRs	5,993.00	Unrestricted	August 2015	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
357	Solano-Fairfield-CCTV-cameras	8,499.16	Unrestricted	August 2015	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
358	San Joaquin-Lodi-CCTV	11,936.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
359	Merced-CCTV & Access	13,158.16	Unrestricted	August 2015	N			completed-received final invoice-pending processing
360	Imperial-El Centro-CCTV	14,586.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			completed-pending receipt of final bill
361	El Dorado-Cameron Park-CCTV	14,602.18	Unrestricted	July 2015	N			completed and paid
362	Santa Cruz-Watsonville-DSSRV upgrade	26,625.05	Unrestricted	November 2015	N			project in progress
363	Nevada-Nevada City-upgrade DVRs-add cameras	29,504.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			project in progress
364	Solano-Vallejo-external cameras	29,883.00	Unrestricted	July 2015	N			completed and paid
365	San Mateo-HOJ-camera system replacement	89,799.00	Unrestricted	December 2015	N			project in progress

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
366	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	STOPTECH, LTD.	Tulare	Freight and Drayage	Goods
367	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	STOPTECH, LTD.	Judicial Council	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
368	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	STOPTECH, LTD.	Tulare	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
369	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	2014-15	IMF	STOPTECH, LTD.	El Dorado	Security Equipment costing more than \$5,000	Goods
370	Education	Distance Learning	2013-14	IMF	DISH NETWORK, LLC	Judicial Council	Radio, Television Receiving/Broadcasting	Services
371	Education	Distance Learning	2013-14	IMF	TATA COMMUNICATIONS (AMERICA). INC.	Judicial Council	IS Supplies/Minor Software	Services
372	Education	Distance Learning	2014-15	IMF	DISH NETWORK, LLC	Judicial Council	Radio, Television Receiving/Broadcasting	Services
373	Education	Distance Learning	2014-15	IMF	EDGECAST NETWORKS, INC.	Judicial Council	IS Supplies/Minor Software	Services
374	Education	Distance Learning	2014-15	IMF	GLOBAL CROSSING GENESIS SOLUTIONS	Judicial Council	Radio, Television Receiving/Broadcasting	Services
375	Education	Distance Learning	2014-15	IMF	TATA COMMUNICATIONS (AMERICA). INC.	Judicial Council	IS Supplies/Minor Software	Services
376	Education	Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Not Specific	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
377	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2013-14	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
378	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
379	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
380	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
381	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
382	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
383	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
384	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
385	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Not Specific	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
386	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
387	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	JUVENILE LAW SOCIETY	Judicial Council	Consultants-Speakers	Services
388	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	SLATER, ALAN	Judicial Council	Consultants-Speakers	Services
389	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	2014-15	IMF	WERNERT, ANTHONY A.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Speakers	Services
390	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2013-14	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
391	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2013-14	IMF	PARC 55 WYNDHAM SAN FRANCISCO UNION SQUARE	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
392	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
393	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
394	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Dis-encumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
366	Tulare-Visalia-replace duress system base unit-shipping	60.00	Unrestricted	July 2015	N			completed and paid
367	Duress alarm system time and materials service	4,701.11	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	6/30/2015	4,501	pending PO closure
368	Tulare-Visalia-replace duress system base unit	5,821.58	Unrestricted	July 2015	N			completed and paid
369	El Dorado-Juvenile & Bldg C-duress alarm system	15,927.45	Unrestricted	August 2015	Y	August 2015	1,070	completed-received invoice-pending processing
370		54,446.94	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	Y	10/31/2015	54,447	CTF submitted 9/17/15 to disencumber funds.
371		843.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N	7/31/2015	-	
372		70,411.61	Unrestricted	12/31/2016	N	4/15/2016	-	Current balance of unused funds: \$58,555.95; still need money to cover August-December 2015 services.
373		144.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N	2/29/2016	144	Balance may be used for unanticipated overages through 12/31/15 per Mandy Covey.
374		3,520.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	7/31/2015	3,520	
375		4,588.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	7/31/2015	817	
376	Lodging for participants at Court Clerk Training Institute	58,994.00	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	6,126	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015.
377	Lodging for faculty for CFCC's AB 1058 Program (FY 13)	11.95	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	12	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015
378	Lodging for faculty at New Judge Orientation	3,005.00	Unrestricted	Completed	N			
379	Lodging for faculty at New Judge Orientation	3,005.00	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	2,044	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015.
380	Lodging for faculty at New Judge Orientation	3,070.60	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	1,075	
381	Lodging for March 2015 EAC faculty	3,758.72	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	8/31/2015	1,872	
382	Lodging/meals for faculty at Family Law Institute	3,892.24	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	11/30/2015	2,260	Invoice is being processed by Accounting.
383	Lodging/meals for faculty at Cow County Judges Institute	4,140.20	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	11/30/2015	1,824	Invoice is being processed by Accounting.
384	Lodging for faculty at New Judge Orientation	4,752.90	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	1,685	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015.
385	Lodging for faculty at Court Clerk Training Institute	6,807.00	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	794	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015.
386	Faculty lodging for June 2015 PAO	7,638.12	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	11/30/2015	3,838	Invoice is being processed by Accounting.
387	Faculty for Juvenile Dependency Orientation, June 2015	800.00	Unrestricted	Completed	N			
388	ICM Faculty	2,250.00	Unrestricted	Completed	N			
389	ICM Faculty	2,250.00	Unrestricted	Completed	N			
390	CFCC's AB 1058 program (FY 13)	711.80	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	712	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015.
391	Lodging for March 2014 CACs	0.01	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	0	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015.
392	Meals for VAWE participants at Cow County Judges Institute	1,950.00	Unrestricted	Completed	N	11/30/2015		Invoice is being processed by Accounting.
393	Lodging for participants at New Judge Orientation	9,015.00	Unrestricted	Completed	N			
394	Lodging for participants at New Judge Orientation	9,015.00	Unrestricted	Completed	N			Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
395	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
396	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
397	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
398	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
399	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
400	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
401	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Goods
402	Finance	Court Interpreters	2013-14	TCTF	KINGS COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Kings	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
403	Finance	Revenue and Collections	2013-14	IMF	KONICA MINOLTA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS USA, INC.	Not Specific	Office Copier Expense (Rental, Maintenance and misc. service.)	Services
404	Finance	Revenue and Collections	2014-15	TCTF	KONICA MINOLTA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS USA, INC.	Not Specific	Office Copier Expense (Rental, Maintenance and misc. service.)	Goods
405	Finance	Revenue and Collections	2014-15	TCTF	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	Judicial Council	Office Supplies	Services
406	HR	Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	2013-14	IMF	CONCERN: EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROG.	Judicial Council	Health and Medical	Services
407	HR	Human Resources - Court Investigation	2013-14	IMF	VAN DERMYDEN MADDUX LAW CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Consultants-HR	Services
408	HR	Human Resources - Court Investigation	2014-15	IMF	ELLIS BUEHLER MAKUS, LLP	Judicial Council	Consultants-HR	Services
409	HR	Human Resources - Court Investigation	2014-15	IMF	VAN DERMYDEN MADDUX LAW CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Consultants-HR	Services
410	HR	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
411	HR	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN EXPRESS	Judicial Council	Meetings, Conferences, Exhibits and Shows	Services
412	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2013-14	IMF	AVASANT, LLC	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
413	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2013-14	IMF	AVASANT, LLC	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
414	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2013-14	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
415	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2013-14	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
395	Lodging for March 2015 EAC participants	9,208.80	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	8/31/2015	4,206	
396	Lodging for participants at New Judge Orientation	10,747.10	Unrestricted	Completed	N			
397	Lodging for participants at New Judge Orientation	11,958.00	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	10/31/2015	2,909	Final close encumbrance form will be submitted by Friday, September 18, 2015.
398	Lodging for March 2015 EAC participants	19,031.52	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	8/31/2015	535	
399	Lodging/meals for participants at Cow County Judges Institute	25,495.90	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	11/30/2015	7,270	Invoice is being processed by Accounting.
400	Lodging for participants at Family Law Institute	40,113.68	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	11/30/2015	7,182	Invoice is being processed by Accounting.
401	Lodging for participants at June 2015 PAO	63,651.00	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	11/30/2015	1,007	Invoice is being processed by Accounting.
402	Supplemental funding for one court	130,168.00	Unrestricted	Completed	Y	12/31/2015	130,168	Encumbered to the wrong PCC and already distributed to the court. Finance will submit the request to disencumber funds by September 30, 2015. Disencumbrance date may be earlier depending on Business Services' workload.
403		78.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	N			Suspect incorrect PCC applied for final payment, staff reviewing for correction.
404		312.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			
405		1,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Suspect incorrect PCC applied for final payment, staff reviewing for correction.
406	Mental health referral services for trial court judges.	5,149.75	Unrestricted	12/31/2017	Y	Unknown	5,150	Since the contract is still active and involves multiple funding sources, HR is discussing with Accounting the process to properly disencumber funds. We expect to disencumber these funds as soon as additional information is received from Accounting.
407	Law firm provides court investigation services stemming from courts' personnel issues.	21,467.02	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	12/31/2015	21,467	HR will submit the request to disencumber funds by September 30, 2015. Disencumbrance date may be earlier depending on Business Services' workload.
408	Law firm provides court investigation services stemming from courts' personnel issues.	3,552.77	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	12/31/2015	3,553	HR will submit the request to disencumber funds by September 30, 2015. Disencumbrance date may be earlier than 12/31/15 depending on Business Services' workload.
409	Law firm provides court investigation services stemming from courts' personnel issues.	22,496.39	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	12/31/2015	22,496	HR will submit the request to disencumber funds by September 30, 2015. Disencumbrance date may be earlier than 12/31/15 depending on Business Services' workload.
410	Conference room and lodging costs associated with the Labor Relations Academies and Forums.	11,345.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	6/30/2015	581	Contract already disencumbered - amount disencumbered is \$580.55
411	Conference room and lodging costs associated with the Labor Relations Academies and Forums.	13,460.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	12/31/2015	4,506	HR will submit the request to disencumber funds by September 30, 2015. Disencumbrance date may be earlier than 12/31/15 depending on Business Services' workload.
412	Consultant Services	114,684.14	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	114,684	Consultant billing based on actual hours up to full-time.
413	Consultant Services	115,989.18	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	115,989	Consultant billing based on actual hours up to full-time.
414	Consultant Services	2,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	2,000	
415	Consultant Services	4,416.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	4,416	

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
416	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2013-14	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
417	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2013-14	IMF	MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
418	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	ASCENT SERVICES GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
419	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	ASCENT SERVICES GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
420	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	ASCENT SERVICES GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
421	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	AVASANT, LLC	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
422	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	AVASANT, LLC	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
423	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
424	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
425	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
426	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
427	IT	California Courts Technology Center	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
428	IT	CCPOR (ROM)	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
429	IT	CCPOR (ROM)	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
430	IT	CLETS Services/Integration	2013-14	IMF	DATAMAXX APPLIED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
431	IT	CLETS Services/Integration	2014-15	IMF	DATAMAXX APPLIED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
432	IT	CLETS Services/Integration	2014-15	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
433	IT	CLETS Services/Integration	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
434	IT	CLETS Services/Integration	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
435	IT	Data Integration	2013-14	IMF	INFOJINI, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
436	IT	Data Integration	2013-14	IMF	JOURNAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
437	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
438	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	ALLIED NETWORK SOLUTIONS, INC.	Not Specific	Maintenance - Software	Services
439	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	ALLIED NETWORK SOLUTIONS, INC.	Not Specific	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
440	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	INFOJINI, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
441	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	JOURNAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
442	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
443	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
444	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
445	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
446	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
447	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	STAFF TECH, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
448	IT	Data Integration	2014-15	IMF	TEMPOSITIONS, INC.	Not Specific	Other contract clerical and non	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
416	Consultant Services	7,300.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	7,300	
417	Legal Services	80,355.18	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N	6/30/2016	338	
418	Consultant Services	108,001.76	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
419	Consultant Services	120,198.24	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
420	Consultant Services	216,320.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
421	Consultant Services	64,865.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
422	Consultant Services	78,125.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
423	Consultant Services	194,478.80	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
424	Consultant Services	249,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
425	Data Center Services	232,005.91	Restricted	6/30/2017	N			
426	Data Center Services	1,148,535.83	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
427	Data Center Services	2,790,291.14	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
428	Data Center Services	37,201.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
429	Data Center Services	49,661.18	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
430	Consultant Services	3,600.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	3,600	
431	Consultant Services	4,500.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
432	Consultant Services	109,140.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
433	Data Center Services	21,450.18	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
434	Data Center Services	53,411.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
435	Consultant Services	17,133.60	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	17,134	
436	Consultant Services	4,821.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
437	Consultant Services	107,101.80	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
438	Maintenance Expense	7,684.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
439	Consultant Services	33,874.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
440	Consultant Services	212,960.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
441	Consultant Services	54,120.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
442	Consultant Services	109,140.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
443	Consultant Services	182,528.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
444	Maintenance Expense	4,481.59	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
445	Data Center Services	175,990.87	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
446	Data Center Services	214,430.57	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
447	Consultant Services	167,270.40	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
448	Consultant Services	28,598.40	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
449	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2013-14	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
450	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2013-14	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
451	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2014-15	IMF	INNOTAS	Not Specific	Maintenance - Software	Services
452	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2014-15	IMF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Software	Services
453	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2014-15	IMF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Software	Services
454	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2014-15	IMF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Software	Services
455	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2014-15	IMF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Software	Services
456	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	2014-15	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
457	IT	Interim Case Management Systems	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
458	IT	Interim Case Management Systems	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
459	IT	Interim Case Management	2013-14	IMF	CALIFORNIA TECHNOLOGY AGENCY	Judicial Council	Stephen P. Teale Data Center	Services
460	IT	Interim Case Management	2013-14	IMF	JOURNAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
461	IT	Interim Case Management	2013-14	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
462	IT	Interim Case Management	2013-14	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
463	IT	Interim Case Management	2013-14	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
464	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	ASCENT SERVICES GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
465	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY	Judicial Council	Stephen P. Teale Data Center	Services
466	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	INNOVASAFE, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
467	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	JOURNAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
468	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	PCMG, INC.	Not Specific	IS Supplies/Minor Software	Services
469	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
470	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
471	IT	Interim Case Management	2014-15	IMF	SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
472	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	ALAMEDA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Alameda	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
473	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	COLUSA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Colusa	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
474	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Fresno	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
475	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	HUMBOLDT COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Humboldt	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
476	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	IMPERIAL COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Imperial	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
477	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	MERCED COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Merced	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
478	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	MONTEREY COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Monterey	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
479	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Bernardino	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
480	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Joaquin	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
481	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Santa Clara	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
482	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	SHASTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Shasta	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
483	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	SISKIYOU COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Siskiyou	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
484	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	SOLANO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Solano	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
449	Consultant Services	2,343.20	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	2,343	
450	Consultant Services	3,583.09	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	3,583	
451	Maintenance Expense	44,496.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
452	Maintenance Expense	112,312.97	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoiced quarterly in arrears
453	Maintenance Expense	623,247.25	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoiced quarterly in arrears
454	Maintenance Expense	683,840.03	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoiced quarterly in arrears
455	Maintenance Expense	1,238,408.23	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoiced quarterly in arrears
456	Consultant Services	145,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
457	Data Center Services	264,847.81	Restricted	6/30/2017	N			
458	Data Center Services	381,568.59	Restricted	6/30/2017	N			
459	Data Center Services	10,749.07	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	10,749	
460	Consultant Services	195,620.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	195,620	Funds for Sustain modifications minimized
461	Consultant Services	45,228.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	45,228	Less than expected OT
462	Consultant Services	83,428.95	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	83,429	part-time consultant work less than anticipated
463	Consultant Services	130,107.19	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	126,513	part-time consultant work less than anticipated
464	Consultant Services	82,489.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
465	Data Center Services	44,155.02	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
466	Consultant Services	4,200.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
467	Consultant Services	200,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
468	Software Expenses	2,210.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
469	Consultant Services	90,800.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
470	Consultant Services	156,055.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
471	Consultant Services	166,750.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
472	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	60,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
473	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	3,415.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
474	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	12,974.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
475	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	21,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
476	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	7,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
477	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	680.99	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
478	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	59,273.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
479	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	57,680.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
480	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	12,340.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
481	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	20,192.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
482	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	60,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
483	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	35,760.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
484	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	17,500.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
485	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	TEHAMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Tehama	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
486	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	TULARE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Tulare	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
487	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	VENTURA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Ventura	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
488	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	YOLO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Yolo	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
489	IT	Jury Management System Grants	2013-14	IMF	YUBA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Yuba	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
490	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial	2013-14	IMF	BERKELEY COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION	Not Specific	IS Software and licenses costing more than \$5,000	Services
491	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial	2013-14	IMF	INFOJINI, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
492	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2013-14	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
493	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	ALLIED NETWORK SOLUTIONS, INC.	Not Specific	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
494	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	BANYAN GROUP CONSULTING, LLC	Judicial Council	Tuition/Training Charges and Registration Fees	Services
495	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	INFOJINI, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
496	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	SAP AMERICA, INC.	Not Specific	Tuition/Training Charges and Registration Fees	Services
497	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
498	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
499	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	IT Equipment	Services
500	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
501	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
502	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
503	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
504	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
505	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	IT Equipment	Services
506	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Wide Area Network	Services
507	IT	Telecommunications	2013-14	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
508	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
509	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
510	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Inyo	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
511	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Not Specific	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
512	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
513	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
514	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
515	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
516	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	IT Equipment	Services
517	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
518	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	IT Equipment	Services
519	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	IT Equipment	Services
520	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
521	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	AT&T	Judicial Council	Wide Area Network	Services
522	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
523	IT	Telecommunications	2014-15	IMF	MONO GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
524	IT	Testing Tools	2014-15	IMF	ALEXAN INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
525	IT	Testing Tools	2014-15	IMF	ALLIED NETWORK SOLUTIONS, INC.	Not Specific	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
526	IT	Testing Tools	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Dis-encumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
485	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	41,955.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
486	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	1,842.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
487	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	12,635.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
488	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	15,263.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
489	Jury Grants for the Trial Court	60,000.00	Restricted	TBD	N			There is a possibility that the trial court could request an extension for the grant.
490	Software Expenses	0.01	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	0	
491	Consultant Services	30,810.01	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	30,810	Unbilled hours due to vacations, time off, etc.
492	Data Center Services	555,097.06	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
493	Consultant Services	44,448.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
494	Training Expense	580.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
495	Consultant Services	100,486.40	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
496	Training Expense	1,200.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
497	Data Center Services	375,186.06	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
498	Consultant Services	13,914.86	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	7,247	
499	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	1,803.29	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
500	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	4,234.26	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
501	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	54,820.93	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
502	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	66,400.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
503	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	70,690.96	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
504	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	121,409.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
505	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	514,488.11	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
506	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	1,566,787.91	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N			
507	Consultant Services	7,247.41	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	7,247	
508	Consultant Services	180,243.42	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
509	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	545.49	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
510	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	2,400.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
511	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	25,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
512	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	33,009.70	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
513	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	108,923.38	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
514	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	215,850.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
515	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	443,882.73	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
516	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	557,398.13	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
517	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	578,482.58	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
518	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	664,096.26	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
519	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	1,346,742.42	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
520	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	2,199,218.04	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
521	Services related to LAN WAN assistance to the trial courts	4,504,906.15	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
522	Consultant Services	118,037.44	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
523	Consultant Services	157,278.75	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
524	Consultant Services	123,728.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
525	Consultant Services	46,803.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
526	Data Center Services	13,583.58	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
527	IT	Testing Tools	2014-15	IMF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
528	IT	Uniform Civil Filing Fee System	2014-15	IMF	BANYAN GROUP CONSULTING, LLC	Judicial Council	Tuition/Training Charges and Registration Fees	Services
529	IT	Uniform Civil Filing Fee System	2014-15	IMF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Not Specific	Tuition/Training Charges and Registration Fees	Services
530	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
531	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
532	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
533	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	APEX SYSTEMS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
534	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ASCENT SERVICES GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
535	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ASCENT SERVICES GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
536	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Not Specific	Data Center Services	Services
537	IT	V2 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
538	IT	V2 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
539	IT	V2 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
540	IT	V2 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	APEX SYSTEMS, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
541	IT	V2 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ASCENT SERVICES GROUP, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
542	IT	V2 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
543	IT	V2 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
544	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
545	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	21 TECH, LLC	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
546	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
547	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	BERKELEY COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION	Not Specific	Freight and Drayage	Services
548	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
549	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
550	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
551	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
552	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
553	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
554	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
555	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
556	IT	V3 CMS	2013-14	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
557	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	21 TECH, LLC	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
558	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	22ND CENTURY STAFFING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
559	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ALL STAR CONSULTING, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
560	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	CDW GOVERNMENT, INC.	Not Specific	Maintenance - Software	Services
561	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	CDW GOVERNMENT, INC.	Not Specific	Maintenance - Hardware	Services
562	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	CDW GOVERNMENT, INC.	Not Specific	IT Equipment	Services
563	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
564	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
565	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
566	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
567	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	DELASOFT, INC.	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
568	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Not Specific	Maintenance - Software	Services
569	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.	Not Specific	Maintenance - Software	Services
570	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	PCMG, INC.	Not Specific	Maintenance - Software	Services
571	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	PCMG, INC.	Not Specific	Minor Equipment-IT	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Dis-encumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
527	Data Center Services	30,570.42	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
528	Training Expense	580.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
529	Training Expense	3,500.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
530	Consultant Services	6,353.60	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	6,354	
531	Consultant Services	13,227.80	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	13,228	
532	Consultant Services	102,090.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	102,090	Savings - let consultant go early due to program shut down
533	Consultant Services	23,571.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	23,572	
534	Consultant Services	825.60	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	826	
535	Consultant Services	45,709.60	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	45,710	Savings - let consultant go early due to program shut down
536	Data Center Services	70,488.50	Restricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	870	
537	Consultant Services	16,976.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	16,976	Savings - let consultant go early due to program shut down
538	Consultant Services	37,540.80	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoicing still in progress
539	Consultant Services	65,360.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoicing still in progress
540	Consultant Services	14,016.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoicing still in progress
541	Consultant Services	45,258.40	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			Invoicing still in progress
542	Data Center Services	30,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	Y	11/30/2015	29,200	estimated final invoiced applied
543	Data Center Services	107,620.62	Restricted	6/30/2017	Y	11/30/2015	105,421	estimated final invoiced applied
544	Data Center Services	200,381.41	Restricted	6/30/2017	N			All funds have been expended
545	Consultant Services	19,680.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			All funds have been expended
546	Consultant Services	17,051.20	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	17,051	
547	Shipping Expense	0.01	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	0	
548	Consultant Services	4,360.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	4,360	
549	Consultant Services	17,221.60	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	17,222	
550	Consultant Services	22,672.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	22,672	OT budget not used
551	Consultant Services	26,184.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	26,184	OT budget not used
552	Consultant Services	37,435.76	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	17,002	
553	Consultant Services	1,552.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	1,552	
554	Consultant Services	2,500.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	2,500	
555	Consultant Services	17,480.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	5,000	
556	Consultant Services	25,544.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	Y	6/30/2016	25,544	OT budget not used
557	Consultant Services	245,016.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
558	Consultant Services	114,072.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
559	Consultant Services	120,973.02	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
560	Maintenance Expense	2,360.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
561	Maintenance Expense	9,580.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
562	Equipment Purchase	28,101.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
563	Consultant Services	74,867.60	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
564	Consultant Services	134,248.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
565	Consultant Services	134,248.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
566	Consultant Services	137,416.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
567	Consultant Services	173,179.92	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
568	Maintenance Expense	403.69	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
569	Maintenance Expense	1,638.80	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
570	Maintenance Expense	2,208.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
571	Equipment Purchase	43,306.74	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
572	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	PROTECH PROFESSIONAL TECHNICAL SERVICES, INC.	Not Specific	Tuition/Training Charges and Registration Fees	Services
573	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
574	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Data Center Services	Services
575	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
576	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
577	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
578	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
579	IT	V3 CMS	2014-15	TCTF	ZIBA GROUP	Judicial Council	Consultants-Information Systems	Services
580	LSO	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	2013-14	IMF	AGNEW MULTILINGUAL	Judicial Council	Consultants-Other	Services
581	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2013-14	IMF	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Contra Costa	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
582	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2013-14	IMF	SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Santa Clara	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
583	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2014-15	IMF	ALAMEDA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Alameda	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
584	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2014-15	IMF	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Contra Costa	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
585	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2014-15	IMF	LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Los Angeles	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
586	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2014-15	IMF	ORANGE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Orange	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
587	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2014-15	IMF	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Francisco	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
588	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	2014-15	IMF	SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	Santa Clara	Allocation-Payments to Trial Courts	Services
589	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	ANGELO, KILDAY & KILDUFF, LLP	Judicial Council	Consultants-HR	Services
590	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO	San Diego	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
591	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO	Tulare	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
592	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	BANCROFT, MCGAVIN, HORVATH & JUDKINS, P.C.	San Joaquin	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
593	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	BUEHLER, LISA	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
594	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	BUEHLER, LISA	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
595	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
596	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
597	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	CARL WARREN & COMPANY	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
598	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
599	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	CHANG, RUTHENBERG & LONG, PC	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
600	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	FARRAR & BATES, LLP	San Bernardino	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
601	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	FRYE CLAIMS CONSULTATION & ADMINISTRATION, INC.	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
602	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	San Francisco	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
603	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
604	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	JONES DAY	San Bernardino	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
605	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	JONES DAY	Sonoma	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
606	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	JONES DAY	Contra Costa	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
607	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	MATHENY SEARS LINKERT & JAIME, LLP	Glenn	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
608	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	San Mateo	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
609	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	MURCHISON & CUMMING, LLP	Orange	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
610	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	MURCHISON & CUMMING, LLP	San Diego	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
611	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	San Diego	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
612	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	Not Specific	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
613	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	Riverside	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
614	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
615	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	Orange	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
616	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
572	Training Expense	4,500.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
573	Data Center Services	133,153.29	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
574	Data Center Services	283,084.76	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
575	Consultant Services	120,240.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
576	Consultant Services	133,600.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
577	Consultant Services	133,672.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
578	Consultant Services	142,952.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
579	Consultant Services	157,368.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2017	N			
580		8,050.00	Unrestricted	4/30/2015	N			The last invoice was billed in May for \$8,050; no funds remain encumbered on contract. Contract closed.
581		130,389.58	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	Y	7/1/2015	130,390	Contract close out was submitted to Business Services on 07/01/2015.
582		17,286.67	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	Y	7/1/2015	17,287	Contract close out was submitted to Business Services on 07/01/2015.
583		255,400.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Encumbered funds exhausted; contracts closed.
584		285,944.43	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	9/15/2015	59,684	Contract close out was submitted to Business Services on 09/15/15
585		558,500.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Encumbered funds exhausted; contracts closed.
586		427,419.46	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Encumbered funds exhausted; contracts closed.
587		322,980.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Encumbered funds exhausted; contracts closed.
588		232,185.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N			Encumbered funds exhausted; contracts closed.
589		7,009.90	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
590		15,118.38	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	15,118	
591		18,799.86	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	18,800	
592		1,938.70	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
593		299.49	Unrestricted	12/31/2013	Y	9/23/2015	299	
594		18,664.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	18,664	
595		7,377.16	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	7,377	
596		9,033.06	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
597		8,418.00	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	8,418	
598		716.32	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	716	
599		30,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
600		1,010.50	Unrestricted	3/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	1,011	
601		4,460.50	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	4,461	
602		2,111.80	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
603		4,322.27	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
604		7,006.55	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
605		7,197.50	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	7,198	
606		19,824.28	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
607		14,299.99	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	14,300	
608		7,480.00	Unrestricted	3/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	7,480	
609		2,109.55	Unrestricted	10/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	2,110	
610		2,362.83	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
611		4,415.05	Unrestricted	12/31/2013	Y	9/23/2015	4,415	
612		5,000.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	5,000	
613		5,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
614		11,842.82	Unrestricted	3/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	11,843	
615		12,718.69	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	12,719	
616		19,182.07	Unrestricted	10/31/2013	Y	9/23/2015	19,182	

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
617	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	REED SMITH, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
618	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Stanislaus	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
619	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Shasta	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
620	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Shasta	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
621	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Yolo	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
622	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Orange	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
623	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH, P.C.	Orange	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
624	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	VAN DERMYDEN MADDUX LAW CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
625	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	VILLARREAL HUTNER & TODD PC	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
626	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
627	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN, LLP	Sonoma	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
628	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Alameda	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
629	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
630	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Contra Costa	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
631	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Alameda	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
632	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2013-14	IMF	YOUNG MOORE & HENDERSON, PA	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
633	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	ANDREWS, LAGASSE, BRANCH & BELL, LLP	San Diego	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
634	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	ANGELO, KILDAY & KILDUFF, LLP	Judicial Council	Consultants-HR	Services
635	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	ANGELO, KILDAY & KILDUFF, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
636	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO	San Bernardino	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
637	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
638	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO	Madera	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
639	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BARKETT & GUMPERT	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
640	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BENTON, ORR, DUVAL & BUCKINGHAM	Orange	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
641	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BENTON, ORR, DUVAL & BUCKINGHAM	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
642	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BENTON, ORR, DUVAL & BUCKINGHAM	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
643	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BENTON, ORR, DUVAL & BUCKINGHAM	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
644	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BEST BEST & KRIEGER, LLP	San Diego	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
645	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BEST BEST & KRIEGER, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
646	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BOLD, POLISNER, MADDOW, NELSON & JUDSON	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
647	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BOLD, POLISNER, MADDOW, NELSON & JUDSON	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
648	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BOLD, POLISNER, MADDOW, NELSON & JUDSON	Santa Cruz	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
649	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BOLD, POLISNER, MADDOW, NELSON & JUDSON	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
650	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
651	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CARL WARREN & COMPANY	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
652	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
653	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CUMMINGS, MCCLOREY, DAVIS & ACHO & ASSO.	Ventura	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
654	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CUMMINGS, MCCLOREY, DAVIS & ACHO & ASSO.	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
655	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CUMMINGS, MCCLOREY, DAVIS & ACHO & ASSO.	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
656	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CUMMINGS, MCCLOREY, DAVIS & ACHO & ASSO.	Solano	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
657	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CUMMINGS, MCCLOREY, DAVIS & ACHO & ASSO.	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
658	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	CUMMINGS, MCCLOREY, DAVIS & ACHO & ASSO.	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
659	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	DUNN CARNEY ALLEN HIGGINS & TONGUE, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
660	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	ELLIS BUEHLER MAKUS, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
661	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST, LLP	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
662	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	FOSTER EMPLOYMENT LAW, INC.	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
663	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	FOSTER EMPLOYMENT LAW, INC.	Alameda	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
664	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	FRYE CLAIMS CONSULTATION & ADMINISTRATION, INC.	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
665	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	GRISWOLD, LASALLE, COBB, DOWD & GIN, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
617		626.01	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	626	
618		3,751.99	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	3,752	
619		13,061.22	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	13,061	
620		16,109.24	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
621		495.13	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	495	
622		7,694.19	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	7,694	
623		6,597.78	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	6,598	
624		5,701.06	Unrestricted	4/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	5,701	
625		2,540.76	Unrestricted	9/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	2,541	
626		2,384.02	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
627		2,815.85	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
628		1,849.05	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
629		2,729.88	Unrestricted	4/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	2,730	
630		4,425.48	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	4,425	
631		12,146.85	Unrestricted	6/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	12,147	
632		544.10	Unrestricted	3/30/2014	Y	9/23/2015	544	
633		23,911.66	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
634		15,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
635		25,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
636		6,531.46	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	6,531	
637		33,329.38	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
638		36,518.46	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	36,518	
639		8,481.70	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
640		2,515.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
641		6,017.65	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
642		23,355.47	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
643		40,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
644		1,950.17	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
645		7,558.72	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
646		3,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
647		3,301.26	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
648		7,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
649		15,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
650		25,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
651		3,500.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
652		13,942.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
653		740.04	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
654		1,432.69	Unrestricted	3/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	1,433	
655		35,105.92	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
656		45,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
657		49,537.52	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
658		49,958.90	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
659		10,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
660		34,368.82	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
661		10,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
662		41,880.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
663		32,781.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
664		1,500.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
665		5,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
666	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	HARDY ERICH BROWN & WILSON	Calaveras	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
667	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	HARDY ERICH BROWN & WILSON	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
668	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	San Mateo	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
669	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
670	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	San Francisco	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
671	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	Alameda	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
672	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
673	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JARVIS FAY DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
674	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JONES DAY	Ventura	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
675	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JONES DAY	Sonoma	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
676	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JONES DAY	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
677	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JONES DAY	Ventura	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
678	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JONES DAY	San Bernardino	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
679	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	JONES DAY	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
680	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
681	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	San Francisco	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
682	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	Alameda	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
683	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
684	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
685	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
686	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MURCHISON & CUMMING, LLP	San Diego	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
687	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	MURCHISON & CUMMING, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
688	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	Orange	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
689	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special	Services
690	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Nevada	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
691	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Amador	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
692	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Tehama	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
693	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Amador	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
694	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Modoc	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
695	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Shasta	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
696	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
697	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Amador	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
698	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Shasta	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
699	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP	Orange	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
700	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT	San Diego	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
701	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
702	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
703	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Contra Costa	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
704	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
705	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Monterey	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
706	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Humboldt	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
707	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
708	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
709	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
710	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Santa Barbara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
711	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Humboldt	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
712	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
713	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Yuba	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
714	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
715	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	San Francisco	Legal Services-Litigation	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
666		3,554.46	Unrestricted	3/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	3,554	
667		10,774.90	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
668		492.38	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
669		1,223.72	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
670		1,487.87	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
671		2,147.79	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
672		10,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
673		30,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
674		3,248.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
675		3,882.50	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
676		16,521.54	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
677		21,242.40	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
678		31,541.05	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
679		38,838.61	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
680		587.62	Unrestricted	3/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	588	
681		1,173.06	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
682		1,988.88	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	1,989	
683		2,490.70	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
684		4,187.99	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	4,188	
685		5,768.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
686		2,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
687		10,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
688		62,036.82	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
689		5,035.43	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
690		16,236.83	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
691		20,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
692		31,877.18	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	31,877	
693		35,588.55	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
694		36,229.13	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
695		50,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
696		50,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
697		51,886.47	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
698		77,402.96	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
699		8,024.50	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
700		789.97	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
701		523.22	Unrestricted	9/30/2015	Y	9/23/2015	523	
702		1,043.74	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	1,044	
703		1,169.07	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	1,169	
704		1,334.55	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	1,335	
705		2,676.20	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
706		2,700.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
707		3,840.06	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
708		5,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
709		5,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
710		5,031.10	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
711		12,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
712		12,467.86	Unrestricted	3/31/2015	Y	9/23/2015	12,468	
713		15,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
714		15,976.67	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
715		23,855.71	Unrestricted	TBD	N			

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
716	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Contra Costa	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
717	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
718	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Los Angeles	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
719	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SEDGWICK, LLP	Santa Clara	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
720	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SULLIVAN, HILL, LEWIN, REZ & ENGEL, APLC	Riverside	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
721	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	SULLIVAN, HILL, LEWIN, REZ & ENGEL, APLC	Orange	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
722	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	VALLEY REHABILITATION SERVICES, INC.	Merced	Consultants-HR	Services
723	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	VAN DERMYDEN MADDOX LAW CORPORATION	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
724	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	WAGNER-PELAYES, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
725	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN, LLP	San Francisco	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
726	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Alameda	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
727	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Judicial Council	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
728	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Fresno	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
729	LSO	Litigation Management Program	2014-15	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Alameda	Legal Services-Litigation	Services
730	LSO	Regional Office Assistance Group	2013-14	IMF	CONTINUING EDUCATION OF THE BAR	Not Specific	Freight and Drayage	Services
731	LSO	Regional Office Assistance Group	2013-14	IMF	CONTINUING EDUCATION OF THE BAR	Not Specific	Library Purchases and Subscriptions	Services
732	LSO	Regional Office Assistance Group	2014-15	IMF	KONICA MINOLTA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS USA, INC.	Not Specific	Office Copier Expense (Rental, Maintenance and misc. service.)	Services
733	LSO	Regional Office Assistance Group	2014-15	IMF	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	Not Specific	Office Supplies	Goods
734	LSO	Regional Office Assistance Group	2014-15	IMF	THOMSON REUTERS / BARCLAYS	Not Specific	Library Purchases and Subscriptions	Goods
735	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2013-14	IMF	BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
736	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
737	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
738	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	FOSTER EMPLOYMENT LAW, INC.	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
739	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	HANSON, BRIDGETT, MARCUS, VLAHOS & RUDY	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
740	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	LOZANO SMITH, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
741	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	LOZANO SMITH, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
742	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	MATHENY SEARS LINKERT & JAIME, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
743	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
744	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI, LLP	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
745	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	2014-15	IMF	WILEY, PRICE & RADULOVICH	Judicial Council	Legal Services (Outside Attorneys, Special Masters)	Services
746	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2013-14	TCTF	KONICA MINOLTA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS USA, INC.	Not Specific	Office Copier Expense (Rental, Maintenance and misc. service.)	Services
747	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	TCTF	ACCESS INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	Not Specific	Records Storage	Services
748	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	AMERICAN PAYROLL ASSOCIATION	Not Specific	Library Purchases and Subscriptions	Services
749	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	TCTF	CALHR	Not Specific	Tuition/Training Charges and Registration Fees	Services
750	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	IMF	EPI-USE AMERICA, INC.	Not Specific	Consultants-Information Systems	Services

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
716		25,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
717		32,936.26	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
718		36,667.82	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
719		50,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
720		1,278.13	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
721		6,617.79	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
722		4,875.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	9/23/2015	4,875	
723		40,566.21	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
724		14,812.50	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
725		27,720.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
726		15,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
727		40,227.53	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
728		40,300.93	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
729		50,000.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			
730		7.95	Unrestricted	TBD	N			Registration fee
731		309.23	Unrestricted	TBD	N			Registration fee
732		312.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			Copier maintenance in Burbank. No savings.
733		2,488.61	Unrestricted	TBD	Y		2,489	PO for office supplies.
734		8.34	Unrestricted	TBD	Y		8	PO for the purchase of books.
735		12,901.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	7/1/2015	12,901	Close out form submitted to Business Services on 7/1/15.
736		50.34	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	7/1/2015	50	Close out form submitted to Business Services on 7/1/15.
737		18,865.93	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	N		-	All funding has been exhausted.
738		5,265.00	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N		-	The firm provides legal assistance for the trial courts in arbitrations. The remaining funds will be spent resulting in no savings.
739		3,298.40	Unrestricted	6/30/2016	N		-	Contract for legal advice regarding transaction issues pertaining to government. We use this firm when we have questions. There will be some savings but can't predict how much.
740		0.88	Unrestricted	12/31/2014	Y	7/1/2015	1	Close out form submitted to business services.
741		11,821.74	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N		-	All funding has been exhausted.
742		13,209.19	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	10/1/2015	13,209	Don't expect this contract to be renewed resulting in savings in the amount of remaining funds.
743		15,000.00	Unrestricted	12/31/2015	N			Vendor handles arbitrations and PERBs for the trial courts. Potentially, no savings.
744		8,636.00	Unrestricted	TBD	N			The funds have been exhausted; no prior year funds remain on this contract.
745		1.27	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	7/1/2015	1	Close out form submitted to Business Services.
746	Maintenance	162.00	Restricted	6/30/2015	N		-	Final bill paid 7/3/15. PO closed.
747	Offsite Storage	7,549.02	Restricted	3/30/2016	N		-	Contract renews annually until Business Services requires bid for new vendor of off-site storage.
748	Subscription	355.00	Unrestricted	10/31/2015	Y	10/31/2015	355	PO canceled. Will submit check request for payment to this vendor
749	Training Fees for Deborah Benson	140.00	Restricted	7/30/2015	N		-	PO completed and closed.
750	Maintenance & Operations Support - System Integrator	286,312.50	Unrestricted	6/30/2015	Y	10/31/2015	149,625	Last invoice paid in Aug 2015. Remaining balance of \$149,625 will be disencumbered.

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	Fiscal Year	Fund	Vendor Name	Court/County	Oracle Financial System Expenditure Description	Contract is for "Goods", "Services", or "Goods & Services"?
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
751	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	EPI-USE LABS, LLC	Judicial Council	Maintenance - Software	Services
752	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	TCTF	GHA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Not Specific	Minor Equipment-IT	Goods
753	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	GHA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	Not Specific	Minor Equipment	Goods
754	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	GO-GETTERS	Not Specific	Freight and Drayage	Services
755	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	GRANDFLOW, INC.	Not Specific	All Printed Items (Forms, Stationery, Reports, etc.)	Goods
756	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	IMAGEX.COM	Not Specific	All Printed Items (Forms, Stationery, Reports, etc.)	Goods
757	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	TCTF	KONICA MINOLTA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS USA, INC.	Not Specific	Office Copier Expense (Rental, Maintenance and misc. service.)	Services
758	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	TCTF	PCMG, INC.	Not Specific	Freight and Drayage	Goods
759	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	TCTF	PCMG, INC.	Not Specific	Office Copier Expense (Rental, Maintenance and misc. service.)	Goods
760	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	TCTF	PCMG, INC.	Not Specific	Office Copier Expense (Rental, Maintenance and misc. service.)	Goods
761	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	IMF	R.R. DONNELLEY	Not Specific	All Printed Items (Forms, Stationery, Reports, etc.)	Goods
762	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	IMF	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	Not Specific	Minor Equipment	Goods
763	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	2014-15	IMF	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	Not Specific	Office Supplies	Goods
764	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial	2014-15	IMF	VARIDESK, LLC	Not Specific	Minor Equipment	Goods

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

Table A: FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF Open Contracts/Encumbrances as of June 30, 2015

Line #	Briefly Describe the Purpose of the "Goods" or "Services" (If Expenditure Description (Col. G), is insufficient)	Remaining Open Contract Amount	Restricted/Unrestricted ¹	Estimated Date of Contract Completion ²	Any Estimated Contract Savings? (Y/N)	If "Y", Estimated Date Contract will be Reduced/Disencumbered to Reflect Savings	If "Y", Total Preliminary Estimated Contract Savings ³	Additional Comments
	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
751	Annual Maintenance Fee	114.19	Unrestricted	6/29/2016	Y	10/31/2015	114	Balance of \$114.19 will be disencumbered.
752	Replacement laptop battery for Robert Ochoa	106.33	Restricted	7/23/2015	N		-	PO completed and closed.
753	Ergonomic equipment for Krista Champlin	294.27	Unrestricted	8/7/2015	N		-	PO completed and closed.
754	Delivery of incoming and outgoing mail to US Post Office	3,400.00	Unrestricted	1/31/2016	N		-	Ongoing
755	Printed envelopes - A/P Unit	523.78	Unrestricted	7/30/2015	N		-	PO completed and closed.
756	Window envelopes for checks - A/P Unit	8,236.50	Unrestricted	8/30/2015	N		-	PO completed and closed.
757	Monthly maintenance service for two copiers	1,944.00	Restricted	7/30/2016	N		-	Multi-year contract through 7/30/16.
758	Shipping charges for Check Printer Supplies	83.00	Restricted	7/30/2015	N		-	PO completed and closed.
759	Maintenance kit for Check Printer	1,139.25	Restricted	10/30/2015	N		-	Invoice processed and awaiting check to be cut by Accounting Office.
760	Supplies for A/P Unit Check Printer	2,972.90	Restricted	7/30/2015	N		-	PO completed and closed.
761	Envelopes for Checks - A/P Unit	325.61	Unrestricted	10/30/2015	N		-	Last 300K envelopes delivered in September. Expecting last invoice for the remaining balance of PO.
762	Ergonomic equipment for Paula Coombs	970.06	Unrestricted	TBD	N		-	Already billed for \$266.98. Still waiting for invoice for last item received in the amount of balance.
763	Blanket PO for Standard Office Supplies	12,073.06	Unrestricted	7/31/2015	Y	10/31/2015	4,800	Do not expect any more invoices for this PO. However, my record shows a balance of approx \$4800 of unused balance
764	Ergonomic equipment for Krista Champlin	534.00	Unrestricted	7/30/2015	Y	10/31/2015	34	Difference of \$34 remaining

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² 2013-14 and 2014-15 contracts must be spent by June 30 of 2016 and 2017 respectively

³ More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

**Table B: Summary of FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF
Open Contracts/Encumbrances by Fund as of June 30, 2015**

1B

Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF)

Line #	JCC Office	Program Title	# of Open Contracts	2013-14 Open Contract Amounts	2014-15 Open Contract Amounts	Total Open Contract Amounts	2013-14 Preliminary Estimated Savings ²	2014-15 Preliminary Estimated Savings ²	Total Preliminary Estimated Savings ²
1		<i>Funds Restricted or Returned to Courts:¹</i>							
2	REFM	Court Facilities	65	\$ 2,338,350	\$10,124,869	\$12,463,219	\$ -	\$ 250,220	\$ 250,220
3	CFCC	Sargent Shriver Civil Representation	16	\$ 0	\$ 3,878,651	\$ 3,878,651	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	CFCC	Equal Access Fund	2	\$ -	\$ 1,363,120	\$ 1,363,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	IT	Interim Case Management Systems	2	\$ -	\$ 646,416	\$ 646,416	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	IT	V3 CMS	1	\$ -	\$ 200,381	\$ 200,381	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7	IT	V2 CMS	2	\$ 70,489	\$ 107,621	\$ 178,109	\$ 870	\$ 105,421	\$ 106,290
8	IT	California Courts Technology Center	1	\$ -	\$ 232,006	\$ 232,006	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	8	\$ 162	\$ 13,935	\$ 14,097	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10		<i>Subtotal, Restricted or Returned to Courts¹</i>	97	\$ 2,409,001	\$ 16,566,999	\$ 18,975,999	\$ 870	\$ 355,641	\$ 356,511
11		<i>Unrestricted:</i>							
12	CFCC	Court-Appointed Counsel	75	\$ 351,675	\$13,281,389	\$13,633,064	\$ 547	\$ -	\$ 547
13	IT	V3 CMS	35	\$ 191,681	\$ 2,330,189	\$ 2,521,869	\$ 139,087	\$ -	\$ 139,087
14	CFCC	CASA	44	\$ -	\$ 860,325	\$ 860,325	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15	REFM	Court Facilities	46	\$ 293,689	\$ 497,201	\$ 790,890	\$ 293,572	\$ 465,065	\$ 758,637
16	CFCC	Model Self-Help	9	\$ 51,961	\$ 553,141	\$ 605,102	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
17	IT	V2 CMS	12	\$ 208,754	\$ 192,175	\$ 400,929	\$ 208,754	\$ 29,200	\$ 237,954
18	Finance	Court Interpreters	1	\$ 130,168	\$ -	\$ 130,168	\$ 130,168	\$ -	\$ 130,168
19	CFCC	Family Law Information Center	4	\$ 3,297	\$ 88,375	\$ 91,673	\$ 3,297	\$ -	\$ 3,297
20	COSSO	Assigned Judges	9	\$ -	\$ 80,012	\$ 80,012	\$ -	\$ 80,012	\$ 80,012
21	COSSO	Court Interpreters	2	\$ 7,124	\$ 34,643	\$ 41,767	\$ 7,124	\$ -	\$ 7,124
22	CFCC	CAC Training	2	\$ -	\$ 5,209	\$ 5,209	\$ -	\$ 209	\$ 209
23	COSSO	Replacement Screening Stations	1	\$ -	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
24	Finance	Revenue and Collections	2	\$ -	\$ 1,312	\$ 1,312	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25		<i>Subtotal, Unrestricted</i>	242	\$ 1,238,350	\$ 17,928,471	\$ 19,166,821	\$ 782,549	\$ 574,486	\$ 1,357,036
26									
27		Total	339	\$ 3,647,351	\$ 34,495,470	\$ 38,142,821	\$ 783,419	\$ 930,128	\$ 1,713,547

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF)

Line	JCC Office	Program Title	# of Open Contracts	2013-14 Open Contract Amounts	2014-15 Open Contract Amounts	Total Open Contract Amounts	2013-14 Estimated Savings ²	2014-15 Estimated Savings ²	Total Estimated Savings ²
28		<i>Funds Restricted or Returned to Courts:¹</i>							
29	IT	Jury Management System Grants	18	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
30		<i>Subtotal, Restricted or Returned to Courts¹</i>	18	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
31		<i>Unrestricted:</i>							
32	IT	Telecommunications	26	\$ 2,421,797	\$11,136,014	\$13,557,811	\$ 14,495	\$ -	\$ 14,495
33	IT	California Courts Technology Center	15	\$ 324,745	\$ 4,969,816	\$ 5,294,560	\$ 244,727	\$ -	\$ 244,727
34	IT	Enterprise Policy & Planning	8	\$ 5,926	\$ 2,847,304	\$ 2,853,231	\$ 5,926	\$ -	\$ 5,926
35	LSO	Complex Civil Litigation Program	8	\$ 147,676	\$ 2,082,429	\$ 2,230,105	\$ 147,676	\$ 59,684	\$ 207,360
36	LSO	Litigation Management Program	141	\$ 331,192	\$ 1,760,097	\$ 2,091,289	\$ 219,424	\$ 108,092	\$ 327,517
37	IT	Data Integration	14	\$ 21,955	\$ 1,298,180	\$ 1,320,135	\$ 17,134	\$ -	\$ 17,134
38	IT	Interim Case Management Systems	13	\$ 465,134	\$ 746,659	\$ 1,211,793	\$ 461,539	\$ -	\$ 461,539
39	CFCC	Self-Help Centers	40	\$ -	\$ 1,182,372	\$ 1,182,372	\$ -	\$ 4,095	\$ 4,095
40	IT	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	8	\$ 585,907	\$ 521,900	\$ 1,107,808	\$ 30,810	\$ -	\$ 30,810
41	COSSO	Trial Court Security Grants	26	\$ 5,050	\$ 308,326	\$ 313,376	\$ -	\$ 5,579	\$ 5,579
42	TCAS	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	11	\$ -	\$ 313,139	\$ 313,139	\$ -	\$ 154,928	\$ 154,928
43	COSSO	JusticeCorps	6	\$ 32,463	\$ 214,696	\$ 247,159	\$ 7,031	\$ -	\$ 7,031
44	IT	Testing Tools	4	\$ -	\$ 214,685	\$ 214,685	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
45	Education	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	12	\$ 712	\$ 200,186	\$ 200,898	\$ 712	\$ 23,108	\$ 23,820
46	IT	CLETS Services/Integration	5	\$ 3,600	\$ 188,502	\$ 192,102	\$ 3,600	\$ -	\$ 3,600
47	Education	Distance Learning	6	\$ 55,290	\$ 78,664	\$ 133,954	\$ 54,447	\$ 4,481	\$ 58,928
48	COSSO	Court Interpreter Program	8	\$ 4,926	\$ 88,220	\$ 93,146	\$ 529	\$ 2,787	\$ 3,316
49	LSO	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	11	\$ 12,901	\$ 76,149	\$ 89,050	\$ 12,901	\$ 13,262	\$ 26,163
50	IT	CCPOR (ROM)	2	\$ -	\$ 86,863	\$ 86,863	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
51	CFCC	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	3	\$ -	\$ 67,050	\$ 67,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52	CFCC	Educational Programs	3	\$ -	\$ 63,949	\$ 63,949	\$ -	\$ 11,064	\$ 11,064
53	Education	Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel	1	\$ -	\$ 58,994	\$ 58,994	\$ -	\$ 6,126	\$ 6,126
54	HR	Human Resources - Court Investigation	3	\$ 21,467	\$ 26,049	\$ 47,516	\$ 21,467	\$ 26,049	\$ 47,516

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² Preliminary estimate. More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

**Table B: Summary of FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF
Open Contracts/Encumbrances by Fund as of June 30, 2015**

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF)

Line	JCC Office	Program Title	# of Open Contracts	2013-14 Open Contract Amounts	2014-15 Open Contract Amounts	Total Open Contract Amounts	2013-14 Estimated Savings²	2014-15 Estimated Savings²	Total Estimated Savings²
55	Education	Faculty and Curriculum Development	13	\$ 12	\$ 45,370	\$ 45,382	\$ 12	\$ 15,391	\$ 15,403
56	CFCC	Interactive Software - Self-Represented Litigants Electronic Forms	2	\$ -	\$ 40,400	\$ 40,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
57	HR	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	2	\$ -	\$ 24,805	\$ 24,805	\$ -	\$ 5,086	\$ 5,086
58	CFCC	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	4	\$ -	\$ 21,677	\$ 21,677	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
59	CFCC	Publications	1	\$ -	\$ 9,500	\$ 9,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
60	LSO	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	1	\$ 8,050	\$ -	\$ 8,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
61	HR	Employee Assistance Program for Bench	1	\$ 5,150	\$ -	\$ 5,150	\$ 5,150	\$ -	\$ 5,150
62	IT	Uniform Civil Filing Fee System	2	\$ -	\$ 4,080	\$ 4,080	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
63	LSO	Regional Office Assistance Group	5	\$ 317	\$ 2,809	\$ 3,126	\$ -	\$ 2,497	\$ 2,497
64	Finance	Revenue and Collections	1	\$ 78	\$ -	\$ 78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
65	Audit Services	Audit Services	1	\$ -	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
66		Subtotal, Unrestricted	407	\$ 4,454,348	\$ 28,678,924	\$ 33,133,272	\$ 1,247,580	\$ 442,231	\$ 1,689,811
67									
68		Total	425	\$ 4,953,858	\$ 28,678,924	\$ 33,632,782	\$ 1,247,580	\$ 442,231	\$ 1,689,811
69									
70		<i>Restricted or Returned to Courts, All Funds¹</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>\$ 2,908,511</i>	<i>\$ 16,566,999</i>	<i>\$ 19,475,509</i>	<i>\$ 870</i>	<i>\$ 355,641</i>	<i>\$ 356,511</i>
71		<i>Unrestricted, All Funds</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>\$ 5,692,698</i>	<i>\$ 46,607,395</i>	<i>\$ 52,300,093</i>	<i>\$ 2,030,130</i>	<i>\$ 1,016,718</i>	<i>\$ 3,046,847</i>
72		Grand Total, All Funds	764	\$ 8,601,208	\$ 63,174,394	\$ 71,775,602	\$ 2,030,999	\$ 1,372,359	\$ 3,403,358

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² Preliminary estimate. More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

**Table C: Summary of FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF
Open Contracts/Encumbrances by JCC Office as of June 30, 2015**

1B

Line #	JCC Office and Program Title	# of Open Contracts	2013-14 Open Contract Amounts	2014-15 Open Contract Amounts	Total Open Contract Amounts	2013-14 Preliminary Estimated Savings ²	2014-15 Preliminary Estimated Savings ²	Total Preliminary Estimated Savings ²
1	Information Technology							
2	Telecommunications	26	\$ 2,421,797	\$11,136,014	\$13,557,811	\$ 14,495	\$ -	\$ 14,495
3	California Courts Technology Center	16	\$ 324,745	\$ 5,201,822	\$ 5,526,566	\$ 244,727	\$ -	\$ 244,727
4	Enterprise Policy & Planning	8	\$ 5,926	\$ 2,847,304	\$ 2,853,231	\$ 5,926	\$ -	\$ 5,926
5	V3 CMS	36	\$ 191,681	\$ 2,530,570	\$ 2,722,251	\$ 139,087	\$ -	\$ 139,087
6	Interim Case Management Systems	15	\$ 465,134	\$ 1,393,075	\$ 1,858,209	\$ 461,539	\$ -	\$ 461,539
7	Data Integration	14	\$ 21,955	\$ 1,298,180	\$ 1,320,135	\$ 17,134	\$ -	\$ 17,134
8	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	8	\$ 585,907	\$ 521,900	\$ 1,107,808	\$ 30,810	\$ -	\$ 30,810
9	V2 CMS	14	\$ 279,243	\$ 299,796	\$ 579,038	\$ 209,624	\$ 134,621	\$ 344,245
10	Jury Management System Grants	18	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	Testing Tools	4	\$ -	\$ 214,685	\$ 214,685	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12	CLETS Services/Integration	5	\$ 3,600	\$ 188,502	\$ 192,102	\$ 3,600	\$ -	\$ 3,600
13	CCPOR (ROM)	2	\$ -	\$ 86,863	\$ 86,863	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
14	Uniform Civil Filing Fee System	2	\$ -	\$ 4,080	\$ 4,080	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15	Subtotal, Information Technology	168	\$ 4,799,497	\$25,722,792	\$30,522,289	\$ 1,126,942	\$ 134,621	\$ 1,261,563
17	Center for Families, Children, and the Courts							
18	Court-Appointed Counsel	75	\$ 351,675	\$13,281,389	\$13,633,064	\$ 547	\$ -	\$ 547
19	Sargent Shriver Civil Representation	16	\$ 0	\$ 3,878,651	\$ 3,878,651	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
20	Equal Access Fund	2	\$ -	\$ 1,363,120	\$ 1,363,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
21	Self-Help Centers	40	\$ -	\$ 1,182,372	\$ 1,182,372	\$ -	\$ 4,095	\$ 4,095
22	CASA	44	\$ -	\$ 860,325	\$ 860,325	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23	Model Self-Help	9	\$ 51,961	\$ 553,141	\$ 605,102	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
24	Family Law Information Center	4	\$ 3,297	\$ 88,375	\$ 91,673	\$ 3,297	\$ -	\$ 3,297
25	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	3	\$ -	\$ 67,050	\$ 67,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
26	Educational Programs	3	\$ -	\$ 63,949	\$ 63,949	\$ -	\$ 11,064	\$ 11,064
27	Interactive Software - Self-Represented Litigants							
28	Electronic Forms	2	\$ -	\$ 40,400	\$ 40,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
29	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	4	\$ -	\$ 21,677	\$ 21,677	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
30	Publications	1	\$ -	\$ 9,500	\$ 9,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
31	CAC Training	2	\$ -	\$ 5,209	\$ 5,209	\$ -	\$ 209	\$ 209
31	Subtotal, Center for Families, Children, and the Courts	205	\$ 406,934	\$21,415,159	\$21,822,093	\$ 3,844	\$ 15,369	\$ 19,213
33	Real Estate and Facilities Management							
34	Court Facilities	111	\$ 2,632,040	\$10,622,070	\$13,254,109	\$ 293,572	\$ 715,285	\$ 1,008,857
35	Subtotal, Real Estate and Facilities Management	111	\$ 2,632,040	\$10,622,070	\$13,254,109	\$ 293,572	\$ 715,285	\$ 1,008,857
37	Legal Services							
38	Complex Civil Litigation Program	8	\$ 147,676	\$ 2,082,429	\$ 2,230,105	\$ 147,676	\$ 59,684	\$ 207,360
39	Litigation Management Program	141	\$ 331,192	\$ 1,760,097	\$ 2,091,289	\$ 219,424	\$ 108,092	\$ 327,517
40	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	11	\$ 12,901	\$ 76,149	\$ 89,050	\$ 12,901	\$ 13,262	\$ 26,163
41	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	1	\$ 8,050	\$ -	\$ 8,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42	Regional Office Assistance Group	5	\$ 317	\$ 2,809	\$ 3,126	\$ -	\$ 2,497	\$ 2,497
43	Subtotal, Legal Services	166	\$ 500,136	\$ 3,921,484	\$ 4,421,620	\$ 380,002	\$ 183,535	\$ 563,536
45	Court Operations Special Services							
46	Trial Court Security Grants	26	\$ 5,050	\$ 308,326	\$ 313,376	\$ -	\$ 5,579	\$ 5,579
47	JusticeCorps	6	\$ 32,463	\$ 214,696	\$ 247,159	\$ 7,031	\$ -	\$ 7,031
48	Court Interpreter Program	8	\$ 4,926	\$ 88,220	\$ 93,146	\$ 529	\$ 2,787	\$ 3,316
49	Assigned Judges	9	\$ -	\$ 80,012	\$ 80,012	\$ -	\$ 80,012	\$ 80,012
50	Court Interpreters	2	\$ 7,124	\$ 34,643	\$ 41,767	\$ 7,124	\$ -	\$ 7,124
51	Replacement Screening Stations	1	\$ -	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52	Subtotal, Court Operations Special Services	52	\$ 49,563	\$ 730,398	\$ 779,961	\$ 14,684	\$ 88,379	\$ 103,063
54	Center for Judicial Education & Research							
55	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	12	\$ 712	\$ 200,186	\$ 200,898	\$ 712	\$ 23,108	\$ 23,820
56	Distance Learning	6	\$ 55,290	\$ 78,664	\$ 133,954	\$ 54,447	\$ 4,481	\$ 58,928
57	Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel	1	\$ -	\$ 58,994	\$ 58,994	\$ -	\$ 6,126	\$ 6,126
58	Faculty and Curriculum Development	13	\$ 12	\$ 45,370	\$ 45,382	\$ 12	\$ 15,391	\$ 15,403
59	Subtotal, Center for Judicial Education & Research	32	\$ 56,014	\$ 383,213	\$ 439,228	\$ 55,171	\$ 49,107	\$ 104,278

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² Preliminary estimate. More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

**Table C: Summary of FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF
Open Contracts/Encumbrances by JCC Office as of June 30, 2015**

1B

Line #	JCC Office and Program Title	# of Open Contracts	2013-14 Open Contract Amounts	2014-15 Open Contract Amounts	Total Open Contract Amounts	2013-14 Preliminary Estimated Savings²	2014-15 Preliminary Estimated Savings²	Total Preliminary Estimated Savings²
61	<i>Trial Court Administrative Services</i>							
62	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	19	\$ 162	\$ 327,073	\$ 327,235	\$ -	\$ 154,928	\$ 154,928
63	<i>Subtotal, Trial Court Administrative Services</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>\$ 162</i>	<i>\$ 327,073</i>	<i>\$ 327,235</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ 154,928</i>	<i>\$ 154,928</i>
65	<i>Finance</i>							
66	Court Interpreters	1	\$ 130,168	\$ -	\$ 130,168	\$ 130,168	\$ -	\$ 130,168
67	Revenue and Collections	3	\$ 78	\$ 1,312	\$ 1,390	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
68	<i>Subtotal, Finance</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>\$ 130,246</i>	<i>\$ 1,312</i>	<i>\$ 131,558</i>	<i>\$ 130,168</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ 130,168</i>
70	<i>Human Resources</i>							
71	Human Resources - Court Investigation	3	\$ 21,467	\$ 26,049	\$ 47,516	\$ 21,467	\$ 26,049	\$ 47,516
72	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	2	\$ -	\$ 24,805	\$ 24,805	\$ -	\$ 5,086	\$ 5,086
73	Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	1	\$ 5,150	\$ -	\$ 5,150	\$ 5,150	\$ -	\$ 5,150
74	<i>Subtotal, Human Resources</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>\$ 26,617</i>	<i>\$ 50,854</i>	<i>\$ 77,471</i>	<i>\$ 26,617</i>	<i>\$ 31,135</i>	<i>\$ 57,752</i>
76	<i>Audit Services</i>							
77	Audit Services	1	\$ -	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
78	<i>Subtotal, Audit Services</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ 38</i>	<i>\$ 38</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ -</i>	<i>\$ -</i>
79								
80	<i>Restricted or Returned to Courts, All Funds¹</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>2,908,511</i>	<i>16,566,999</i>	<i>19,475,509</i>	<i>870</i>	<i>355,641</i>	<i>356,511</i>
81	<i>Unrestricted, All Funds</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>5,692,698</i>	<i>46,607,395</i>	<i>52,300,093</i>	<i>2,030,130</i>	<i>1,016,718</i>	<i>3,046,847</i>
82	Grand Total, All Funds	764	8,601,208	63,174,394	71,775,602	2,030,999	1,372,359	3,403,358

¹ "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

² Preliminary estimate. More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

This page intentionally left blank

**Table D: Summary of FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF
Open Contracts/Encumbrances by JCC Office and Fund as of June 30, 2015**

Line #	JCC Office and Program Title	IMF Open Contract Amounts	TCTF Open Contract Amounts	Total Open Contract Amounts	IMF Preliminary Estimated Unrestricted Savings ¹	TCTF Preliminary Estimated Unrestricted Savings ¹	IMF/ TCTF Preliminary Estimated Restricted Savings ^{1,2}	Total Preliminary Estimated Savings ¹
1	Information Technology							
2	Telecommunications	\$13,557,811	\$ -	\$13,557,811	\$ 14,495	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,495
3	California Courts Technology Center	\$ 5,294,560	\$ 232,006	\$ 5,526,566	\$ 244,727	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 244,727
4	Enterprise Policy & Planning	\$ 2,853,231	\$ -	\$ 2,853,231	\$ 5,926	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,926
5	V3 CMS	\$ -	\$ 2,722,251	\$ 2,722,251	\$ -	\$ 139,087	\$ -	\$ 139,087
6	Interim Case Management Systems	\$ 1,211,793	\$ 646,416	\$ 1,858,209	\$ 461,539	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 461,539
7	Data Integration	\$ 1,320,135	\$ -	\$ 1,320,135	\$ 17,134	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,134
8	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	\$ 1,107,808	\$ -	\$ 1,107,808	\$ 30,810	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,810
9	V2 CMS	\$ -	\$ 579,038	\$ 579,038	\$ -	\$ 237,954	\$ 106,290	\$ 344,245
10	Jury Management System Grants	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ 499,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	Testing Tools	\$ 214,685	\$ -	\$ 214,685	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12	CLETS Services/Integration	\$ 192,102	\$ -	\$ 192,102	\$ 3,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,600
13	CCPOR (ROM)	\$ 86,863	\$ -	\$ 86,863	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
14	Uniform Civil Filing Fee System	\$ 4,080	\$ -	\$ 4,080	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15	Subtotal, Information Technology	\$26,342,577	\$ 4,179,712	\$30,522,289	\$ 778,232	\$ 377,041	\$ 106,290	\$ 1,261,563
17	Center for Families, Children, and the Courts							
18	Court-Appointed Counsel	\$ -	\$13,633,064	\$13,633,064	\$ -	\$ 547	\$ -	\$ 547
19	Sargent Shriver Civil Representation	\$ -	\$ 3,878,651	\$ 3,878,651	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
20	Equal Access Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,363,120	\$ 1,363,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
21	Self-Help Centers	\$ 1,182,372	\$ -	\$ 1,182,372	\$ 4,095	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,095
22	CASA	\$ -	\$ 860,325	\$ 860,325	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23	Model Self-Help	\$ -	\$ 605,102	\$ 605,102	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
24	Family Law Information Center	\$ -	\$ 91,673	\$ 91,673	\$ -	\$ 3,297	\$ -	\$ 3,297
25	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	\$ 67,050	\$ -	\$ 67,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
26	Educational Programs	\$ 63,949	\$ -	\$ 63,949	\$ 11,064	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,064
27	Interactive Software - Self-Represented Litigants Electronic Forms	\$ 40,400	\$ -	\$ 40,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
28	Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	\$ 21,677	\$ -	\$ 21,677	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
29	Publications	\$ 9,500	\$ -	\$ 9,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
30	CAC Training	\$ -	\$ 5,209	\$ 5,209	\$ -	\$ 209	\$ -	\$ 209
31	Subtotal, Center for Families, Children, and the Courts	\$ 1,384,949	\$20,437,144	\$21,822,093	\$ 15,159	\$ 4,054	\$ -	\$ 19,213
33	Real Estate and Facilities Management							
34	Court Facilities	\$ -	\$13,254,109	\$13,254,109	\$ -	\$ 758,637	\$ 250,220	\$ 1,008,857
35	Subtotal, Real Estate and Facilities Management	\$ -	\$13,254,109	\$13,254,109	\$ -	\$ 758,637	\$ 250,220	\$ 1,008,857
37	Legal Services							
38	Complex Civil Litigation Program	\$ 2,230,105	\$ -	\$ 2,230,105	\$ 207,360	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 207,360
39	Litigation Management Program	\$ 2,091,289	\$ -	\$ 2,091,289	\$ 327,517	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 327,517
40	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	\$ 89,050	\$ -	\$ 89,050	\$ 26,163	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,163
41	Alternative Dispute Resolution Centers	\$ 8,050	\$ -	\$ 8,050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42	Regional Office Assistance Group	\$ 3,126	\$ -	\$ 3,126	\$ 2,497	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,497
43	Subtotal, Legal Services	\$ 4,421,620	\$ -	\$ 4,421,620	\$ 563,536	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 563,536
45	Court Operations Special Services							
46	Trial Court Security Grants	\$ 313,376	\$ -	\$ 313,376	\$ 5,579	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,579
47	JusticeCorps	\$ 247,159	\$ -	\$ 247,159	\$ 7,031	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,031
48	Court Interpreter Program	\$ 93,146	\$ -	\$ 93,146	\$ 3,316	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,316
49	Assigned Judges	\$ -	\$ 80,012	\$ 80,012	\$ -	\$ 80,012	\$ -	\$ 80,012
50	Court Interpreters	\$ -	\$ 41,767	\$ 41,767	\$ -	\$ 7,124	\$ -	\$ 7,124
51	Replacement Screening Stations	\$ -	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52	Subtotal, Court Operations Special Services	\$ 653,681	\$ 126,280	\$ 779,961	\$ 15,926	\$ 87,137	\$ -	\$ 103,063
54	Center for Judicial Education & Research							
55	Mandated, Essential, and Other Education for Judicial Officers	\$ 200,898	\$ -	\$ 200,898	\$ 23,820	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,820
56	Distance Learning	\$ 133,954	\$ -	\$ 133,954	\$ 58,928	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58,928
57	Essential and Other Education for Court Personnel	\$ 58,994	\$ -	\$ 58,994	\$ 6,126	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,126
58	Faculty and Curriculum Development	\$ 45,382	\$ -	\$ 45,382	\$ 15,403	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,403
59	Subtotal, Center for Judicial Education & Research	\$ 439,228	\$ -	\$ 439,228	\$ 104,278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 104,278

¹ Preliminary estimate. More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

² "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

**Table D: Summary of FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 TCTF and IMF
Open Contracts/Encumbrances by JCC Office and Fund as of June 30, 2015**

Line #	JCC Office and Program Title	IMF Open Contract Amounts	TCTF Open Contract Amounts	Total Open Contract Amounts	IMF Preliminary Estimated Unrestricted Savings ¹	TCTF Preliminary Estimated Unrestricted Savings ¹	IMF/ TCTF Preliminary Estimated Restricted Savings ^{1,2}	Total Preliminary Estimated Savings ¹
61	<i>Trial Court Administrative Services</i>							
62	Phoenix HR and Financial Services	\$ 313,139	\$ 14,097	\$ 327,235	\$ 154,928	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 154,928
63	<i>Subtotal, Trial Court Administrative Services</i>	\$ 313,139	\$ 14,097	\$ 327,235	\$ 154,928	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 154,928
65	<i>Finance</i>							
66	Court Interpreters	\$ -	\$ 130,168	\$ 130,168	\$ -	\$ 130,168	\$ -	\$ 130,168
67	Revenue and Collections	\$ 78	\$ 1,312	\$ 1,390	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
68	<i>Subtotal, Finance</i>	\$ 78	\$ 131,480	\$ 131,558	\$ -	\$ 130,168	\$ -	\$ 130,168
70	<i>Human Resources</i>							
71	Human Resources - Court Investigation	\$ 47,516	\$ -	\$ 47,516	\$ 47,516	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,516
72	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	\$ 24,805	\$ -	\$ 24,805	\$ 5,086	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,086
73	Employee Assistance Program for Bench Officers	\$ 5,150	\$ -	\$ 5,150	\$ 5,150	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,150
74	<i>Subtotal, Human Resources</i>	\$ 77,471	\$ -	\$ 77,471	\$ 57,752	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,752
76	<i>Audit Services</i>							
77	Audit Services	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
78	<i>Subtotal, Audit Services</i>	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
79								
80	<i>Subtotal, 2013-14 Restricted or Returned to Courts²</i>	\$ 499,510	\$ 2,409,001	\$ 2,908,511	N/A	N/A	\$ 870	\$ 870
81	<i>Subtotal, 2014-15 Restricted or Returned to Courts²</i>	\$ -	\$ 16,566,999	\$ 16,566,999	N/A	N/A	\$ 355,641	\$ 355,641
82	Total, Restricted or Returned to Courts²	\$ 499,510	\$ 18,975,999	\$ 19,475,509	N/A	N/A	\$ 356,511	\$ 356,511
83	<i>Subtotal, 2013-14 Unrestricted</i>	\$ 4,454,348	\$ 1,238,350	\$ 5,692,698	\$ 1,247,580	\$ 782,549	N/A	\$ 2,030,130
84	<i>Subtotal, 2014-15 Unrestricted</i>	\$ 28,678,924	\$ 17,928,471	\$ 46,607,395	\$ 442,231	\$ 574,486	N/A	\$ 1,016,718
85	Total, Unrestricted	\$ 33,133,272	\$ 19,166,821	\$ 52,300,093	\$ 1,689,811	\$ 1,357,036	N/A	\$ 3,046,847
87	Total, 2013-14	\$ 4,953,858	\$ 3,647,351	\$ 8,601,208	\$ 1,247,580	\$ 782,549	\$ 870	\$ 2,030,999
88	Total, 2014-15	\$ 28,678,924	\$ 34,495,470	\$ 63,174,394	\$ 442,231	\$ 574,486	\$ 355,641	\$ 1,372,359
89	Grand Total	\$ 33,632,782	\$ 38,142,821	\$ 71,775,602	\$ 1,689,811	\$ 1,357,036	\$ 356,511	\$ 3,403,358

¹ Preliminary estimate. More savings are likely, but cannot be estimated reliably currently

² "Restricted" by statute, council policy, or charges to be returned to courts

Item 2
FY 2016–2017 Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations from the Judicial Council, Trial Court Operations, and Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriations (Action Item)

Issue

The purpose of the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee’s December 14-15, 2015 meeting is to adopt preliminary 2016–2017 allocation recommendations related to certain TCTF programs that will be revisited in February 2016. In the interim, the subcommittee will receive feedback and updated information from Judicial Council of California (JCC) staff regarding the preliminary recommendations and wait for the release of the Governor’s Budget Proposal for 2016–2017. The JCC’s Finance office recommends the subcommittee approve recommendations #1 and #3, which are essentially a continuation of 2015–2016 allocation levels, and consider the two options provided in Recommendation #2. The plan is for the TCBAC to consider the subcommittee’s recommendation in March 2016 and to bring final allocation recommendations to the Judicial Council’s April 14-15, 2016 business meeting. The subcommittee and the TCBAC will need to review and recommend additional allocations to the Judicial Council in July upon enactment of the State Budget (see “Pending FY 2016–2017 TCTF allocation recommendations for Judicial Council” section for more information on the items not being considered at this meeting as well as attachment 2E, column F).

Previous Judicial Council and Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Action

For 2014–2015, the TCBAC’s recommendations to move the allocation for costs of the V3 case management system to the IMF and discontinue the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF were initially approved by the Judicial Council in April 2014, but those actions were deferred to 2015–2016 by the council in June 2014 in response to the continuation of the \$20 million transfer in the Governor’s 2014 May Revision proposal. The transfer was discontinued as part of the 2015 Budget Act.

Fiscal Status of the Trial Court Trust Fund

In the 2015 Budget Act, at the request of the Judicial Council, the \$20 million transfer from the IMF to the TCTF was discontinued and up to a \$66.2 million General Fund backfill is provided to address the continued decline in civil fee and criminal assessment revenues that support courts’ base allocation since 2012–2013. With the shift of the non-reimbursable V3 case management system costs from the TCTF to the IMF, the cessation of the transfer created a net shortfall of \$13.7 million to the TCTF. This estimated deficit has been reduced to \$8.1 million based on \$2.4 million ongoing as well as \$3.2 million potential continuing one-time savings from programs and costs funded from the TCTF (see Table 1 below).¹ \$2.4 million of ongoing savings

¹ The deficit amounts displayed on row 45 of attachment 2B for 2016–2017 through 2020–2021 vary from the \$8.1 million amount primarily due to the statutorily-required reimbursement of up to \$325,000 to the California State

have been realized from reducing the jury reimbursement allocation by \$1.5 million to \$14.5 million as well as \$0.9 million in other items. \$3.2 million in potential continuing one-time judges' compensation savings for 2016–2017 and the near future as well is estimated based on historical judgeship vacancy rates.

Table 1. Trial Court Trust Fund Operational Deficit

Description	Amount	
Discontinued \$20 Million Transfer from IMF		-\$20.0 million
Savings from Funding V3 CMS from IMF and Decommissioning V2 CMS		\$6.3 million
Net Deficit		-\$13.7 million
Adjustments to Net Deficit		
Add: Estimated Vacancy-related Judicial Compensation Savings (One-time)	\$3.2 million	
Add: Reduced Jury Reimbursement Allocation from \$16 Million to \$14.5 Million (Ongoing)	\$1.5 million	
Add: Exclude 2013–2014 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Program from Base Distribution Calculation (Ongoing)	\$0.8 million	
Add: Miscellaneous (Ongoing)	\$0.1 million	
Subtotal, Adjustments to Net Deficit	\$5.6 million	
Estimated Operational Deficit with Judicial Compensation Savings		-\$8.1 million
Estimated Operational Deficit without Judicial Compensation Savings		-\$11.3 million

The subcommittee is not being asked to address this shortfall at this meeting, but can consider this information when reviewing Recommendation 2. Fortunately, with an estimated ending unrestricted fund balance of \$9.2 million for 2015–2016 (see 2B, column E, row 43), there will likely not be a need to address the TCTF's \$8.1 million operational deficit in 2016–2017, but in 2017–2018 when the projected ending unrestricted fund balance becomes negative (see 2B, column G, row 43).

This assumes that the Governor will continue to fully backfill from the General Fund any TCTF shortfall resulting from the decrease in revenue that supports courts' base distributions and that the \$3.2 million in estimated one-time judges' compensation savings continues. With the anticipated continued decline in revenue that supports courts' base distributions in 2016–2017,

Auditor for audits of the trial courts occurring every odd year and the timing of allocations and the receipt of the statutorily-designated revenues that support them related to the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections programs.

an estimated total of \$74.8 million will need to be backfilled by the General Fund next fiscal year (see 2B, column F, row 15).

Table 2 displays the annual decline in revenue that support the trial courts' base distributions as well as the annual percent decline in revenue that support the trial courts' base distributions, excluding county Maintenance of Effort payments to the TCTF, which are fixed in statute. Based on the four-year average annual decline in TCTF revenue that supports trial courts' base distributions, the Judicial Council may want to consider establishing a floor in that amount, \$26.4 million, for the TCTF unrestricted fund balance to allow it to absorb a decrease in these revenues if not backfilled by the General Fund instead of requiring an unanticipated reduction to be allocated during the year when it is more difficult for courts to plan for and efficiently and effectively operationalize reductions. The subcommittee may also consider this information when reviewing Recommendation 2.

Table 2 – Annual Decreases in the TCTF Revenue that Supports Court Base Distributions

Fiscal Year	TCTF Revenue Supporting Court Base Distributions	\$ Annual Decrease in Revenue	TCTF Non-MOE Revenue Supporting Court Base Distributions	% Annual Decrease in Non-MOE Revenue
FY 2012-13 Actual	\$1.245 billion	N/A	\$585.4 million	N/A
FY 2013-14 Actual	\$1.213 billion	-\$32.0 million	\$553.8 million	-5.5%
FY 2014-15 Actual	\$1.175 billion	-\$37.6 million	\$519.8 million	-6.8%
FY 2015-16 (2016-17 1st Turn 10R)	\$1.158 billion	-\$17.4 million	\$498.5 million	-3.4%
FY 2016-17 (2016-17 1st Turn 10R)	\$1.139 billion	-\$18.7 million	\$479.9 million	-3.7%
Four-Year Average	N/A	-\$26.4 million	N/A	-4.8%

The projected 2016–2017 ending TCTF fund balance is \$15.4 million (see 2B, column F, row 34). Because about \$13.8 million are monies that are either statutorily restricted or restricted by the council (mainly savings related to the Program 45.45 court interpreter appropriation), the estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$1.6 million (see 2B, column F, rows 37 and 43).

Recommendation 1

The JCC Finance office recommends the subcommittee adopt the preliminary recommendation to:

1. Allocate \$128.308 million from the TCTF Judicial Council (previously Program 30.05, now Program 0140010), Trial Court Operations (previously Program 30.15, now Program 0140019), Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (previously Program 45.10,

now Program 0150010) and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (Program 0150011) appropriations for those programs funded by statutorily-designated revenues, statutorily-appropriated at a specific amount, or have no impact on TCTF fund balance.

Recommendation 1 Rationale

The Judicial Council (previously Program 30.05, now Program 0140010) appropriation is used to fund the costs of Judicial Council staff. The Trial Court Operations (previously Program 30.15, now Program 0140019) appropriation is used to fund the operational costs for statewide administrative infrastructure programs that support the trial courts and a grant program, the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program. The Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (previously Program 45.10, now Program 0150010) appropriation primarily funds distributions, including base allocations, to the trial courts, but also is used to transfer the worker's compensation insurance premiums paid by courts to the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund, make payments to dependency counsel on behalf of the courts that participate in the court-appointed counsel Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program, and pay certain allowable facilities-related costs that are reimbursed by the courts. The Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (Program 0150011) appropriation funds the court-appointed dependency counsel program. Attachments 2C and 2E displays all approved and estimated allocations from the 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 appropriations discussed and Attachment 2E identifies those Support for Operation of the Trial Courts and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel appropriation allocations recommended for the subcommittee's consideration at this meeting (see Column E, rows 21 to 32)..

Of the programs recommended to be funded from Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations expenditure authority in 2016–2017, those included in Recommendation 1 are either funded by revenues that, per statute, are to be used solely by that program with their recommended allocation amounts reflecting current estimated revenues and any remaining unexpended revenues from prior years (Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program, Equal Access Fund, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections), or whose allocations, based on Judicial Council policy, are fully reimbursed by courts and their recommended allocation amounts reflecting the estimated costs to be reimbursed based on anticipated services (Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS, California Courts Technology Center, Interim Case Management System, Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services).² In both instances, these allocations have no impact on the TCTF unrestricted fund balance as unspent revenues would be restricted in the fund balance or there is no actual cost to the fund at all. The program's budgets, if necessary, will be updated to reflect the actual program revenues or the actual program costs to be reimbursed.

² Report to the Judicial Council. April 21, 2006, <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/jc/documents/reports/0406ItemF-2.pdf>

Of the other two programs contained in Recommendation 1, one is statutorily-appropriated at a specific amount while the other is funded by statutorily-designated revenues and, as a result, gives the Judicial Council little discretion in the allocation amount of these programs. Regarding the court-appointed dependency counsel program, the 2015 Budget Act specifically appropriates \$114.7 million for the program in Item 0250-102-0932 (Program 0150011). It is assumed that this specific appropriation will continue and be included in the 2016 Budget Act. If the program receives any of the additional funding requested in a 2016–2017 Budget Change Proposal, the Judicial Council will address this allocation at its July 29, 2016 business meeting. For the court-appointed dependency counsel collections allocation, statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted through the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council’s approved standard. The \$526,865 recommended allocation reflects the estimated 2015–2016 revenue available for distribution to the courts from the program in 2016–2017. The program’s budget, if necessary, will be updated to reflect the actual program revenues. The council has already approved a formula for allocating monies related to the court-appointed dependency counsel and court-appointed dependency counsel collections programs.

Table 3 displays the proposed allocations from the TCTF Judicial Council, Trial Court Operations, Support for Operation of the Trial Courts, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel expenditure authority organized by recommendation. Attachments 2D and 2F provide the description of these programs.

Table 3 -- Proposed 2016–2017 TCTF One-Time Allocations

Program Title	2015–2016 Allocation	Rec. #1 2016–2017 Estimated Restricted Revenue or Court Reimbursement	Rec. #2 2016–2017 Recommended Maximum Allocation	Total Recommended 2016–2017 Allocation
Judicial Council (Program 30.05 or 0140010)				
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	\$500,000	\$500,000		\$500,000
Equal Access Fund	\$163,000	\$194,000		\$194,000
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	\$260,000	\$260,000		\$260,000
Revenue and Collections Program	\$625,000		\$625,000	\$625,000
Phoenix Financial Services	\$106,434	\$107,000		\$107,000
Phoenix Human Resources Services	\$1,349,000	\$1,349,000		\$1,349,000
Subtotal, Judicial Council	\$3,003,434	\$2,410,000	\$625,000	\$3,035,000

Program Title	2015–2016 Allocation	Rec. #1 2016–2017 Estimated Restricted Revenue or Court Reimbursement	Rec. #2 2016–2017 Recommended Maximum Allocation	Total Recommended 2016–2017 Allocation
Trial Court Operations (Program 30.15 or 0140019)				
Children in Dependency Case Training	\$113,000		\$113,000	\$113,000
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	\$7,793,000	\$7,793,000		\$7,793,000
Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	\$644,320	\$564,000		\$564,000
California Courts Technology Center	\$1,472,029	\$1,472,000		\$1,472,000
Interim Case Management System	\$842,232	\$842,000		\$842,000
Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations	\$524,750	\$0		\$0
Subtotal, Trial Court Operations	\$11,389,331	\$10,671,000	\$113,000	\$10,784,000
Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (Program 45.10 or 0150010)				
Jury Reimbursements	\$14,500,000		\$14,500,000	\$14,500,000
Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	\$9,223,000		\$9,223,000	\$9,223,000
Self-Help Center Reimbursements	\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
Replacement Screening Stations Reimbursements	\$2,286,000		\$2,286,000	\$2,286,000
Elder Abuse Reimbursements	\$332,000		\$332,000	\$332,000
California State Auditor Audits Reimbursement	\$325,000	\$0		\$0
CAC Dependency Counsel Collections Reimbursement	\$872,692	\$526,865		\$526,865
Subtotal, Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	\$30,038,692	\$526,865	\$28,841,000	\$29,367,865
Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (Program 0150011)	\$114,700,000	\$114,700,000	\$0	\$114,700,000
Total	\$159,131,457	\$128,307,865	\$29,579,000	\$157,886,865

TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Expenditure Authority

There is estimated to be sufficient expenditure authority for the recommended allocations. The 2015 Budget Act provides \$4.85 million in expenditure authority for Judicial Council allocations and \$13.03 million for Trial Court Operations allocations and it is anticipated that the expenditure authority in 2016–2017 will be \$3.49 million and \$13.03 million respectively (see Attachment 2C, columns D and E, line 17). The recommended allocations are \$3.04 million from

the Judicial Council appropriation and \$10.78 million from the Trial Court Operations appropriation (see Attachment 2C, columns D and E, line 13). There is also provisional language in the 2015 Budget Act that allows for this authority to be increased, if needed. It is assumed that this provisional authority will continue and be included in the 2016 Budget Act.

Pending FY 2016–2017 TCTF allocation recommendations for Judicial Council

The subcommittee is being asked to consider only specific programs that reimburse trial court costs from the TCTF Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation as other allocations depend on enactment of the State Budget or are items that don't require Judicial Council action. Assuming the timely enactment of the 2016 State Budget, the TCBAC intends to bring recommendations for the council's consideration at its July 29, 2016 meeting regarding new funding allocations and historical funding reallocations based on the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Model (WAFM); trial court benefits cost changes funding, any Proposition 47 workload-related funding, allocation of the statutorily-required 2 percent set-aside; and preliminary allocation adjustments related to the 1 percent cap on trial courts' reserves. The TCBAC may also revisit what is being preliminarily recommended in this report or any changes made to the recommendations in February 2016.

There are a number of items that the council will not be asked to act on because they either are required by the Budget Act (a \$50 million distribution from the Immediate & Critical Needs Account for court operations (see 2E, Column D, row 20)), have already been acted upon by the council (various revenue distributions (see Column D, rows 35, 38-40)), are required by statute (various revenue distributions(see Column D, rows 36 and 37)), or are authorized charges for the cost of programs (see Column D, row 45).

Recommendations 2 and 3

The JCC Finance office recommends the subcommittee adopt preliminary recommendations to:

2. A. Allocate \$29,579,000, \$738,000 from the TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations to the Children in Dependency Cases Training program and Revenue and Collections Program, continuing their 2015–2016 amounts and \$28.841 million from the TCTF Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation for the programs that reimburse trial court costs, or
 - B. Though there is currently not estimated to be an immediate need to reduce allocations for 2016–2017, reduce allocations in 2016–2017 to begin addressing the estimated \$8.1 million to \$11.3 million operational deficit in the TCTF by the end of 2017–2018; and
3. For the jury reimbursement program, direct JCC Finance staff to make, if eligible jury costs exceed the total allocation, a year-end allocation adjustment so that each court

receives the same share of the approved allocation based on their share of the statewide allowable jury expenditures.

Recommendations 2 and 3 Rationale

Two programs contained in Recommendation 2, with no proposed changes from their 2015–2016 allocation level, are the Children in Dependency Cases Training program and Revenue and Collections Program. The TCTF received a General Fund transfer increase in FY 2007–2008 to fund the Children in Dependency Cases Training program to help the Judicial Branch comply with Assembly Bill 2480 (Stats. 2006, ch. 385) which concerns the appointment of counsel for children in appeals of dependency court orders. The council approved the move of the Revenue and Collections Program allocation to the TCTF from the IMF in April 2014.

For four of the five programs funded from the Support for the Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation included in Recommendation 2, because they defray or help defray trial court costs, the 2016–2017 recommended allocation of \$28.8 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund should be maintained at the 2015–2016 levels for the following items:

- Criminal justice realignment (\$9.2 million);
- Self-help center (\$2.5 million);
- Replacement screening stations (\$2.3 million); and
- Elder abuse (\$332,000).

Over the past four years, these programs have generally distributed their full allocation. For the fifth program, jury reimbursements, JCC Finance staff recommend the 2016–2017 allocation of \$14.5 million, maintaining at the 2015–2016 allocation level. Recent jury reimbursement activity indicates that at it is too soon to tell whether a reduced allocation amount, allowing for the savings to offset any TCTF revenue shortfalls, would still be sufficient to defray trial court costs. Jury reimbursements have declined every year beginning in 2009–2010. In addition, the reimbursement for 2013–2014 was \$13.9 million and 2014–2015 was \$13.7 million. However, the 2015–2016 reimbursement is estimated to be \$14.2 million, the first increase since 2008–2009. The latest five year average of program expenditures is \$14.6 million and the latest three year average is \$14.1 million.

Though there is currently not estimated to be an immediate need to reduce allocations for 2016–2017, the subcommittee could consider, beginning in either 2016–2017, reducing some or all of the specific programs that reimburse trial court costs as a partial or complete alternative to reducing courts' base operations allocations in 2017–2018 to address the \$8.1 million to \$11.3 million operational deficit in the TCTF. In addition, any reduction amounts applied beginning in 2016–2017 instead of 2017–2018 could be used one-time in 2016–2017 to begin to build up the TCTF unrestricted fund balance to address any decreases in revenues that support courts' base distributions not backfilled by the Governor with General Fund monies. Attachment 2G provides

descriptions from the JCC offices regarding the impact an \$8.3 million reduction, the 2016–2017 deficit amount, applied pro rata to the jury, self-help, replacement screening stations, and elder abuse reimbursement programs would have on the trial courts.

For Recommendation 3, JCC staff also recommend that if statewide allowable jury expenditures exceed the allocation, that a year-end adjustment be made to courts' allocations to ensure each court receives a share of the \$14.5 million allocation based on their share of the statewide allowable jury expenditures. This would allow courts to benefit equally from the allocation regardless of when their jury expenditures are incurred.

The Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee will have the opportunity to revisit any preliminary recommendations adopted at this meeting in a subsequent meeting, likely in February, prior to the TCBAC's scheduled March 10, 2016 meeting. Also, based on the amount of funding proposed or provided in the 2016 Governor's Proposed Budget, May Revision, or 2016 Budget Act, the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee or TCBAC may revisit these allocations and present revised recommendations for the Judicial Council's consideration at its July 29, 2016 meeting.

This page intentionally left blank

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	FY 2015-16									
		FY 2013-14 (Year-End Financial Statement)	FY 2014-15 (Year-End Financial Statement)	Estimate as of July 2015	Change in Estimate	Estimate as of October 2015 (1st Turn 10R Revenue Estimate) ¹	FY 2016-17 (Estimated) (1st Turn 10R Revenue Estimate) ¹	FY 2017-18 (Estimated) ²	FY 2018-19 (Estimated) ²	FY 2019-20 (Estimated) ²	FY 2020-21 (Estimated) ²
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J
1	Beginning Balance	82,520,997	21,218,232	6,614,017	-	6,614,017	23,630,253	15,351,119	7,715,530	(62,483)	(8,165,497)
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	(2,688,884)	5,624,798	-	2,063,980	2,063,980	-	-	-	-	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	79,832,113	26,843,030	6,614,017	2,063,980	8,677,997	23,630,253	15,351,119	7,715,530	(62,483)	(8,165,497)
4	Revenue	1,374,450,890	1,341,324,951	1,319,206,676	(19,402,200)	1,299,804,476	1,277,791,539	1,295,324,577	1,295,324,577	1,295,324,577	1,295,324,577
5	Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue	658,755,572	659,050,502	659,050,502	-	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502
6	Civil Fee Revenue	384,474,327	355,952,541	338,643,093	5,836,869	344,479,962	333,225,454	333,039,131	333,039,131	333,039,131	333,039,131
7	Court Operations Assessment Revenue	149,578,279	139,931,778	131,033,479	(76,042)	130,957,437	123,406,517	108,911,002	108,911,002	108,911,002	108,911,002
8	Civil Assessment Revenue	154,784,402	159,372,012	164,263,670	(26,482,819)	137,780,851	134,692,460	165,473,646	165,473,646	165,473,646	165,473,646
9	Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue	25,360,674	24,994,594	24,237,643	1,504,445	25,742,088	25,811,573	27,109,037	27,109,037	27,109,037	27,109,037
10	Interest from SMIF	94,882	151,376	108,806	177,786	286,592	286,592	286,592	286,592	286,592	286,592
11	Sanctions and Contempt Fines	1,237,263	1,586,715	1,111,362	(66,662)	1,044,700	965,888	807,043	807,043	807,043	807,043
12	Miscellaneous Revenue	165,492	285,431	758,121	(295,776)	462,345	352,553	647,625	647,625	647,625	647,625
13	General Fund Transfer	742,319,017	922,648,255	943,382,019	341,336	943,723,355	916,824,000	916,824,000	916,824,000	916,824,000	916,824,000
14	General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	-	114,700,000	-	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000
15	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	-	30,900,000	66,200,000	(10,000,000)	56,200,000	74,800,000	81,600,000	81,600,000	81,600,000	81,600,000
16	Reduction Offset Transfers	26,080,000	26,080,000	6,080,000	-	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
17	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	12,630,047	12,678,778	13,220,122	-	13,220,122	13,220,122	13,220,122	13,220,122	13,220,122	13,220,122
18	Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	2,155,479,954	2,333,631,984	2,462,788,817	(29,060,864)	2,433,727,953	2,403,415,661	2,427,748,699	2,427,748,699	2,427,748,699	2,427,748,699
19	Total Resources	2,235,312,067	2,360,475,014	2,469,402,834	(26,996,884)	2,442,405,950	2,427,045,913	2,443,099,818	2,435,464,229	2,427,686,216	2,419,583,203
20	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations										
21	Program 30 (0140) - Expenditures/Allocations	22,672,123	19,718,918	16,981,201	(2,119,037)	14,862,164	13,902,000	6,395,399	5,745,399	6,395,399	5,745,399
22	Program 30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,764,788	4,095,938	4,881,548	(1,408,715)	3,472,833	3,118,000	2,754,399	2,754,399	2,754,399	2,754,399
23	Program 30.15 (0140019) - Trial Court Operations	18,907,335	15,622,980	12,099,653	(710,322)	11,389,331	10,784,000	3,641,000	2,991,000	3,641,000	2,991,000
24											
25	Program 45 (0150) - Expenditures/Allocations	2,191,275,014	2,333,437,799	2,434,428,774	(30,596,517)	2,403,832,258	2,397,792,794	2,428,988,889	2,429,781,314	2,429,456,314	2,429,781,314
26	Program 45.10 (0150010) - Support for Trial Court Operations	1,753,105,306	1,883,174,214	1,857,613,977	(32,353,341)	1,825,260,636	1,819,118,446	1,850,078,153	1,850,870,578	1,850,545,578	1,850,870,578
27	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	-	114,700,000	-	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000
28	Program 45.25 (0150019) - Comp. of Superior Court Judges	312,138,986	319,803,869	332,130,019	1,026,468	333,156,487	333,450,000	333,450,000	333,450,000	333,450,000	333,450,000
29	Program 45.35 (0150028) - Assigned Judges	25,496,371	24,792,538	26,047,000	597,868	26,644,868	26,645,000	26,645,000	26,645,000	26,645,000	26,645,000
30	Program 45.45 (0150037) - Court Interpreters	90,983,918	96,802,928	95,855,000	-	95,855,000	95,855,000	95,855,000	95,855,000	95,855,000	95,855,000
31	Program 45.55 (0150046) - Grants	9,550,433	8,864,250	8,082,778	132,489	8,215,267	8,024,348	8,260,735	8,260,735	8,260,735	8,260,735
32	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	146,697	704,280	-	81,276	81,276	-	-	-	-	-
33	Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	2,214,093,835	2,353,860,997	2,451,409,975	(32,634,278)	2,418,775,698	2,411,694,794	2,435,384,288	2,435,526,713	2,435,851,713	2,435,526,713
34	Ending Fund Balance	21,218,232	6,614,017	17,992,859	5,637,394	23,630,253	15,351,119	7,715,530	(62,483)	(8,165,497)	(15,943,510)
35											
36	Fund Balance Detail										
37	Restricted Fund Balance	18,557,776	16,294,708	15,180,335	(790,456)	14,389,879	13,797,652	14,265,077	14,265,077	14,265,077	14,265,077
38	Court Interpreter Program	14,734,148	10,917,600	10,917,600	-	10,917,600	10,917,600	10,917,600	10,917,600	10,917,600	10,917,600
39	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	996,574	1,574,692	1,102,164	(575,297)	526,866	586,200	1,053,624	1,053,624	1,053,624	1,053,624
40	Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	1,632,117	927,837	927,837	(81,276)	846,561	846,561	846,561	846,561	846,561	846,561
41	Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services	1,168,453	380,151	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel	26,484	2,494,429	2,232,735	(133,882)	2,098,852	1,447,292	1,447,292	1,447,292	1,447,292	1,447,292
43	Unrestricted Fund Balance	2,660,456	(9,680,691)	2,812,524	6,427,849	9,240,373	1,553,467	(6,549,546)	(14,327,560)	(22,430,573)	(30,208,587)
44											
45	Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	(58,613,881)	(20,229,013)	11,378,842	3,573,414	14,952,256	(8,279,134)	(7,635,589)	(7,778,013)	(8,103,013)	(7,778,013)

1. Revenue projections provided for the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2016-2017. The 2015-2016 allocations reflect amounts approved by the Judicial Council through October 2015 as well as recommended allocations for 2016-2017 and revenue distributions based on the revenue projections. Also includes an estimated increase to Programs 45.25 (0150019) and 45.35 (0150028) in 2015-2016 to reflect the 2.4% judges' salary increase.

2. Revenue projections for 2017-2018 and held constant in future years based on revenues collected through September 2015 and not included for the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2016-2017 which only displays the budget year. The 2017-2018 and future year allocations reflect revenue distributions based on the revenue projections and vary primarily due to the statutorily-required reimbursement of up to \$325,000 to the California State Auditor for audits of the trial courts occurring every odd year and the timing of allocations and receipt of the statutorily-designated revenues that support them related to the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections programs.

TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Appropriations Allocations

#	Project and Program Title	2015-16 JC- Approved Allocation	2015-16 Funded from Courts' Program 45.10 TCTF Allocations	2015-16 Approved Total Allocation	FY 2016-17 Allocations for TCBCAC Revenue & Expenditure Subcommittee Consideration		
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col A + B)	Judicial Council (Staff) ¹	Trial Court Operations ¹	Total
					Col. D	Col. E	Col F (Col. D + E)
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	113,000		113,000	-	113,000	113,000
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	8,293,000		8,293,000	500,000	7,793,000	8,293,000
3	Equal Access Fund	163,000		163,000	194,000	-	194,000
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000		260,000	260,000	-	260,000
5	Revenue and Collections Program	625,000		625,000	625,000	-	625,000
6	Programs Funded from Courts' TCTF Allocations						
7	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS		644,320	644,320	-	564,000	564,000
8	California Courts Technology Center		1,472,029	1,472,029	-	1,472,000	1,472,000
9	Interim Case Management System		842,232	842,232	-	842,000	842,000
10	Phoenix Financial Services		106,434	106,434	107,000	-	107,000
11	Phoenix HR Services		1,349,000	1,349,000	1,349,000	-	1,349,000
12	Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations		524,750	524,750	-	-	-
13	Total, Program/Project Allocations	9,454,000	4,938,765	14,392,765	3,035,000	10,784,000	13,819,000
14	Department of Motor Vehicles Amnesty Program service charges	250,000		250,000	-	-	-
15	Estimated State Controller's Office services charges	219,399		219,399	83,000	-	83,000
17	Estimated Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,490,100	13,025,000	16,515,100
18	Appropriation Balance	N/A	N/A	N/A	372,100	2,241,000	2,613,100

1. Provisional language in the State Budget Act for 2015 allows the Judicial Council appropriation authority to be increased for increased revenues that support the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot, Equal Access Fund, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections. Provisional language also allows up to \$11.274 million to be transferred to the Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriation authority for the recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts. It is assumed that this provisional authority will continue and be included in the 2016 Budget Act.

Description of Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations
 Projects/Programs Proposed to the TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure
 Subcommittee by the JCC for FY 2016–2017

Table of Contents

<i>Center for Families, Children, and the Courts</i>	71
<i>Children in Dependency Case Training</i>	71
<i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program</i>	72
<i>Equal Access Fund</i>	73
<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	74
<i>Finance</i>	74
<i>Revenue and Collections Program</i>	74
<i>Information Technology Office</i>	75
<i>Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System</i>	75
<i>California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations</i>	75
<i>Interim Case Management System</i>	76
<i>Trial Court Administrative Services Office</i>	76
<i>Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services</i>	76

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Children in Dependency Case Training

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$113,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

Program provides training designed to improve the trial and appellate advocacy skills of juvenile dependency court-appointed attorneys. All trial courts are eligible to send attorneys to this training. These funds are used to hire expert faculty and to support attendees’ travel. Attorneys educated in advanced trial skills save court costs by improving hearing efficiency, avoiding continuances, and adhering to federal standards for timeliness. If they are educated in establishing an adequate record, identifying issues for appeal, and meeting the appropriate timelines for writs and appeals, attorneys save the appellate courts considerable time by providing thorough and timely filings.

Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$8,293,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

This directed funding implements a pilot program required by Government Code section 68651 (AB 590-Feuer). Project funds come from a restricted \$10 supplemental filing fee on certain postjudgment motions. The funding supports six pilot programs, which are each a partnership of a legal services nonprofit corporation, the court, and other legal services providers in the community. The programs provide legal representation to low-income Californians (at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level) in housing, child custody, probate conservatorship, and guardianship matters. Since not all eligible low-income parties with meritorious cases can be provided with legal representation, the court partners receive funds to implement improved court procedures, personnel training, case management and administration methods, and best practices.

Pilot programs were selected through a competitive RFP process and approved by the Judicial Council. The projects are located in Kern, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Yolo counties. The San Francisco Superior Court did not request funding for the project. Government Code 68651 provides that the “participating projects shall be selected by a committee appointed by the Judicial Council with representation from key stakeholder groups, including judicial officers, legal services providers, and others, as appropriate... Projects approved pursuant to this section shall initially be authorized for a three-year period, commencing July 1, 2011, subject to renewal for a period to be determined by the Judicial Council, in consultation with the participating project in light of the project's capacity and success....”

The majority of administrative funds are being used for the evaluation of the pilot project as the statute requires the Judicial Council to submit a study of the project to the Governor and Legislature by January 2016. “The study shall report on the percentage of funding by case type and shall include data on the impact of counsel on equal access to justice and the effect on court administration and efficiency, and enhanced coordination between courts and other government service providers and community resources. This report shall describe the benefits of providing representation to those who were previously not represented, both for the clients and the courts, as well as strategies and recommendations for maximizing the benefit of that representation in the future. The report shall describe and include data, if available, on the impact of the pilot program on families and children. The report also shall include an assessment of the continuing unmet needs and, if available, data regarding those unmet needs.” This study should provide useful information to all courts on effective ways of handling these cases.

The pilots focus on providing representation in cases where one side is generally represented and the other is not. These are typically the most difficult cases for both the litigants and the courts. The intent is not only to improve access to the courts and the quality of justice obtained by those low-income individuals who would otherwise not have counsel, but also to allow court calendars

that currently include many self-represented litigants to be handled more effectively and efficiently. The legislature found that the absence of representation not only disadvantages parties, but has a negative effect on the functioning of the judicial system. “When parties lack legal counsel, courts must cope with the need to provide guidance and assistance to ensure that the matter is properly administered and the parties receive a fair trial or hearing. Such efforts, however, deplete scarce court resources and negatively affect the courts’ ability to function as intended, including causing erroneous and incomplete pleadings, inaccurate information, unproductive court appearances, improper defaults, unnecessary continuances, delays in proceedings for all court users and other problems that can ultimately subvert the administration of justice.”

Equal Access Fund

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$194,000, \$31,000 increase from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

For the last 13 years, the state Budget Act has contained a provision for the allotment of \$10 million to an Equal Access Fund “to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice.” In 2005, the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act was approved by the Legislature and the Governor. That act established a new distribution of \$4.80 per filing fee to the Equal Access Fund in the Trial Court Trust Fund. The estimated revenue from filing fees for the fund is \$5.7 million per year.

The Budget Act provides that 90% of the funds are to support agencies providing civil legal assistance for low-income persons. The Business and Professions Code sets forth the criteria for distribution of those funds. 10% of the funds support partnership grants to eligible legal services agencies providing self-help assistance at local courts. Organizations must complete specific applications for these funds and have the approval of their courts. The Budget Act allocates up to 5% for administrative costs. Two thirds of the administrative costs go to the State Bar and 1/3 to the Judicial Council.

The Judicial Council administrative funds cover the costs of staffing to distribute and administer the grants, provide technical assistance and training support for the legal services agencies and courts, as well as the cost of Commission expenses, accounting and programmatic review. It further provides staff support to develop on-line document assembly programs and other assistance for partnership grant projects.

The program serves all 58 courts by providing support to legal services programs which assist litigants with their legal matters. Thirty-three partnership grant programs operate 33 self-help centers in 28 courts. Parties who receive legal services – either fully or partly represented or helped in self-help centers – generally save the court valuable time and resources by helping litigants have better prepared pleadings, more organized evidence, and more effective presentation of their cases. Legal services programs also save significant time for courts by

helping litigants understand their cases and helping them to settle whenever possible. Often a consultation with a lawyer is helpful for potential litigants to understand when they do not have a viable court case.

The administrative funds also provide the staff support to develop on-line document assembly programs and other instructional materials developed in partnership grant programs which are available to courts throughout the state.

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$260,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.47 mandates the collections program. This funding provides staffing for the program. Collections program staff assists trial courts in implementing the program in a variety of ways. A dedicated Serranus webpage, maintained by staff, provides quick access to the guidelines, optional forms, and other program resources. Staff also administers a listserv for judicial officers and court staff to share questions and information with program staff and each other. The attorney drafts program guidelines and forms, ensures program compliance with statute, and works directly with courts on implementing the program. The attorney also advises the courts and advisory committees on any legal questions regarding the program. The program analyst guides courts in completing the required implementation reports, receives and processes the reports, and follows up with individual courts as required. Staff hosts a monthly conference call to field implementation questions from the courts and provide courts with another forum for sharing information.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

Finance

Revenue and Collections Program

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$625,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

The JCC Revenue and Collections Unit represents the only centralized professional and technical assistance team available to courts and counties statewide regarding issues relating to the collection and distribution of court-ordered debt and associated revenue. Support provided ranges from assistance with annual reporting requirements, collections master and participation agreements, operational reviews of individual collection programs, as well as daily assistance with policy and statutory guidance. The unit recently assumed lead responsibility for responding to trial court revenue distribution inquiries as well as the planning and execution of related statewide training in partnership with the State Controller's Office.

Information Technology Office

Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$564,000, \$80,320 decrease from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

The Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health case management system (V3 CMS) is deployed at the California Court Technology Center (CCTC) for Sacramento and Ventura Superior Courts. It is also hosted locally by two Orange and San Diego Superior Courts. The V3 CMS processes 25 percent of all civil, small claims, probate, and mental health cases statewide. V3 CMS functionality enables the courts to process and administer their civil caseloads, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, work queues, payment, and financial processing. This model allows for a single deployment and common version of the software, avoiding the cost of three separate installations.

The V3 CMS program costs for hosting at CCTC are partially reimbursed by the participating hosted courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual statewide administrative technology and infrastructure schedule of court costs (Schedule C) process, where the V3 CMS courts confirm agreed upon technical services charges. Once V3 CMS charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the course of the year in the amount of the charges.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$1,472,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

In alignment with Judicial Council directives to affirm development and implementation of statewide technology initiatives, the CCTC program provides a Judicial Branch Technology Center for use by all courts.

Funding is utilized for maintaining core services and court requested services. Services include: operational support; data network management, desktop computing and local server support; tape back-up and recovery; help desk services; email services; and [disaster recovery program](#). These services allow the courts to rely on the skills and expertise of the maintenance and support within the CCTC to remediate defects, implement legislative updates, configure and install software and hardware upgrades, and address other minor and critical issues.

The TCTF CCTC program costs are fully reimbursed by the participating courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual Schedule C process, where the courts confirm agreed upon technical charges. Once charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the year in the amount of the charges.

Interim Case Management System

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$842,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

The ICMS unit provides program support to trial courts with case management systems hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). Currently, there are eight courts with the Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) CMS hosted at the CCTC. The support for the CCTC-hosted courts include project management and technical expertise for maintenance and operations activities, such as implementation of legislative updates, application upgrades, production support, CCTC infrastructure upgrades, and patch management..

The CCTC hosted SJE courts benefit from a shared hosting environment which provides services such as system redundancy, layered security architecture, help desk and centralized production support resources.

The TCTF ICMS program costs are reimbursed by the participating courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual statewide administrative technology and infrastructure schedule of court costs (Schedule C) process, where the courts confirm agreed upon technical services charges. Once charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the course of the year in the amount of the charges.

Trial Court Administrative Services Office

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$1,456,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

The Judicial Council has sought to establish an administrative infrastructure at the state and local levels to provide appropriate accountability for the legally compliant, effective, and efficient use of resources; to provide the necessary information to support policymaking responsibilities; and consistently and reliably provide the administrative tools to support day-to-day operations. The Phoenix Program supports this goal effectively by implementing a system that provides for uniform processes and standardized accounting and reporting, and provides human capital management and payroll services to the courts in a cost-effective and efficient manner.

For Phoenix Financial Services, these costs relate only to the Virtual Buyer Program. The Virtual Buyer Program provides direct purchasing support to courts that have minimal procurement staff. The program was started in 2003 with one court, and currently, staff are providing Virtual Buyer assistance to 23 courts. The program provides savings in labor costs to the courts, and the benefit of the program staff knowledge and expertise, and also generates savings through the competitive bid and RFP processes.

For Phoenix Human Resources Services, these costs relate to direct services provided to the 11

courts currently on the payroll system. Staff assists the courts with maintaining employee data, entering time, maintaining position control and salary scales, reviewing payrolls including taxes and benefits, and preparing reconciliations for retirement and benefit files. The staff process payroll files weekly which includes creating the files to generate the paychecks and print the remittance statements. The payroll process also generates the files to post the payroll to the General Ledger, and vendor accounts. Staff also works with the Maintenance and Operations unit to support changes to the Phoenix System.

The TCTF Phoenix Program costs are fully reimbursed by the participating courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual statewide administrative technology and infrastructure schedule of court costs (Schedule C) process, where their monthly distributions are reduced monthly over the course of the year in the amount of the charges.

This page intentionally left blank

**FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts:
Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2015-16			2016-17	For R & E Subcommittee Consideration	Explanation for Items Not Considered
			July 2015 Estimate	Change in Estimate	Current Estimate (1st Turn 10R)	Estimated		
			Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D		
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,614,580,055	-	1,614,580,055	1,717,883,255		
3	II. Adjustments							
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-817,737	-	-817,737	-292,733		JC policy
6	III. FY 2015-2016 Allocations							
7	\$25.4 Million in FY 2014-15 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	24,229,808	-	24,229,808			prior year
8	\$13.4 Million in FY 2013-14 Restored Benefits Funding	Base	13,274,798	-	13,274,798			prior year
9	\$90.6 Million in New Funding Offset by \$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall	Base	67,900,000	-	67,900,000			prior year
10	\$26.9 Million Proposition 47 Workload Funding	Non-Base	26,900,000	-	26,900,000			prior year
12	IV. FY 2016-2017 Allocations (Pending)							
13	\$XX.X Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base				pending		pending - July
14	\$XX.X Million in New Funding	Base				pending		pending - July
16	V. Statutory Allocation Adjustments							
17	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-37,677,580	-	-37,677,580	pending		pending - July
18	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to	Non-Base	37,677,580	-	37,677,580	pending		pending
19	1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-392,881	29	-392,853	pending		pending - July
20	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-50,000,000	-	-50,000,000	-50,000,000		Budget Act
21	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	-	9,223,000	9,223,000	9,223,000	
22	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base		(1,283,668)	-1,283,668			JC policy
24	VI. Allocation for Reimbursements							
25	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	114,700,000	-	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	
26	Jury	Non-Base	14,500,000	-	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	
27	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	-	2,286,000	2,286,000	2,286,000	
28	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	-	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	
29	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	-	332,000	332,000	332,000	
30	CSA Audits ¹	Non-Base	325,000	-	325,000	0	0	
31	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement Rollover	Non-Base		782,231	782,231	0	0	
32	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	857,924	14,768	872,692	526,865	526,865	
34	VI. Estimated Revenue Distributions							
35	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	115,960,941	(26,482,819)	89,478,121	86,389,731		JC policy
36	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	25,308,207	(2,807,417)	22,500,790	23,172,763		statutory
37	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	-	10,907,494	10,907,494		statutory
38	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	2,880,243	128,165	3,008,409	2,858,505		JC policy/statute

**FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts:
Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2015-16			2016-17		For R & E Subcommittee Consideration	Explanation for Items Not Considered
			July 2015 Estimate	Change in Estimate	Current Estimate (1st Turn 10R)	Estimated			
			Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E		
39	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,256,310	81,483	2,337,793	2,221,726		JC policy	
40	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	-	943,840	943,840		JC policy/statute	
42	VII. Miscellaneous Charges								
43	Repayment of Prior Year Cash Advance	Non-Base	-20,946,674	(3,723,976)	-24,670,650			Non-allocation	
44	State Admin Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment	Non-Base	380,151	102,128	482,279			JC policy	
45	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-5,774,500	835,735	-4,938,765	-4,334,000		JC policy	
46	Total		1,972,313,977	-32,353,341	1,939,960,636	1,933,818,446	144,067,865	0	
48	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriation Budget Act ²		1,998,579,000	N/A	1,998,579,000	1,991,957,000			
49	Transfer to Compensation of Superior Court Judges appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships		-3,573,000	N/A	-4,856,000	-293,000			
50	Transfer to Court Interpreters appropriation due to court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding		-1,766,000	N/A	-1,766,000				
51	Removal of \$26.9 million one-time funding appropriation for Proposition 47 workload			N/A		-26,900,000			
52	Adjusted Appropriation		1,993,240,000	N/A	1,991,957,000	1,964,764,000			
54	Estimated Remaining Appropriation		20,926,023	N/A	51,996,364	30,945,554			

1 Provision 12 of the 2015 Budget Act requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits.

2 Includes the Budget Act Appropriation of \$114,700,000 for Item 0250-102-0932 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel.

Description of Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Programs
Proposed to the TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee by the
JCC for FY 2016–2017

Table of Contents

<i>Center for Families, Children, and the Courts</i>	81
<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel</i>	81
<i>Self-Help Centers</i>	82
<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	83
<i>Finance</i>	84
<i>Jury</i>	84
<i>Elder Abuse</i>	85
<i>Real Estate and Facilities Management</i>	85
<i>Screening Equipment Replacement</i>	85

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$114,700,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

In April 2015, the Judicial Council approved a methodology for reallocating court-appointed dependency counsel funding among the courts. The revised allocations are based on the caseload-based calculation of funding for each court provided by the workload model approved by the Judicial Council in October 2007. The goal of the reallocation is to bring all courts to an equivalent percentage of court-appointed dependency counsel workload met by available statewide funding. This revised methodology was employed by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) in recommending the 2015-2016 allocation of \$114,700,000. This allocation includes the \$11,000,000 augmentation for court-appointed dependency counsel included in the 2015-2016 state budget. The Judicial Council approved this allocation in July, 2015.

A joint subcommittee of the of the TCBAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee called the Court Appointed Counsel/Funding Allocation Methodology Joint Subcommittee currently reviewing the workload methodology for determining the caseload and

cost of court-appointed dependency counsel. Recommendations from the joint subcommittee will be reviewed by the two advisory committees and reported to the Judicial Council by April 2016. In juvenile dependency proceedings, the trial court is required by law to appoint counsel for a parent or guardian if the parent desires counsel but is financially unable to afford counsel and the agency has recommended that the child be placed in out-of-home care; and to appoint counsel for a child unless the court finds that the child would not benefit from the appointment of counsel (W&I § 317, CRC 5.660, etc.). This allocation funds court-appointed dependency counsel, who represent approximately 125,000 parent and child clients in the state. Representation begins at the initial filing of a petition to remove a child from the home, and extends—sometimes for many years—through the processes of reunification, termination of parental rights, adoption, or emancipation of the child.

For the twenty courts in the Dependency Representation Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program, the Judicial Council, in partnership with local court leadership, directly manages contracts with dependency attorney organizations, including solicitations, negotiation, financial management, invoicing and payment, statistical reporting, training, and other technical assistance. The twenty DRAFT courts account for approximately 60 percent of juvenile dependency filings statewide. The remaining courts receive a base allocation for dependency counsel at the beginning of the year, manage their own dependency counsel contracts, and are reimbursed through the monthly TCTF distribution process for up to 100 percent of their budget. Training and performance standards for dependency attorneys are included in California Rules of Court, rule 5.660. Adequately funding effective counsel for parents and children has resulted in numerous benefits both for the courts and for children in foster care. Effective counsel can ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays and improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge. Unnecessary delays also result in children spending long periods of time in foster care, a situation that has improved greatly in the past few years through the courts' focus on effective representation and adherence to statutory timelines.

Self-Help Centers

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$2,500,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

For 2015–2016, the TCBAC recommended and the council approved that the program's \$2.5 million annual allocation be maintained at the \$2.5 million level for distribution to all 58 trial courts for self-help centers. The estimated 2015–2016 total distribution to courts is \$2.5 million.

Funding for self-help centers comes from both the TCTF (\$6.2 million, of which \$3.7 million is in courts' base allocation) and the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) (\$5 million). When combining the two fund sources, the minimum allocation for any court is \$34,000, with the remainder distributed according to population size in the county where the trial court is located.

Self-help centers, which provide assistance to self-represented litigants in a wide array of civil law matters to save the courts significant time and expense in the clerk's office and in the courtroom, serve over 450,000 persons per year. Self-help staffing reduces the number of questions and issues at the public counter substantially, thereby reducing line lengths and wait times. Similarly, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and clean-up work in the clerk's office. Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and carries measurable short and long-term cost benefits to the court. One study found that self-help centers workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent.

Demand for self-help services is strong and growing. Courts, struggling with budget reductions, indicate that they are not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need of \$44 million in additional funds to fully support self-help.

The Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants, which was approved by the Judicial Council in 2004, calls for self-help centers in all counties. California Rule of Court 10.960 provides that self-help services are a core function of courts and should be budgeted for accordingly. The Budget Act provides that "up to \$5,000,000 [from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund] shall be available for support of services for self-represented litigants." Based upon recommendations by the TCBAC, the Judicial Council has allocated an additional \$6,200,000 for self-help services from the Trial Court Trust Fund since 2007.

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$526,865, decrease of \$345,827 from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

The Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) is a program under which courts collect reimbursements from parents and other responsible persons liable for the cost of dependency-related legal services to the extent that those persons are able to pay. Statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted through the JDCCP to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard.

At its August 23, 2013 meeting, the council adopted amendments to the JDCCP Guidelines by adding current section 14, which addressed the outstanding issue of how the Judicial Council could equitably allocate the funds remitted through the JDCCP among the trial courts in compliance with the statutory mandate that the funds be used to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads. Section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines describes the allocation methodology, which

considers each court's participation in the program and each court's percentage of the statewide court-appointed counsel funding need.

For a court to be eligible to receive an allocation of these funds, it must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. Every court that has satisfied those requirements receives an allocation. Each eligible court's allocated share of the JDCCP funds is equivalent to its share of the aggregate funding need of all the eligible courts.

To the extent the actual revenue for FY 2015–2016 differs from the estimate used here, the court allocations would be adjusted for FY 2016–2017. Any portion of a court's allocated funds not spent and distributed in FY 2015–2016 would be carried forward for distribution to the court in FY 2016–2017 and subsequent years, even if a court is not eligible for an allocation in the subsequent fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

Finance

Jury

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$14,500,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

For 2015–2016, the TCBAC recommended and the council approved that the program's annual allocation be \$14.5 million. Recent jury reimbursement activity indicates that at it is too soon to tell whether a reduced allocation amount, allowing for the savings to offset any TCTF revenue shortfalls, would still be sufficient to defray trial court costs. Jury reimbursements have declined every year beginning in 2009–2010. In addition, the reimbursement for 2013–2014 was \$13.9 million and 2014–2015 was \$13.7 million. However, the 2015–2016 reimbursement is estimated to be \$14.2 million, the first increase since 2008–2009. The latest five year average of program expenditures is \$14.6 million and the latest three year average is \$14.1 million.

The purpose of the jury funding is to reimburse courts for 100 percent of their eligible jury expenditures, which includes the following types of jury costs in criminal cases and non-reimbursed civil cases:

- Jury per diem (\$15 per day after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Mileage (\$0.34 per mile one-way only, after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Meals and lodging for sequestered jurors
- Public transportation (criminal cases only, one-way only).

Elder Abuse

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$332,340, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

For 2015–2016, the TCBAC recommended and the council approved that the program’s \$332,340 allocation remain unchanged and that the courts be reimbursed quarterly, even though this allocation level would likely result in courts being reimbursed at about 45 percent of eligible reimbursements. Through the first quarter in 2015–2016, eligible reimbursements total \$230,325.

AB 59 (Stats. 1999, ch. 561) authorized elders and dependent adults to seek protective orders. As specified by this bill, the council approved form EA-100—Petition for Protective Orders (Elder or Dependent Adult Abuse)—effective April 2000. At its April 27, 2001 meeting, the council approved the allocation of these funds to the courts by the end of that fiscal year. The reimbursement rate for each filing was set at \$185. It appears the rate was set at the level of the lowest first paper filing fee in limited civil cases, and was not intended to cover the actual cost to a court of processing an order. Since 2001–2002, courts that seek reimbursement are required to report quarterly to Judicial Council the number of EA-100 forms filed.

Real Estate and Facilities Management

Screening Equipment Replacement

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$2,286,000, no change from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Description:

The anticipated budget for 2016–2017 is \$2,286,000. Because estimated costs to meet total projected court needs exceed the budget, we will adjust the equipment purchases to fit within the budget by using the entire amount to purchase equipment and suspending reimbursement of service agreement purchases.

The Screening Equipment Replacement Program is a reimbursement program that replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers in the trial courts. The equipment is replaced on an eight-year cycle and is the property of the court. Funds are allocated to courts for replacement based on the age and condition of the equipment.

Master Agreements which include pricing for the equipment, installation, training and maintenance, as well as removal of the old x-ray units are used for program purchases. The purchase price includes 5 years of service. These master agreements will expire late in 2015–2016 and will require going out to bid for new contracts, which will likely result in a price increase. In order to maximize the available funds by taking advantage of current pricing, the entire 2015–2016 program budget will be used to purchase equipment. Replacing a higher number of units will reduce the need to renew service agreements on older equipment. Older equipment is more prone to malfunction, resulting in downtime and requiring the court security

staff to perform manual bag searches and use hand wands for screening. This causes longer lines and delays and can represent a direct cost to the courts in the form of increased staff costs.

In previous years, program funds were used to reimburse the courts for the purchase of service agreements to cover the 3 years from the end of the original 5 year service plan to the end of the 8-year replacement cycle, but those purchases will not be reimbursed in 2015–2016 or 2016–2017. The proposed budget reduction for 2016–2017 increases the need to replace as much equipment as possible in 2015–2016 so that the number of units that will be deferred for replacement will be lower in 2016–2017 and in subsequent years. However, the reimbursement of service agreement purchases may resume in the future if funding is increased.

The estimated cost for equipment replacement and service agreement extensions due in 2016–2017 exceeds the budget. The reasons for this fact include:

- The budget has remained at \$2.286 million since the program began in 2006, while the cost of equipment and service agreements has increased. This includes the added cost of removing decommissioned x-ray units.
- The initial replacement cycle was estimated at 5 years, but was increased to 8 as the cost of equipment increased and experience proved that the equipment had a longer lifecycle than initially anticipated, resulting in the need to cover the costs of service agreement extensions for the balance of the life of the equipment.

To stay within budget in prior years, the Security Operations unit delayed replacement of some x-ray machines and reimbursed the courts for service agreement purchases.

The estimated cost for equipment replacement and service agreement extensions in 2016–2017 will exceed the budget for the same reasons as in 2015–2016, and will again require adjustments in purchases to address the shortfall. The entire budget will be used to replace approximately 112 magnetometers and 46 of the 69 x-ray machines due for replacement this fiscal year. The courts will not be reimbursed for the purchase of service agreements, but can use the pricing available in master agreements currently nearing completion.

Without this program, the courts will be responsible for the purchase and maintenance of the screening equipment. The cost of an x-ray unit with a five-year service agreement is approximately \$36,000. The cost of a magnetometer with a five-year service agreement is approximately \$5,600. Reimbursing the costs of screening equipment is particularly critical to the smaller courts, where equipment and service agreements can represent a significant expenditure relative to their overall operations budget. However, the need in large courts should not be minimized. The cost of a single year's equipment replacement and service agreement renewal costs in a large court can result in the expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars. For example, in 2010 Angeles Superior Court was reimbursed by the program for \$718,000 in equipment and service agreements and \$694,000 in 2011–2012.

The program also offers a service to the court staff responsible for the equipment. The Security Operations unit staff member who manages the program also acts as a liaison to the courts and assists in resolving issues with the vendors and the JCC Customer Service Center and acts as a subject matter expert on radiation and code compliance associated with the x-ray equipment. If a court chooses to purchase equipment or service that is not covered by the Master Agreements, the court is required to go out to bid. That process represents a direct cost to the court in staff time and in the overall cost of the purchase, as well as inconsistency in response to service calls at court expense.

This page intentionally left blank

Impact of Reductions on Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Programs in FY 2016–2017

Table of Contents

<i>Center for Families, Children, and the Courts</i>	89
<i>Self-Help Centers</i>	89
<i>Finance Office</i>	90
<i>Jury</i>	90
<i>Elder Abuse</i>	90
<i>Real Estate and Facilities Management</i>	90
<i>Screening Equipment Replacement</i>	90

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Self-Help Centers

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$1,442,000, \$1,058,000 decrease from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Impact of Reduction on Trial Courts:

All funds for this program go directly to the trial courts. With a reduction of \$1,058,000, approximately 41,000 fewer people will be served by self-help centers. The decrease in services may be higher since some will have to cut back on staff hours or lay off staff, and other courts may have to close self-help centers all together. Some litigants will then seek help in other counties, which is generally less efficient for both the courts and the litigants. The impact will be felt largely by court clerks and judicial officers. In the evaluation of one program that had to cut self-help services, the number of guardianship continuances went from 7 per year to 402 per year. Clerks reported that they had to spend 45 minutes at the counter with guardianship litigants and that the time was generally not productive since the litigants needed additional help with their paperwork, leading to more continuances, more time at the clerks office and in the courtroom, and litigants becoming more and more frustrated. Eighty-five percent of judges in another study indicated that the self-help centers saved between 5-10 minutes per self-represented litigant of court time since the litigants ask fewer questions, are better informed and better able to stay on point. Many judges noted that they have a difficult time understanding what a case is about if the litigant has not had assistance from a self-help center.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

Finance Office

Jury

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$8,365,000, \$6,135,000 decrease from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Impact of Reduction on Trial Courts:

In attempting to determine whether courts would be impacted by a reduction in the funding available to reimburse jury expenditures, we used the average reimbursed jury costs for each court over the past 10, 5, and 3 years and the court's 2015 trial court operations base, and determined that there are some courts that would be impacted more than others. The courts that would be most impacted represent various population densities. The most impacted courts are in clusters 3 and 4 and those that would appear to be least impacted are those in cluster 1. Even though the overall trend for jury expenditures over the last few years has been downward, there are some courts whose costs, relative to their operations base, have either stayed static or have gone up. The specific impacts to individual courts based on a reduction in reimbursement are yet to be determined.

Elder Abuse

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$192,000, \$140,000 decrease from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Impact of Reduction on Trial Courts:

Reimbursements in the Elder Abuse program already do not address all eligible petitions filed in the courts. Over the past 5 years petitions have grown by an average 14 percent per year. As the population of the state ages, more petitions may be filed in the future, increasing the unreimbursed expense for courts. In 2014–2015, courts were reimbursed at 46 percent of eligible reimbursements. This will only grow with a reduction. \$192,000 would not be sufficient to cover one quarter of the reimbursement based on 2015–2016 court data.

Real Estate and Facilities Management

Screening Equipment Replacement

Proposed 2016–2017 Allocation – \$1,319,000, \$967,000 decrease from FY 2015–2016 Allocation

Impact of Reduction on Trial Courts:

The Screening Equipment Replacement program budget has not increased since the program began in 2006. Inflation since then has resulted in a budget shortfall. The shortfall has been addressed by delaying the replacement of some equipment and using the savings to purchase service agreements to cover maintenance and repairs and to provide the radiation surveys necessary for code compliance related to the x-ray machines.

The initial program funds were used solely for the purchase of new equipment; with an

anticipated replacement cycle of 5 years. The cycle was extended to 8 years based on the demonstrated serviceable life of the equipment and the cost of replacement, leaving a 3 year gap in service coverage that represented an unanticipated cost to the courts. This was addressed by using program funds to purchase service agreements for the remaining serviceable life (additional 3 years) of the equipment. However, older equipment often requires more frequent service calls, and older software may not be fully supported, so further extension of the expected serviceable life of x-ray machines is not recommended.

The entire budget will be used to purchase equipment in FY 2015–2016. This will, in part, address the anticipated budget shortfall of \$1.6 million and maximize the pricing available in the current master agreements. These agreements will expire by the end of the fiscal year and any new contracts will likely reflect higher pricing. The courts will be able to purchase service agreements using master agreements maintained by the JCC, allowing for consistent pricing, service levels and response times, but will not be reimbursed for them.

The proposed budget reduction for FY 2016–2017 increases the need to replace as much equipment as possible in FY 2015–2016, because the new equipment is covered for service for five years as part as part of the purchase price. This will reduce the number of units due for replacement in FY 2016–2017, and reduce the number of service agreements to be purchased by the courts.

The proposed reduction will impact the courts because there will be less equipment replaced, resulting in higher maintenance (or service agreement) costs on older equipment. Courts will also be impacted by more frequent equipment downtime as the aging equipment remains in use. When the screening equipment is out of service, court security staff must perform manual bag checks and use hand wands for screening, resulting in longer lines and delays. In some cases, additional staff is required, frequently billed at overtime rates and resulting in increased staff costs.

Anticipated cost to the courts in FY 2015–2016: \$703,286

Anticipated cost to the courts in FY 2016–2017 (with no budget reduction): \$824,208

In addition to the reduction amount of \$967,000, anticipated cost to the courts in FY 2016–2017 (with proposed reduction): \$957,390

Item 3
State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Survey
(Discussion Item)

The State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) supports many trial-court related programs and projects such as self help, education and information technology. Over a several year period, the IMF has experienced a continued decline in the revenues that fund these programs.

In an effort to better assess the value and benefit of IMF-funded programs, in collaboration with the JCC's Office of Court Research, the JCC's budget office developed a survey tool to gather input from each court on the 36 programs currently funded by the IMF (and one TCTF funded program).

Through an online survey, for 36 programs/projects courts were asked to rate the benefit their court believes each program provides to the Judicial Branch, indicate whether or not they've used the program within the last year, and indicate how likely is it that they are willing to pay for programs if IMF funding were eliminated. The results of the survey are provided in Attachments 3D, 3E, 3F, and 3G. Attachment 3B provides a list of the eight survey questions. Attachment 3C provides the cluster assignment for each court.

Attachments

3B – Survey Questions

3C – Court Clusters

3D – Benefit Provided to the Judicial Branch, by Cluster (1-10 Scale), Sorted by Statewide Average

3E – Number of Courts Receiving Benefit, by Cluster, Sorted by Total

3F – Benefit Provided to Court, by Cluster (1-10 Scale), Sorted by Statewide Average

3G – Survey Results for each individual Program/Project

SURVEY QUESTIONS	
1	Rate the benefit your court believes the program provides to the Judicial Branch. (from 1 to 10 with 1 being the lowest and 10 the highest)
2	Does your court directly benefit from this program?
3	If yes, from 1 to 10 with 1 being the lowest and 10 the highest, score the value of this program to your court.
4	Has your court used this service/program in the last year?
5	If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?
6	If yes, please name the alternative.
7	If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?
8	Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

COURT CLUSTERS			
1	2	3	4
Alpine	Butte	Contra Costa	Alameda
Amador	El Dorado	Fresno	Los Angeles
Calaveras	Humboldt	Kern	Orange
Colusa	Imperial	Monterey	Riverside
Del Norte	Kings	San Joaquin	Sacramento
Inyo	Lake	San Mateo	San Bernardino
Lassen	Madera	Santa Barbara	San Diego
Mariposa	Mendocino	Solano	San Francisco
Modoc	Merced	Sonoma	Santa Clara
Mono	Napa	Stanislaus	
Plumas	Nevada	Tulare	
San Benito	Placer	Ventura	
Sierra	San Luis Obispo		
Trinity	Santa Cruz		
	Shasta		
	Siskiyou		
	Sutter		
	Tehama		
	Tuolumne		
	Yolo		
	Yuba		

**BENEFIT PROVIDED TO THE JUDICIAL BRANCH, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY STATEWIDE AVERAGE**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	Self-Help Centers	9.40	9.79	9.55	10.00	9.69	49
2	Judicial Education	8.10	9.63	9.82	9.78	9.39	49
3	Litigation Management Program	7.80	9.58	9.60	9.78	9.25	48
4	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	7.80	9.37	9.30	9.33	9.02	48
5	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	9.40	8.84	9.55	8.11	8.98	49
6	Treasury Services - Cash Management (Support)	8.30	8.47	9.40	8.89	8.71	48
7	Phoenix Program	8.00	8.63	9.40	8.67	8.67	48
8	Telecommunications Support	7.60	8.00	9.50	8.78	8.38	48
9	Essential Court Personnel Education	8.70	8.47	8.82	7.22	8.37	49
10	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	8.10	8.42	9.10	7.67	8.35	48
11	Uniform Civil Filing Services (UCFS)	8.40	8.26	8.80	7.89	8.33	48
12	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	6.80	8.95	9.30	7.67	8.33	48
13	CJER Faculty	8.00	8.32	9.18	7.56	8.31	49
14	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	8.40	8.16	8.33	8.33	8.28	50
15	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	7.50	7.89	9.30	8.78	8.27	48
16	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	7.30	9.21	8.10	7.56	8.27	48
17	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	7.50	7.89	9.20	8.11	8.13	48
18	Essential Court Management Education	7.70	8.11	9.09	7.33	8.10	49
19	Superior Court Audit Program	7.50	7.79	8.50	8.11	7.94	48
20	Data Integration	8.00	7.79	7.70	8.00	7.85	48
21	Trial Court Workload Study Support	6.70	7.26	9.50	7.67	7.69	48
22	Distance Education	8.10	8.05	8.36	5.44	7.65	49
23	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.40	7.47	7.90	6.33	7.54	48
24	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	7.80	8.32	8.10	4.78	7.50	48
25	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	6.70	7.37	7.91	8.11	7.49	49
26	Juvenile Law Practice Resources	7.10	7.63	6.55	7.11	7.18	49
27	Regional Office Assistance Group	8.10	8.00	7.90	3.56	7.17	48
28	Self-Help Document Assembly Programs	6.80	6.42	6.64	7.00	6.65	49
29	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6.30	6.84	8.40	4.67	6.65	48
30	Trial Court Procurement	6.60	7.26	7.60	4.11	6.60	48
31	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	4.70	4.63	7.20	6.33	5.50	48
32	Interim Case Management Systems	6.70	4.84	3.50	4.44	4.88	48
33	Case Management Systems, Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3)	2.90	3.05	4.40	3.67	3.42	48

**NUMBER OF COURTS RECEIVING BENEFIT, BY CLUSTER
SORTED BY TOTAL**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Total
1	Self-Help Centers	10	19	11	9	49
2	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	9	18	12	9	48
3	Judicial Education	9	19	11	9	48
4	Essential Court Personnel Education	10	17	11	9	47
5	Phoenix Program	9	19	10	9	47
6	Essential Court Management Education	9	17	11	9	46
7	Uniform Civil Filing Services (UCFS)	10	17	10	9	46
8	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	10	17	10	8	45
9	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	8	18	10	9	45
10	Treasury Services - Cash Management (Support)	10	17	10	8	45
11	Superior Court Audit Program	8	19	9	9	45
12	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	9	17	10	9	45
13	Telecommunications Support	9	18	10	8	45
14	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	8	18	10	9	45
15	Distance Education	8	19	10	6	43
16	Litigation Management Program	8	16	10	9	43
17	Juvenile Law Practice Resources	7	17	9	8	41
18	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	7	18	9	7	41
19	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	9	17	9	5	40
20	CJER Faculty	6	14	11	8	39
21	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	6	18	9	6	39
22	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	4	16	9	9	38
23	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	7	16	9	6	38
24	Regional Office Assistance Group	10	16	8	4	38
25	Data Integration	9	15	8	5	37
26	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	8	17	6	5	36
27	Trial Court Workload Study Support	4	13	8	7	32
28	Trial Court Procurement	6	14	7	3	30
29	Self-Help Document Assembly Programs	6	11	7	5	29
30	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	6	11	8	3	28
31	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	3	5	6	6	20
32	Interim Case Management Systems	5	6	1	0	12
33	Case Management Systems, Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3)	0	0	2	4	6

**BENEFIT PROVIDED TO COURT, BY CLUSTER (1-10 SCALE)
SORTED BY STATEWIDE AVERAGE**

#	Program	Cluster 1 courts	Cluster 2 courts	Cluster 3 courts	Cluster 4 courts	Statewide average	Responses
1	Self-Help Centers	9.50	9.79	9.73	10.00	9.76	49
2	Judicial Education	8.70	9.79	9.73	9.89	9.57	49
3	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	7.70	9.44	9.60	9.44	9.11	47
4	Phoenix Program	8.78	8.79	9.50	8.89	8.96	47
5	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	9.50	8.47	9.80	8.00	8.88	48
6	Treasury Services - Cash Management (Support)	8.60	8.71	9.40	8.78	8.85	46
7	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	8.33	8.63	9.20	8.75	8.72	46
8	Telecommunications Support	7.40	8.78	9.70	8.89	8.70	47
9	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	8.70	8.37	9.08	8.56	8.64	50
10	Litigation Management Program	7.40	8.84	9.60	8.33	8.60	48
11	Essential Court Personnel Education	9.10	8.42	9.00	7.44	8.51	49
12	CJER Faculty	8.56	8.63	9.18	7.11	8.44	45
13	Essential Court Management Education	8.33	8.17	9.00	7.56	8.28	47
14	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	6.70	9.44	8.00	7.78	8.23	47
15	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	7.50	7.94	9.44	7.50	8.09	43
16	Superior Court Audit Program	7.44	7.95	8.40	8.11	7.98	47
17	Uniform Civil Filing Services (UCFS)	8.00	7.53	8.90	7.75	7.96	47
18	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	6.10	8.53	8.90	7.38	7.89	47
19	Distance Education	8.44	8.32	8.55	5.44	7.85	48
20	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	8.78	7.58	8.11	5.67	7.54	46
21	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	6.60	8.00	7.40	6.88	7.38	47
22	Regional Office Assistance Group	8.60	8.59	8.10	2.78	7.35	46
23	Juvenile Law Practice Resources	6.50	7.79	6.70	7.11	7.17	48
24	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	7.67	7.63	8.00	4.33	7.09	47
25	Data Integration	6.70	7.50	6.60	5.63	6.80	46
26	Trial Court Workload Study Support	4.56	6.61	9.33	6.89	6.80	45
27	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	4.56	6.53	7.20	8.22	6.62	47
28	Trial Court Procurement	6.56	6.47	7.67	3.00	6.02	44
29	Self-Help Document Assembly Programs	6.10	5.47	5.80	6.00	5.77	47
30	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	5.10	4.78	8.60	3.00	5.37	46
31	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	3.22	2.82	5.20	6.63	4.14	44
32	Interim Case Management Systems	5.00	4.00	1.33	0.88	3.11	44
33	Case Management Systems, Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3)	0.33	0.88	2.56	3.50	1.62	42

#1: STATEWIDE MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.28	9	18	12	9	48	9	16	12	9	46	8.64

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	16.0%	8
No	84.0%	42
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in House

If central funding were provided to courts, they could provide training on their own or in partnership.

We would seek alternative educational opportunities, likely at a local level, to meet the necessary requirements.

Would have to develop a program in-house

Other Juv and Fam Law education events, though most are not multidisciplinary.

While our Court might be able to do some sort of local-level outreach that would be similar in nature, we would not be able to host any sort of similar programs at a statewide level.

Other training that meets mandatory training requirements

Other courses would have to be pursued in order to meet educational requirements.

On-line Courses

Develop a regional approach for delivery of content with live and distance learning. Option to minimize travel and lodging expense while still delivering education by SME (judicial, court staff, and bar associations)

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
15	14	7	12	2	0	50

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

There are benefits to courts from learning what other courts are doing, such as the Beyond the Bench and Family dispute Resolution Conferences. Established best practices can be shared and the overall level of proficiency for professional staff increases.

Youth Summit does not benefit our Court.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.

To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. As an example, our mediator obtained a scholarship, which was needed because the court could not afford the cost of travel, lodging and training, in order to obtain mandatory training.

Small Courts would suffer an extreme disadvantage without these programs.

We have no funds to pay for this service.

We would seek grant funding for the Youth Summit.

#1: STATEWIDE MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION

The court would provide funding for these programs if there were sufficient discretionary funds available.

Judicial training that includes other law and justice partners is rare but extremely beneficial for both the court and justice partners.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Funding any or all portion of this program would be dependent on available and prioritized funding.

The programs are important because they satisfy educational requirements and are directly applicable to what CFCC's do on a daily basis in court. Also, the networking is invaluable.

With regard to question #10, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

Completely dependent on funding.

Due to continuing budget cuts the court was required to eliminate its in-house training programs in 2012. The CFCC programs are essential in providing judicial officers and court staff current information and training to better assist the court's customers and to satisfy the mandatory education requirement. There is no other cost-effective source for meeting mandatory CE requirements with high quality, directly relevant training. Eliminating IMF funding would result in an unfunded mandate.

If question 10 means whether we would pay to put on a statewide conference of our own, the answer is "no." If, however, the question is whether we would pay to send Court attendees to statewide programs offered by the JCC, then the answer is "yes"

It would depend on the cost and our ability to financially support.

Court would pay for limited educational programs. In general for those areas required.

If IMF Funding were eliminated, I would hope that the JCC would fund it from trial court trust fund.

As now a "donor" court, we have closed courtrooms and continue to reduce staffing levels in conjunction with budget reductions.

We would need to assess where these funds would be diverted to determine our willingness to absorb the cost. We would likely be willing to pay a portion, provided it ends up saving overall IMF funds that can be freed up for other priorities.

#2: SELF-HELP DOCUMENT ASSEMBLY PROGRAMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
6.65	6	11	7	5	29	5	7	7	5	24	7.13

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	59.2%	29
No	40.8%	20
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.		

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Legal Solutions, I-Can

Guide and File; Hot Docs; Smart Forms developed in house

We are implementing Tyler Guide and Serve

We create and use our own Self Help packets

Self-provision in partnership with other courts.

Essential Forms

There would be other technology solutions, but we like hot docs and the JC staff solutions that are provided.

We could create this for ourselves if we had to.

I expect the trial courts would take over this program themselves - possible regionally.

We will be implementing our new CMS that has a feature to enable fillable forms. Odyssey's Guide and File is that program, but would benefit from the steps already taken to develop Hot Docs.

Guide and File

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
22	6	5	6	2	8	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

As a Tyler Odyssey Court, we are participating in the Guide and File project which will provide expanded capacities for developing forms programs.

This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally. Funding and developing centrally avoids each court reinventing the wheel.

We currently use iCan Legal for forms. This is something we would like to examine more and possibly switch over to.

Although this product might be available by direct license, the court would probably not be able to afford it. Hot Docs are used locally and regularly, they support local self help services and the clerks and judges use the Hot Docs also. We could not develop or provide a replacement. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

We do not use this program, but the benefit is needed.

This program should be managed by the trial courts, as is done with Guide-and-File.

We are deploying a new CMS, which will have Guide & File. This will better serve our self-help program.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to

#2: SELF-HELP DOCUMENT ASSEMBLY PROGRAMS

the residents of Tulare County.

Funding any or all portion of this program would be dependent on available and prioritized funding.

With regard to question #18, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

funding would be needed.

Ventura currently uses a modified version of a PDF forms completion program that Harry Jacobs created before Hot Docs. This program is modified and updated by the court's IT department.

Difficult to determine what my court's costs would be. I understand the statewide cost is approx. \$100,000, but I don't know what my court's share of that would be.

Whether we could pay for it would depend on the cost.

This does not seem to be suited to IMF funding, but rather a trial court trust fund obligation.

As a donor court, we will not have resources to fund this expense.

Most likely approach it as a collaborative consortium of trial courts investing for their collective good at reduced shared costs

#3: JUVENILE LAW PRACTICE RESOURCES

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.18	7	17	9	8	41	6	16	8	6	36	7.64

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	18.4%	9
No	75.5%	37
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	6.1%	3

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Lexis or West

DCA website for opinions, child welfare and probation websites, CJER, Judicial Resources Network, etc.

Our own research.

CJER

Staff research.

Programs exist for bench officers, attorneys are responsible for their education.

online legal research

Use other existing electronic legal research tools

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
23	4	13	4	2	3	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

If we were allowed to retain our Civil Assessments we probably could have paid for this program.

Response to 26 depends upon cost to trial court and available funds. This program collates materials in a complex field of law from different sources into a single access point and replacement would be piecemeal. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

We do not use these services, but would benefit if available.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

CalDOG would be more helpful if it was updated with greater frequency. However, we understand that that would require more resources.

Extremely beneficial for juvenile judicial officers.

This services is somewhat duplicative of other support that our court has

As a donor court, we simply do not have the resources to continue funding this program.

#4: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FORMS TRANSLATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.49	4	16	9	9	38	1	15	10	9	35	7.40

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	22.4%	11
No	69.4%	34
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	8.2%	4

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Use employee interpreters to translate

Live Translation

We would do our own translations.

English only forms

We would utilize other interpreter services/staff to translate forms.

Court funding

Bilingual staff can assist in translation

Use an interpreter to assist non-English speaking parties.

The trial courts would have to do ourselves

Court would need to outsource this translation work to an independent contractor. Perhaps, other courts would be willing to collaborate and share in the cost

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
20	7	9	5	3	5	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

#34 not likely due to budget constraints

This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel. The Language Access plan should also address this, as it relates to access on a statewide basis. It should be funded from 45.45 funds, not IMF.

We link to the JCC forms library.

Although this product might be available by direct license, the court would probably not be able to afford it. These documents are used locally and regularly, they support local self help services and are used by the clerks and judges also. It is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts. We could not develop or provide a replacement. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

We do not see the multiple languages that larger counties see. However, the Spanish forms are helpful in our County.

This should be funded by 45.45 funds.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

#4: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FORMS TRANSLATION

While the translated versions of the forms are not used in court (as they must be completed in English for the court record) they are used as a tool. Likewise, there is no way to know how many court users are accessing the translated forms online or through other agencies and therefore gain an understanding of what they need to do, thus obviating the need to access Self Help Services. Were this program eliminated, our court may potentially be willing to cover the cost of translating some of the most essential forms, but would be unlikely to be able to offer translation to all relevant languages and for all forms.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

In a rural border town, where 95% of the residents speak Spanish, having forms in court customer's native language is crucial. We would have to continue to provide translations and documents in Spanish if this was discontinued, bearing the expense. This would be detrimental to our court.

Is it possible to fund this service from 45.45 Interpreter funding?

Whether we could pay for it would depend on the cost.

We do not have the funding or capability to translate forms.

As a donor court, we simply do not have the resources to support this program.

#5: SELF-HELP CENTERS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
9.69	10	19	11	9	49	10	19	11	9	49	9.76

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	12.2%	6
No	87.8%	43
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund program from other court revenues

Fund in house

Prior to this funding the court designated some of its local funding to establish self-help centers. However, without the current funding services would have to be reduced.

We would have to fund it ourselves locally or reduce services or look for national grant opportunities

Despite being a donor court, we supplement existing funding by 100% because of the benefits self help services provide to our court.

Increase use of volunteers and pro bono attorney services

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
17	13	7	6	6	0	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Self Help Centers are a valuable service to the public. The assistance they provide to the public helps streamline the legal process for those that do not understand the court system. It also eliminates unnecessary appearances in the court.

The Self Help Centers provide guidance and information to hundreds of litigants who otherwise would be seeking help from court clerk staff, courtroom staff, and the judiciary. These programs leverage online education and information and use workshop and clinic models whenever possible to maximize the help available to litigants using minimal staffing. The assistance provided to litigants prior to accessing the clerk's office and/or to appearing for a court hearing or trial saves immeasurable time for the court that would otherwise be spent by clerks and judges educating litigants, explaining legal terms and procedures, correcting forms, and guiding litigants unfamiliar with how to conduct themselves in a courtroom to present their case.

Consider using IMF funds only for items all courts could use rather than supporting operations everywhere.

To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

The Self Help Centers are vital in these budget reduction times. It is unknown how many public members could actually be assisted at Court Counters without this service, but it is clear that they would not be served as they are now. Litigants would not be ready or prepared to appear in Court without this service.

We have no funds to pay for this service.

No way to pay for it

#5: SELF-HELP CENTERS

We would likely pay for this program if there is available funding in our budget, but if there is no increase in our allocation, we would not be able to continue this service.

We are willing to pay for this program but would need additional funding to do so. The legislature strongly supports this program, perhaps they would be willing to support a separate statewide BCP.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Public access would be diminished without this specific funding to assist self-represented litigants.

With regard to question #42, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

The Self-Help Centers are extremely important and valuable to the public and our court. They provide access to justice and help build the public's trust and confidence in our judicial system. They contribute to court efficiencies and help litigants be better prepared, which saves the court time and money.

would require additional funding.

Without the funding the court would have to reduce services provided to self-help litigants, including closing centers and reducing staff. This would have a significant impact on self-represented litigants and the court in that the self-help centers increase access, improve efficiencies and reduce delay. Even prior to the program funding, the court committed to funding its self-help center. However, the court does not have the financial resources to absorb the lack of funding received from the program.

If this funding was discontinued, we would have to significantly reduce our self-help services.

It would depend on the cost and our ability to financially support this function.

Self Help Services are needed tremendously- especially in rural communities and border communities where the majority of litigants are pro per. However, if funding was eliminated, there would be no way I could support the self-help center out of general funds. Self help services- to ensure that Californians can access justice- should be provided by the State and funding needs to continue. Where will people go when they cannot afford an attorney? By turning them away, we are barring them justice and their time in court because of finances. This is just not ok.

In order to pay for self-help services out of our general operations budget we would have to reduce staffing or services in other areas.

This is a very high priority service that we cannot provide without JCC assistance.

This should be funded by Trial Court Trust Fund allocations. Access to justice is an ongoing and fundamental court obligation, not a "modernization" item.

#6: STATEWIDE SUPPORT FOR SELF-HELP PROGRAMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.98	10	17	10	8	45	9	16	10	8	43	9.06

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	14.3%	7
No	81.6%	40
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	4.1%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Local funds and staff

Individual court websites

Courts can pool knowledge in this area.

Post on the local website self-help information

Court developed program

Local court self-help centers

We would have to fund our needs locally

While we don't benefit directly, our LEP and SRL benefit from this information. If this goes away, we would ban together with other courts and prioritize forms and translations that would be posted on courts' websites

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
25	5	9	5	4	1	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Our court does not have the capacity or resources to produce and update the multitude of online resources currently available on the state website for self represented litigants. We would only be able to provide a small fraction of the materials currently available, and it would come at the expense of direct service to litigants since staff time would be needed to create these resources.

To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service, but this is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

The Court could not keep up with legislation changes and changes to forms without this service. The convenience for the litigant and court employees of fillable, correct and updated forms is a necessary service.

We would probably expand our website and look for collaborative grants.

The \$60,000 cost spend in FY13-14 seems extremely cost efficient. It would cost all courts a significant amount of money if each court had to individually make these changes.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #50, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

#6: STATEWIDE SUPPORT FOR SELF-HELP PROGRAMS

insufficient funding to replicate at a local level.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

Our self-help center relies on the California Courts website for pro pers who need to access information and complete JC forms.

We would only be able to put up some information on our website if this was discontinued- and our site wouldn't have the comprehensive informational resources and form bank available that the JC has now.

Again, this is a high priority service that we cannot provide without JCC assistance.

We do not have the money or capability to provide this service; our staff and funding would need to be augmented.

As a donor court, we simply do not have the resources to offset the loss of funding.

#7: DISTANCE EDUCATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.65	8	19	10	6	43	8	19	10	7	44	7.85

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	28.6%	14
No	69.4%	34
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	2.0%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

In-house training
Court's own training staff
Fund in house
training in-house
Non-satellite-based distance learning is more cost-effective.
We could get our statewide education through other channels, e.g., webinars, in person, etc.
Not participate in the program
locally and regionally provided training, but cannot replace the great programs CJER develops and delivers.
Other agencies or develop internally
Develop and provide training using local resources.
We would have to prepare and execute our own training program.
We could use DVD's in lieu of live broadcasts (except for Sexual Harassment training).
State Bar materials, CJA programs, NCSC programs
This can be done now with internet services - like Blue Jeans (vendor). Reduces the need for specific equipment, etc...
Collaborate with others to provide content delivered via distance learning modality

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
25	10	8	5	1	0	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

We find the program valuable but due to workloads and low staffing we do not fully utilize
Distance education is a very valuable way to educate the court employees and very cost effective. The court does not have the resources to send all of its employees to training and the Judicial Council staff do an excellent job in their broadcasts and other trainings they provide.
Delivery has not met expectations as to concept or benefits
During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.
This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts and needs to be utilized as much as possible, including satellite and web-based events.

#7: DISTANCE EDUCATION

Our Technology capabilities are limited. This makes these broadcasts sometimes difficult. However, I believe this is a needed service.

We have no funds to pay for this service.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

The satellite service should be abandoned in favor of web-based distance learning.

The satellite broadcasts are an efficient mode of training that can literally reach thousands of staff and judges at once time all while remaining at their court locations.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #58, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

would need funding

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

For rural and geographically distant courts, this is a lifeline for the minimum education requirements. Some courts are not in urban cities and rely on this to keep up with major changes, new laws, ethics, and new educational opportunities.

The live satellite broadcasts are not used very often. The online, on-demand videos are much more useful to judges and staff.

Again, this seems to be a mission that is squarely within the Trial Court Trust Fund, not an IMF fund item

As a donor court, we do not have the resources to support the program independently.

#8: ESSENTIAL COURT MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.10	9	17	11	9	46	5	14	10	9	38	8.28

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	20.4%	10
No	77.6%	38
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	2.0%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Development of in-house training classes or consortium with other courts for regional training.

Local court funds and staff

Fund in house

The private sector has a wide variety of leadership training opportunities from institutions of distinction that could be accessed by trial court staff if they are interested in career enhancements.

We are working to develop an in-house curriculum for training new managers.

some of the training could be conducted in-house

We can provide training ourselves.

Try to partner with larger Courts

Develop and provide training using local resources.

Sending staff to other trainings would be cost-prohibitive.

Although I am certified and teach this in CA, the other options for ICM is nationally - the way we used to get this education.

Provide a combination of regional and local training

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
18	14	10	3	4	0	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

The Core 40 classes are an excellent summary for new supervisory staff as well as the Core 24 for managers. As a Fellow of the ICM program, I believe ICM classes are very important for all managers as well as succession planning. These courses as you know are at a national level and utilized by courts in various states. I am also certified to teach three that I do for our CA Consortium.

Our staff has participated in CORE 40 training courses and some labor relations programs. We find these services valuable and would not be able to replicate the benefit on the scale that a statewide program offers.

Use IMF funds to develop program materials and provide instructors; let courts pay for staff to attend, including lodging costs

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.

This program had high aspirations but they have not really been realized. Court staff career training in the private sector can be supported by education reimbursement policies in the trial court. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

The answer to 66 depends on what is meant by "willing to pay for." We would pay in the sense that we would devote more

#8: ESSENTIAL COURT MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

resources to building out our own in-house training. We might also pay to send staff to the Core 40, although it would depend on the cost and whether we thought it would be more cost-effective to simply train in-house.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

Mandatory training is properly funded out of the JCC budget. Other should be provided by a consortium of courts if funding were provided; otherwise courts should pay the costs of the non-mandatory training.

As long as there are resources available, the court may pay a modest amount for educational opportunities.

We may be able to pay for a limited number of staff to attend some of these programs.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

We could pay for internal development of similar course; limit the number of participants currently, we require all supervisors/managers to attend Core 40.

With regard to question #66, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

Due to lack of funding

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

I serve as ICM certified faculty on these courses because they are important for our future court leaders.

Depending again on the cost and our court's ability to fund.

Sending staff to other trainings would be cost-prohibitive.

We currently have set aside some monies to support continuing education requirements. We will be unable to replicate some of the training offered via distance education.

#9: ESSENTIAL COURT PERSONNEL EDUCATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.37	10	17	11	9	47	7	18	10	9	44	8.69

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	26.5%	13
No	71.4%	35
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	2.0%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

In-house training

Court staff; local training entities; national providers

Fund in house

some of the training could be conducted in-house

Self-provided training

Limited in house training

Try to partner with larger Courts

We would seek alternative training such as CCA

No alternative at this time, but we could try to partner with other courts to mirror current training provided.

Develop and provide this education locally.

In house training program.

Sending staff to other trainings would be cost-prohibitive. Though we do not send staff to the TCJAI.

Train our own trial court staff locally OR partner with other trial courts to provide

Regional and local delivery of training with court staff serving as faculty

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
21	8	11	6	3	0	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Use IMF money to develop program materials and provide instructors; let courts pay for staff to attend

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.

This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts

This program is valued by both Administration and Court Clerks. We have participated fully in these trainings and they are well received. Although new employees are not being hired due to budget constraints, these services are very beneficial for all.

Education programs provided by the JCC are a great opportunity for legal research attorneys to mix with Legal Research Attorneys from other courts to discuss how other jurisdictions handle matters. It can be especially helpful in the non-civil areas where fewer legal research attorneys are employed and it's a convenient way to earn MCLEs. Trainings for clerks

#9: ESSENTIAL COURT PERSONNEL EDUCATION

and other line staff are also invaluable in that they provide the only forum in which training on fundamental skills (customer service, for example) are provided with an eye toward the unique demands of working in a Court environment. The value of trainings that include specific knowledge of CA-specific, Court operations cannot be overstated.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

Mandatory training is properly funded by the JCC budget.

We may be able to pay for a limited number of staff to attend some of these programs.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

This is one we would need to develop internally. We would be willing to pay to send limited staff to training and they could bring the information back for us to train in-house.

With regard to question #74, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

It would depend on the cost and our court's ability to fund.

Sending staff to other trainings would be cost-prohibitive.

We would find a way to train our staff. We do not have any trial court attorneys.

As a donor court, we simply do not have the resources to continue offering this program.

#10: CJER FACULTY

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.31	6	14	11	8	39	7	12	11	8	38	8.84

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	12.2%	6
No	77.6%	38
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	10.2%	5

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house

To the extent our Court's judges/staff are faculty, we could explore using court funds to pay some portion of their travel expenses

Virtual collaboration and distance learning can achieve the same objectives without high costs for travel.

Possibly; the court could utilize internal expertise.

NCSC, CJA

Locally funded

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
21	6	12	7	1	2	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

If funding has to be reduced here, a sharing arrangement for costs between JC and court should be established.

Individual courts should not have to pay travel expenses for their judges to be faculty; small court judges would probably be precluded from being faculty if this were not paid from state funds.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

The concern here is that many of the highly qualified faculty come from courts that may not be able to pay their presenters' own travel expenses. We would not want to see these faculty dropped because of an inability to pay their travel costs.

Virtual collaboration and distance learning can achieve the same objectives without high costs for travel.

Local courts could pay for travel-related costs.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

If courts must pay for travel expenses for staff to be faculty, perhaps the responsibility could be rotated amongst the 58 courts.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

Courts should not have to pay expenses for their staff that are willing to teach. Some courts will be unable to absorb the

#10: CJER FACULTY

costs and we will lose good faculty as a result.

It would depend on the cost and our court's ability to fund.

If not funded, it would be difficult to allow judges and staff to participate as faculty.

We would probably self-pay, and participate less.

Since many of the programs are required by judges, we would be forced to eliminate services to fund this program if it is defunded.

It would be a disincentive to recruit SME to perform as faculty if courts would have to absorb travel and lodging costs

#11: JUDICIAL EDUCATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
9.39	9	19	11	9	48	7	19	11	9	46	9.57

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	10.2%	5
No	89.8%	44
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Pay for this training from court operations funds

Fund in house

Self-provided training

Don't really have one - cost would be prohibitive if the Court had to pay it.

CJA, NCSC

Not nearly as robust, but if JC decided to stop funding court would collaborate with other courts and local justice partners for delivery of needed education

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
14	7	9	10	9	0	49

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Our court would have to pay, to some degree, to provide mandated judicial training such as new judge training or death penalty training. Beyond that the court would most likely pass along the costs of training onto the bench officers or minimize travel expenses for any out of area training. Further, the court would provide only mandatory trainings and no other. This would significantly impact the courts budget, the level of training available to our bench officers, and the morale of our bench.

These courses are required per Rule of Court and the courts shouldn't be asked to fund them. If required there should be funding to support these mandated, essential programs.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.

The training of new judges is a function of the trial court, however all trial courts benefit from new judges acquiring introductory skills early in their tenure. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. We would urge greater use of satellite and web-based events so that there can be savings in costs of travel and lodging. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

This seems to be one of the core functions of the JCC, i.e., providing judicial education. Our court would be opposed to spending local funds on this function for that reason.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

This is a good program that can be delivered at a much lower cost.

If there were no other alternatives.

#11: JUDICIAL EDUCATION

Training of/for judicial officers is unique. We can not think of an alternative to these courses that could deliver as much value as is received by the participants.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

If the Executive branch grants new judgeships, shouldn't they find the mandatory training to go along with it? Judicial costs should not be part of the court's budget.

With regard to question #90, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

but would need funding.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

Cost would be prohibitive if the Court had to pay it.

We would probably self-pay, and participate less.

Because this is required, we would be required to eliminate services to fund the costs of participation.

#12: COURT INTERPRETER TESTING ETC.

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.27	7	16	9	6	38	7	14	7	6	34	8.29

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	4.2%	2
No	91.7%	44
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	4.2%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Regarding Q. 96: unclear - if program were eliminated, would there then be no certification and testing?) Would be difficult for any individual court to do this function, although we would certainly continue using interpreters.

We do our own recruitment. However, statewide testing is an important function.

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
26	5	9	4	2	2	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Depends on how much the services would cost us and if we can do them at our court at no additional cost.

Budget cuts to core services would preclude Court from considering funding of interpreter testing recruitment services if IMF funding were eliminated.

This must be a statewide program for uniformity in certification. It should be funded from 45.45 funds.

Cont Ed to be the responsibility of the interpreter.

Elimination of these services would compel the trial courts to recreate their own programs to certify/test interpreters. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

Interpreter requirements, forms, etc. are a necessary service.

Would want to see more support for courts, such as training and guidance in the use of interpreters for languages of lesser diffusion. e.g., providing stipends so these interpreters to reimburse for cost of testing and continuing education. More work is needed re cross-departmentally training, and to increase awareness among other court staff and the bench about what great language access looks like.

This should be funded by 45.45 funds.

We are a small rural court with no employee interpreters and very difficult to obtain certified and/or qualified interpreters.

This program benefits all courts and should be maintained/supported by IMF.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

We would like more services in this area. There is virtually no ongoing education provided by the Branch to interpreters. More languages need to be certified. More outreach is needed for recruitment.

#12: COURT INTERPRETER TESTING ETC.

With regard to question #95, the answer is based on the assumption that our court has used interpreters that have been tested via the program.

would require funding. No local skill in this area

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

Our responses are due primarily to the fact that our county is overwhelmingly English-speaking and there isn't the need.

This is an essential JCC service that this Court cannot provide.

We have neither the funds nor staffing readily available to provide interpreter services for our growing Hmong, Vietnamese and Central American populations.

This should not be funded by IMF, instead it should be funded as a core function of the court interpreter program 45.45.

JC has a regulatory role to oversee the certification of interpreters and therefore it should not be imbedded in the IMF

#13: TRIAL COURT WORKLOAD STUDY SUPPORT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.69	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.85
	4	13	8	7	32	3	9	9	6	27	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	6.3%	3
No	79.2%	38
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	14.6%	7

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Legislate direct trial court funding.

Use of WebEx long distance meetings and conference calls would have to suffice.

Not nearly as robust, but court would need to use its case management system and internal resources to measure performance

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
22	3	13	6	1	3	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

This needs to be a budget item in JC budget - funds to update one or two elements of the case weights each year. If the Legislature and Governor really want use of measures, they need to provide adequate funding to do it right. There is no way trial courts could do this themselves and have enough credibility for it to make any difference.

The Workload Study called "RAS" which WAFM relied upon was outdated and not statistically significant because the largest courts in the state did not participate. It had not been created or initiated for the purpose of budget development. The assumptions in the RAS on the mean value of the time studies were inconsistent with the reality of actual operations. Further reliance upon this faulty data resulted in the flaws that are perpetuated in the WAFM. The passage of WAFM was accomplished by promises of addressing parking lot issues that remain unresolved, and, the use of BLS as the labor factor without further scrutiny of the propriety of its continued use results in a two-tiered system of justice: the better resourced, larger courts and the lesser resourced courts, which are invariably rural courts.

There needs to be a mechanism for trial courts to participate in the development of resource need and funding allocation models.

The nominal cost of just over \$9,000 should continue. The work of this committee supports the entire branch.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #101 and #103, although the answers are "yes," the benefit received is somewhat intangible. However, it's important to recognize that the work is important to the overall judicial system.

Since RAS studies are used to adjust WAFM, all courts benefits. We see this as a no cost to the branch and do not currently have funds to pay for it.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

This is of great value to the branch to measure its needs and performance. This becomes a powerful tool and it seems

that this is a core function of a central governing body and therefore should be funded as its core responsibility and not funded by IMF

#14: BUDGET FOCUSED TRAINING AND MEETINGS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.35	8	18	10	9	45	8	16	8	9	41	8.72

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	18.8%	9
No	81.3%	39
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house
Legislate direct trial court funding.
conference call meetings
We could pay our share of expenses.
locally provided training, review state produced materials
The court would engage necessary private vendors as necessary to comply with any budgetary requirements/reporting.
locally fund
If a member of our court was serving on this committee, we would be willing fund his/her travel costs
Fund in house

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
19	5	11	8	5	0	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

These meetings are a valuable forum for the courts to know the budget process, and keeping current with budget information as we can't operate unless we know/have allocated funds. The training that Finance staff attend is essential to ensure they are completing the requirements of the 7A and other materials needed by the Judicial Council.
The various documents, formulas, are difficult and complex to follow. In person participation allows for complete understanding of the policy direction that is followed.
OK to fund the development and presentation of materials to train staff on budget practices, in particular new aspects or changes each year. However, a) trial courts should pay travel costs of their staff to attend programs, and b) no IMF funds should pay for TCBAC associated costs, this should be paid from the JC budget.
This Advisory Committee should not be funded by IMF, since other such committees are not.
During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.
The first attempt to move from historical funding should not be the end of it. This court agrees on the importance of stable funding. What has been ignored is that trial court employees are doing the same work, whether in large or small, urban or rural, courts.
We don't have the funds right now to pay for this.
Support for advisory committees is properly funded from the JCC budget.

The work of this committee supports the entire branch. IMF support should continue unless there is another funding source. We wonder how other JC Advisory Committee expenses are funded?

#14: BUDGET FOCUSED TRAINING AND MEETINGS

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #114, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

The information learned at TCBAC meetings is extremely helpful for budget planning purposes. Although costly to meet as a group, that is the best forum for discussions. To cut costs, have everyone pay for their own lunch.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

The budget-related training for court staff is helpful.

This should be a JCC general fund expense because the determination of the trial court budget affects almost 90% of the branch allocation. All branch budget activities should be general fund supported, not IMF.

There should be some discussion about the role of TCBAC within the JC governance structure and the core function. It seems this cost would be necessary for a functioning governing body and the cost TCBAC should not be apportioned 100% to IMF. Perhaps a prorating the costs between JC and IMF would make better sense

#15: TREASURY SERVICES – CASH MANAGEMENT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.71	10	17	10	8	45	9	17	10	8	44	8.85

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	16.7%	8
No	79.2%	38
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	4.2%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

This program must be operated on a statewide basis.

Agreement with local county treasurer.

I don't believe we would be allowed to distribute the UCF fees, but we would be willing to try.

We would return to local management of UCF payments and Trust funds.

Bring services in house

We would do our own reporting.

Submit directly to SCO?

This Court would assume these functions [reporting/distributions] locally.

We could perform the distributions as we have in the past.

Would need to update UCF and program changes locally and with Phoenix

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
21	3	11	10	3	0	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

This is a service that is required by everybody and must be maintained and followed on a consistent basis. If 58 trial courts each followed their own process for trust and treasury, the potential for audit exceptions would increase over time.

JC staff and costs are fundamental to budgeting, so should be funded from JC budget or TCTF, not IMF

Once again, this should not be funded out of IMF.

If we used SAP to gather the data, the other program might not be needed.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

This is properly funded from the JCC budget.

We wonder why the cost for these two staff are not supported by the JCC budget (like other finance staff).

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #122, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

#15: TREASURY SERVICES – CASH MANAGEMENT

Needed to ensure monies are correctly distributed as per TC145 but if we could somehow do this ourselves and save the cost it could be done in-house.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level. This program is necessary on a branch-wide basis for the economy of scale. For each court to go out individually will cost more and is not efficient.

We simply have no flexibility in the local court budget to pay for this type of service.

This should be a general fund supported item, for branch-wide activity. Not properly an IMF item.

As a donor court, we do not have the resources to otherwise support this program.

The ideal solution would be to secure funding from general fund to carry out this mandate. Another alternative would be legislation to allow deduction of these associated costs from the UCF before their distribution. This doesn't seem appropriate for a core function of the branch, imposed by laws

#16: TRIAL COURT PROCUREMENT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
6.60	6	14	7	3	30	5	11	7	4	27	7.16

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	37.5%	18
No	50.0%	24
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	12.5%	6

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We use L.A. Shared Procurement Services

The court would have to bid for services no longer available through this program.

Los Angeles Coop Purchasing Program

Fund in house

Contract with LA Procurement

Collaborative services agreement with Los Angeles Superior Court.

Los Angeles Procurement

We have a Business Services Manager and a contract specialist on staff.

Hope LA Court could assist

We would handle procurement in-house or contract out, likely with another court

Not essential service for us, but a helpful resource.

Court would utilize State DGS & County leveraged agreements or would perform necessary bidding

We have contracted with LA court for the service. It is comprehensive.

This service is available through larger courts and other governmental entities.

We contract with LA Superior Court for Procurement Services.

Riverside County's program.

We have our own procurement staff AND we utilize COUNTY and other STATE agreements to leverage services

Secure assistance and collaboration with other trial courts and local governmental entities

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
19	8	7	5	3	6	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

This is a subsidy to trial courts using the service; other courts pay this out of their base.

We currently pay for the buyer service.

We have an agreement with LA Superior Court for procurement services.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

#16: TRIAL COURT PROCUREMENT

Given limited funds it is not likely that more positions will be created to cover these services.

This is a local trial court function and should be funded by the trial courts who use the service.

We wonder why this cost is not paid out of the JCC budget. It appears the JCC budget already supports a few Business Services positions.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #130, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

We would need to go out for these contracts ourselves.

We do not have the funding.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program. Necessary for economy of scale. Inefficient for each court to individually source.

See above - We contract with LA Superior Court for Procurement Services.

Would be willing to pay on actual services provided to our court

#17: STATEWIDE SUPPORT FOR COLLECTIONS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.50	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.40
	9	17	9	5	40	9	16	8	5	38	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	19.1%	9
No	76.6%	36
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	4.3%	2

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

The court would have to internally manage these programs, rather than coordinating with the state program as we do today.

Court's staff

Local management of collections and reporting methods.

Courts can share their own analyses and solutions.

Report directly to SCO? We do not necessarily see this as a support program, rather additional reporting, so the court has not necessarily received a benefit other than we report collections.

Court would use internal, County, and Private agency expertise.

Shasta County collections program.

Each court should be solely responsible for their own collection activities

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
21	8	8	8	1	2	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

These are helpful services.

Our Court assumed responsibility of collections from the county this past July. The assistance of Judicial Council staff was invaluable to our court in starting this program which has been successful.

Seems to be a service a court asks for, so the court should pay. Not clear it is used universally.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

Use = Amnesty guidelines

As recently demonstrated by the recent Traffic Amnesty Program, the Court has benefited from the JCC's leadership and coordination role in responding to that new program. As for the willingness to pay, that would greatly depend upon cost passed along to our Court.

Courts now have considerable experience in this area and can share that expertise among themselves.

Because the cost for this program supports other justice partners, perhaps they may be willing to support some of this expense. Perhaps there is also a way to recover some costs through delinquent fine cost recovery.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would

#17: STATEWIDE SUPPORT FOR COLLECTIONS

likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #138, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

We could use already established listservs with other courts and would have to interpret the laws/rules as best we can. would require funding

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level. This program requires branch-wide oversight and coordination as the annual reporting to the Legislature is mandated.

Collections is handled by the County Collections Dept in Mendocino; so the Court's direct interaction with this program is minimal.

We felt the assistance from Bob Fleschman was extremely helpful in disentangling from our costly and malfunctioning county collections program.

This is one of those programs that was created by the legislation without dedicated funding over ten years ago. This should not be an IMF cost. It is a core function and should be funded by GF

Our Court assumed responsibility of collections from the county this past July. The assistance of Judicial Council staff was invaluable to our court in starting this program which has been successful.

#18: TRIAL COURT LABOR RELATIONS ACADEMIES

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.27	7	18	9	7	41	4	18	9	7	38	8.41

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	27.1%	13
No	66.7%	32
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	6.3%	3

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

CalPera is great but very expensive

private training providers

CalPERA

Fund in house

Work directly with our Labor Attorney

Our staff take advantage of continuing education opportunities.

possibly hire a labor attorney to provide training

Participate in CalPELRA however cost would be very expensive

SHRM and conferences put on by Joe Wiley

We would make do with other resources, but the trainings and meetings are quite helpful.

Court would use other State and private training sources.

Liebert Cassidy annual Employment Law Conference, SHRM, HR California

No real alternative for this.

We have several options for HR and Labor training

CALPELRA

use local legal specialists

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
17	2	10	15	3	1	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Don't believe we could afford to pay for this.

Since courts are responsible for their MOU's with represented court employees the labor forums are extremely valuable. The training that prepares court managers/HR staff for negotiations that is provided by Judicial Council staff is very good.

This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel.

Should be every other year.

During budget downturns, educational spending should also be cut proportionately.

Private vendors provide similar services at discounted rates to attract public agency litigation business. Regards of private vendor or services through this program, under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many

#18: TRIAL COURT LABOR RELATIONS ACADEMIES

years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

Courts should pay the costs of these conferences in conference attendance fees.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

This program is a great resource to all of us. It's also an opportunity to share emerging trends and best practices in labor relations.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Sometimes the Judicial Council labor relations information is not very timely. They were not helpful regarding ACA compliance.

This program is a valuable resource for small courts. It is helpful to keep up with labor negotiation trends and essential to stay current on changing labor laws. Extremely valuable negotiation training and JCC staff resources.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

This is one of the areas where a simple oversight or misstep can cost a court and the Branch significantly. Keeping HR staff up to date on changes in the law and recent labor trends minimizes that risk.

#19: SUPERIOR COURT AUDIT PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
7.94	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	7.98
	8	19	9	9	45	3	13	9	6	31	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	19.6%	9
No	80.4%	37
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Court would like to have an internal audit function, but cannot currently afford it.
We would contract with independent auditors
Legal and State resources
would have to rely on in-house auditors or contract out
We would hire an auditor.
Just as the JC contracts for outside services for this function, the court would as well
The JC audit program can be scaled back (but not eliminated) as other state agencies are available to pick up the slack, consistent with state law.
Court has an Internal Audit unit for daily items and would contract for any required outside/independent audit services
We'd likely go back to an independent audit.
third party contract with outside auditor
We could hire outside auditors but PREFER this model

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
17	4	13	8	6	0	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

These are very important services and helpful oversight.
The audit division provided assistance to us last year with a traffic employee who was embezzling funds from the public. It is nice to know that the courts have this service to them.
Audits are a basic requirement of government. As such it should be funded from JC budget of TCTF, not IMF.
Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.
Full financial audits every 6 years is 4 years too late to correct expensive, penalty-loaded errors.
Regarding the willingness to pay, that would depend greatly upon the cost. Based upon recently collected data from the JCC's Phoenix-FI accounting system, we know that San Bernardino paid approximately \$17,000 for a federal grant audit in 2012. The Court acknowledges that a federal grant audit differs from the current scope of the JCC's audit program yet since the individual superior courts have depended upon the JCC's audit services since 2001 at no cost to the individual courts, any future cost to the individual courts would definitely affect our willingness to pay despite the great value the

#19: SUPERIOR COURT AUDIT PROGRAM

Court places upon the program's services.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

As a mandatory program this is properly funded by the JCC budget.

The work performed by IAS is critical to the transparency of the work we do. Funding from IMF should continue.

Our current audit program seems unnecessarily comprehensive, at this point of the maturation of trial court administration, and could use some pruning back.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #154, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

They are very helpful when we have questions and it is necessary to have audits to make sure things are being done correctly. I wonder though if funding was gone could we hire an outside firm to do the same for a lower cost?

necessary, but would need funding.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

This program could be more valuable if it were better focused and not designed to be all-encompassing.

Should be a JCC general office function, not funded from the IMF.

It appears there may be some redundancy here - the overall impact seems to be that we are frequently audited by JCC and by non-Judicial Branch auditors. This service might be helpful if we were given more guidance about how to correct audit findings - e.g. RE: fine/fee distributions.

#20: DATA INTEGRATION

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.85	9	15	8	5	37	8	15	6	3	32	8.03

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	14.9%	7
No	76.6%	36
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	8.5%	4

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Our local application team would have to create data integration locally to DMV, DOJ and other justice partners.

Build interfaces locally

Locally hosted criminal/traffic case management system, and CLETS access only through Ventura County Sheriff's Department

Regionally or in partnership with other trial courts we could consolidate our needs to provide services

Hardcopy Protective Orders as done previously

provide local solution with internal staff

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
17	6	16	5	1	3	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

This is a good example of a program that benefits all courts equally and avoids each court reinventing the wheel. IMF can fund refresh, enhancements, upgrades.

Should provide future benefits.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service.

I am not sure I totally understand this question. CCPOR is important to our court particularly if all 58 courts could be on it, so I answered somewhat neutrally.

This is an overly expensive solution, even for those courts who use it. Funding should be given to all trial courts for this function; the courts are likely to find better, cheaper solutions.

Unfortunately, this court is not aware that that either all or even some of these projects have completed implementation therefore it is difficult to measure. These programs are not necessarily completely integrated for example with case management systems and the like.

If this service is beneficial to other agencies as well, perhaps they could share in the cost in order to minimize the cost to the IMF.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

It would be dependent on cost.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be

#20: DATA INTEGRATION

willing to pay for this program.

We would not have the funds to continue to pay for this if eliminated.

Would need increase allocation from Trial Court Trust Fund or another source

#21: CALIFORNIA COURTS TECHNOLOGY CENTER

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.54	9	17	10	9	45	10	18	10	8	46	7.89

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	17.0%	8
No	83.0%	39
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We use the Tech Center for Phoenix Financial services

Local IT resources in court and county.

Move services to local installation.

In part only re: ICMS Collaborative hosting by a partner court.

Self-provided services.

My understanding is that our tech center costs are relatively expensive and that more economical alternatives are available.

Contract w/3rd party vendors.

Not if funding assistance is not provided. If funding assistance is provided, then the court could host systems/services locally.

JC should not be in the middle of this service trial courts use in our daily work - we can partner with each other or lead a local effort.

Create local solutions with internal resources

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
17	9	14	1	6	1	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Our court uses CCPOR, Phoenix-Financials, and are now E-filing documents to the 5th. (Not sure if that is part of their ACCMS or is separate.

If this program is eliminated, we would look at locally used/hosted services for financials.

Compound question - would answer differently for different services on the list.

Received 2 of the major installations listed.

Support use for Phoenix use only.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

The CCPOR program is very beneficial as is the CAFM system. We would not be able to replace those services.

Use of CTCC = Phoenix and is mandated

This category inappropriately lumps together disparate programs. Phoenix Financial should be funded from the JCC

#21: CALIFORNIA COURTS TECHNOLOGY CENTER

budget. Phoenix HR, by contrast, is an optional program that should be funded by user fees. Why is ACCMS part of this survey? CMS V3, and ICMS, should be locally funded.

The court would have no choice but to pay for these services as the JC hosts the financial system and handles our payroll at this time.

The cost of \$9.4 M spent in FY13-14 seems high. However, depending on the appropriate distribution of costs to all entities who benefit from the program, it could be manageable.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #170, although funds have been built into our base for these services, it's unknown if the total amount would be sufficient to support similar services outside of the CCTC.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

Any services that courts were encouraged to implement when there was no cost associated should have the option to disconnect if there is to be a charge.

We are a managed court. We would not have the funds to pay for these services on our own.

Again, we simply have no flexibility in the local court budget to pay for additional services.

We would need an increased allocation from Trial Court Trust Fund to cover the cost.

Court is only willing to pay for services actually received and deemed to add value to the court

#22: CA COURTS PROTECTIVE ORDER REGISTRY

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.13	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.26
	8	17	6	5	36	8	17	6	5	36	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	21.3%	10
No	68.1%	32
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	10.6%	5

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We have a local registry, not shared with statewide CCPOR; not benefitting from statewide CCPOR either

CLETS manual entry

New CMS (Tyler) will have an alternative product through their system

Use only CLETS access through Ventura County Sheriff's Department.

Reporting the way we used to - through our local SO.

Go back to manually processing restraining orders.

CLETS through the Sheriff Department

Self funding - Restraining orders are a priority

Back to manual delivery.

Absorb the cost within operating budget and reach out to local LEA to defray costs. If infrastructure is not funded, court would revert to previous CLETS system

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
22	3	10	8	2	3	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

It would be a shame if the funding for this program was eliminated as it helps the public and law enforcement. The program has reduced the amount of time to get the documents to LE.

This program must be completed and all courts participated in the registry. The state should provide funding to complete this important project.

A statewide registry of all protective orders from all courts is in the public interest and protects victims. IMF should fund expansion to all courts.

Are tribal courts still using? And if so, are they making a financial contribution?

This is exactly the sort of program that the JCC should fully fund. Our court would participate if the JCC were able to fully fund the resources necessary to bring all 58 courts into the CCPOR.

CCPOR needs to have ALL courts able to use it for it to maximize it's effectiveness.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be

#22: CA COURTS PROTECTIVE ORDER REGISTRY

willing to pay for this program.

We would not have the funds to continue to pay for this if eliminated.

This is a critical JCC service to the trial courts. The ability to check for protective orders from other courts is essential.

#23: CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (V3)

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
3.42	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	3.40
	0	0	2	4	6	1	0	3	3	7	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	8.9%	4
No	26.7%	12
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	64.4%	29

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Odyssey CMS by Tyler Technologies

No alternative without funding for purchase and implementation of a replacement CMS

Our court just transitioned away from V3 and are no longer using this CMS.

We fund and manage our own case management system

our own cms.

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
25	0	1	1	0	21	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

V3 courts subsidized the branch in the development of this CMS, and therefore need to be protected, not punished, for supporting branch wide development programs

Need further detail on costs.

Case management systems are properly funded by local court funds.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Since CMS has been abandoned and technology/CMS funding has not been established, each court should be paying for their own CMS until all courts can be funded equally.

If the JCC pays for the CMS for those courts, then why not all the courts?

If funding assistance is provided, the court could purchase, host and maintain locally.

This should be paid for by the courts that are using the system - not by the branch as a whole.

I know other courts are affected by this program, but this is strictly from our court's perspective

#24: ENTERPRISE POLICY & PLANNING

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
5.50	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	6.74
	3	5	6	6	20	1	5	6	6	18	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	6.4%	3
No	53.2%	25
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	40.4%	19

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

We would have to develop our own local enterprise policies.

Direct purchase of an Oracle license for Jury+ the only application we currently use that relies on Oracle.

Internal staff resources

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
19	1	9	4	4	11	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Securing, funding, and achieving economies of scale with software licensing (e.g. Oracle) across the judicial branch can benefit all courts. Funds for an enterprise architect (EA) for the branch is important to the degree the JCC is to act as a data integration and interface hub for CA Courts.

Would like to receive listing of which courts receive products.

Humboldt has not implemented any of the Oracle products. If there is something we can/should use, it hasn't been identified.

The demise of CCMS has made this program no longer useful.

The program, which is under review, appears too costly, given the excessive number of licenses.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Don't know if the license is used with Phoenix.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

#25: INTERIM CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
4.88	5	6	1	0	12	5	5	1	0	11	5.96

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	8.5%	4
No	46.8%	22
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	44.7%	21

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Fund in house

We would return to our legacy CMS traffic system with no connectivity to DMV

Go directly to DMV

The SJE courts have been reviewing alternative hosting options for some time and hope to have an alternative plan of action finalized by the end of the current FY. We are all small courts, making hosting the CMS locally cost prohibitive.

fund and manage locally

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
21	1	2	6	1	17	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Concerns of funding used for select courts.

We would have to come up with an alternate support and management structure for SJE.

Case management systems are properly funded from local trial court budgets.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #202, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

Since CMS has been abandoned and technology/CMS funding has not been established, each court should be paying for their own CMS until all courts can be funded equally.

If the JCC pays for the CMS expense for some Courts, then why not all Courts?

depending upon funding

Our Court uses Sustain exclusively for our CMS program. If funding stopped a solution would have to be reached to continue Court Operations.

There is some statewide benefit. JCC is currently using fine/fee data from this ICMS (SJE) to analyze fine/fee revenue trends. Data will be used by the Administrative Director and others in coming up with recommendations on how to stabilize or restructure the fine/fee revenue stream. Any change to this long standing funding arrangement would need to be made gradually. Transitioning to a new hosting model or a new CMS cannot happen overnight, especially given the 1% fund balance restriction. It is counterproductive to ask courts to increase the amount paid for this system while at the same time expecting us to fund a transition to a new hosting model or a new CMS.

This is just like V-3. We feel for those courts that would have to pay, but our court doesn't benefit from this and has used

#25: INTERIM CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

its own resources for operating and procuring its CMS

#26: TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
8.38	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	8.70
	9	18	10	8	45	8	17	9	7	41	

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	21.3%	10
No	78.7%	37
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Develop and support with court staff or contractor

Fund in house

Court pays on own contract, potentially higher cost.

We would purchase our own equipment.

Court would have to procure services

contract privately at likely cost prohibitive

Court could develop and implement an alternative approach and assume all funding, if initial (one-time) funding assistance is provided to transition all WAN services to local responsibility and control.

locally fund and manage

Our court would procure similar equipment via an RFP process or leveraged agreement likely without cost savings.

Fund costs from operational budget

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
13	7	7	13	8	0	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

What should happen here is the JCC and representatives of trial courts should develop a standard for network infrastructures and do an RFP and sign master agreement(s) with vendors which trial courts can use to establish an appropriate infrastructure with local funding. Another point would be to develop a BCP every few years to fund refreshes and upgrades, as these expenses are not annual but cyclical.

Continued support is appropriate; continued development should be reviewed.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

The cost for this program is nearly \$15.6 M. The report information is not clear as to how much of this expense is one-time vs. ongoing.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

#26: TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT

With regard to question #210, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

We would be required to pay for these services to function.

If eliminated we would have to self-fund. In that case, we would not implement to JCC standards due to lack of funding.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

Our Court uses Phoenix for our accounting system. If funding stopped, a solution would have to be reached to maintain our court finances.

#27: UNIFORM CIVIL FILINGS SERVICE

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.33	10	17	10	9	46	10	16	10	7	43	8.31

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	19.6%	9
No	78.3%	36
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	2.2%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Not sure how, or if, it affected this court.

County Auditor Controller

Excel

Return to local distribution of funds collected.

We would handle our own reporting.

would have to perform service in-house or contract out

Self-reporting and distributions to the appropriate entities would be required.

Use of internal staff to develop any required reports and/or distribution items

We'd revert to the way we performed this work previously.

Use internal staff to make modifications

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
21	4	11	8	3	1	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

If funding is for JCC staff for on-going operations, it should not be funded from IMF, rather from JCC or TCTF funds. If funds are to refresh or upgrade, it fits the IMF definition.

Seems to be a state administrative cost.

Again using SAP.

We may like to use this. More information is needed.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

Why is this IMF?

Regarding the willingness to pay, that would depend greatly upon the cost to be passed along to our Court. Alameda currently does not have any alternatives to this service and the Court is not aware of the level of effort expended by the JCC since it only receives the final end product. The Court would greatly appreciate any efforts to shorten the time for monies which flow back to Court. Currently, the process takes two months.

As a core, centralized program, this should be funded from the JCC budget.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

#27: UNIFORM CIVIL FILINGS SERVICE

The \$350,000 expense noted in the report is not detailed enough to understand how much of the expense is for staff (ongoing) vs one-time (upgrades).

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #218, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

Could this program be turned over to the Trial Court Accounting Services? We have been on this schedule for quite some time. Courts can also be trained to take on more reporting if necessary. Could it be part of Phoenix FI?

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level. This function needs to be coordinated on a statewide basis with all other budget functions.

This should be a function of the Treasurer and/or Controller's Office. Judicial branch should not have the burden of distribution and reporting.

We will be willing to pay, provided it is cost-effective and adds value to court operations

#28: JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE DEFENSE INSURANCE

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
9.02	8	18	10	9	45	3	9	8	6	26	9.11

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	12.5%	6
No	87.5%	42
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	0.0%	0

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Pay these costs from court operations funds

Self-insurance.

obtain our own insurance for these matters

Judges pay personally or CJA pay

Pay costs from operating budget

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
16	5	12	8	7	0	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

This is essentially a judicial benefit. Not clear it can be paid from trial court funds. Should be paid from judicial branch budget as a judicial benefit.

Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

The court would have to assess whether the court has the resources to absorb this cost, or whether instead the individual judicial officers would have to pay.

This program should not be funded from the IMF.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

Not sure that this is a cost the trial courts can pay using TCTF. If cost is shifted to all courts, cost could be prorated per JO to each court.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Since Judicial Officers are not court employees, it seems the insurance costs for their actions should be borne by the State of CA. Other branches of government should fund specific to Judicial Branch or each individual court.

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level given the importance of protecting the court's judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk.

#29: LITIGATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
9.25	8	16	10	9	43	4	13	9	9	35	9.18

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	12.8%	6
No	85.1%	40
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	2.1%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Local funding; hire lawyers to defend court

Local Legal Research Attorneys.

Self-provision of services.

Court would engage private counsel for issues requiring litigation requirements.

We would have to hire outside counsel, for which we have no budget.

handle locally

Court will need to set up its own liability fund and contract with law firms

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
16	4	10	8	9	1	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

This program is well run, valuable, and cost effective. Makes no sense to transfer this cost to trial courts, as the costs are episodic, unpredictable, and often of considerable magnitude. Managing at state level promotes consistency of litigation outcomes, and smooths expenses as the aggregate on a statewide basis is more even and predictable.

Required by statute

This is a necessary service for all courts.

Were this program to be eliminated, the court would have to secure these services in the private market and the court does not have carryover reserves for litigation exposures. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

Obviously, even if the LMC went away, the court would continue to get sued and would need to retain counsel. However, it is highly unlikely that the court would be able to adequately fund the cost of counsel (and settlements) out of court funds.

We do not it often

This program should not be funded by the IMF.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Unable to budget without funding source. We would have to pay as the need arose and we have no in-house expertise.

#29: LITIGATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Statute requires that the JC provide

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level given the importance of this program in protecting the court from financial ruin. We could not afford to independently hire quality counsel, which could result in the court being unable to pay for the costs of litigation and potentially forcing the court into bankruptcy.

We have no money in our budget in order to fund this.

If the funds were eliminated this courts would be required to pay for these services; if litigation is brought against the court, employees, or judicial officers, the court would have to expense funds for legal counsel; most likely by laying off staff to cover the expense.

We must have access to a litigation management team at the judicial council. Small and mid size courts don't have in house council and need to be able to rely on the services we have received all these years from the Judicial council in supporting us through litigation.

Our ability to pay for this would depend on the cost.

#30: REGIONAL OFFICE ASSISTANCE GROUP

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
7.17	10	16	8	4	38	10	15	8	3	36	7.68

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	22.9%	11
No	68.8%	33
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	8.3%	4

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Hire local counsel
 use of in-house legal staff
 Contract with private counsel.
 We would handle our legal needs in-house, through our internal Office of the General Counsel.
 We provide these services locally.
 private contracts however cost is likely a factor, we generally utilize labor and employment for negotiations or employee issues other than fiscal that covers the general use for our court
 The recent announcement from M. Hoshino indicated the Burbank office will be closing. The staff resources will be reassigned to other locations.
 Court would engage a private firm for any necessary consultation.
 Have to use staff from San Fran
 The alternative is that the services will be provided at another office not in the region.
 Would be very difficult for us to find a viable alternative to this.
 trial courts locally handle own

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
20	5	8	10	4	1	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

The attorneys that our court has used (Steve Crooks, Eric Schnurpfeil, Michael Gidden) and others are excellent. Our court, mid-size, relies heavily on the services provided by these excellent attorneys for legal opinions and legal questions regarding issues with the public and employees. Regarding the Regional Office assistance, this past year we have used the Facilities staff to assist with questions regarding leases, etc.
 Current funding levels would make it very difficult to replace this necessary function
 Courts who prefer to use JCC staff, or whose needs do not warrant hiring local staff to perform these duties, should pay for them. This is not an appropriate use of IMF funds.
 Legal Opinion Unit is excellent.
 This is a necessary service in a small court.
 Were this program to be eliminated, the court would have to secure these services in the private market and the court does not have carryover reserves for litigation exposures. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program,

#30: REGIONAL OFFICE ASSISTANCE GROUP

in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

Courts who use these services should pay for them; otherwise this should be funded by the JCC budget.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #242, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

We could use our own research attorneys for more routine matters, but for more complicated issues such as labor, we would need to hire outside counsel.

We rely on this program to assist our small court with various legal services that we cannot provide in-house. Examples include MOU creation & review, Public Information Act requests, labor/employment law questions, and...

Further information on the cost and service to be provided is needed in order to determine whether the court would be willing to pay for this program.

Again, I don't know how our budget could ever absorb this.

The programs are critical and our court would not be able to self-fund.

These services are provided over email and telephone which can be done at the main building in San Francisco.

We need transactional legal assistance but these services seem to be listed in several areas. Shouldn't they be covered in the Legal Services Office budget?

Again, would depend on the cost.

This should be a Trial Court Trust Fund obligation.

We will continue to us central headquarter and collaborate with other regional courts

#31: TRIAL CTS TRANSACTIONAL ASSISTANCE PGM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.33	6	18	9	6	39	2	9	8	4	23	8.63

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	16.7%	8
No	72.9%	35
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	10.4%	5

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Use court operations funds to pay these costs

LA program and Local LR attorneys.

Hire outside counsel when necessary

Court would engage a private firm for any necessary consultations.

fund locally - for our local trial court employees

Our Court would need to hire our own attorneys to assist with the myriad of transactional legal services

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
16	8	6	10	5	3	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

Our court is required to do the investigations for neighboring courts based on the Region 3 Interpreter contract as we are the "home" court. As a result, outside counsel have been present at these meetings.

While San Mateo Court did not directly utilize this program in the past year, this is a critical service to have when needed.

A subsidy to those courts that use the services, not everyone does.

This is a necessary service in a small court.

Were this program to be eliminated, the court would have to secure these services in the private market and the court does not have carryover reserves for litigation exposures. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

We would attempt to handle most representations in-house using staff attorneys; however, for certain cases we might have to allocate court general funds to pay outside counsel.

Court users should pay for these services. They should not be funded from the IMF.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

The report is not clear as to how many courts and how many issues were resolved using this program in FY13-14.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #250, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

We would have to hire as the need arose.

#31: TRIAL CTS TRANSACTIONAL ASSISTANCE PGM

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level.

These services were invaluable in 2013 when our employees went on strike and PERB refused to issue an order restraining court reporters from striking.

We do not have adequate funding to self-fund.

All courts go into labor and employment negotiations. For the courts that use this program it is not a question of "would the court be willing to pay for this service" - we would have to pay for this service. This would mean reducing services elsewhere to cover the cost. We do not benefit from Alternative Dispute Resolution centers or complex civil litigation program.

Again, service like it is listed in many different line items. Shouldn't all legal services be funded in the Legal Services Office budget?

Small and mid size courts do not have resources to hire in house counsel or outside counsel and need this service.

We would pay for outside counsel as needed.

#32: COURT-ORDERED DEBT TASK FORCE

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
6.50	6	11	8	3	28	3	6	7	2	18	6.64

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	6.3%	3
No	64.6%	31
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	29.2%	14

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Costs would have to be paid from court operations funds

Listserves already set up.

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
23	4	15	0	1	5	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

No evidence the Task Force has done anything constructive. Seems to be politically locked up. Why should the judiciary pay to try and solve a politically intractable problem created by the Legislature?

While PC § 1463.02 states two court executives and two judges shall be a part of the task force, currently Alameda does not have any direct participation in the task force. However, the Court values the statewide efforts to standardize and clarify court-ordered debt. As for the willingness to pay, that would greatly depend upon cost passed along to our Court.

Depends on the outcome.

Distribution of collections of court ordered debt is extremely complex due to the myriad penalty and fee statutes legislated over many years. It is important to have sufficient training at the trial court level for successful collection of court ordered debt. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable.

Meeting expenses for task forces are properly funded out of the JCC budget.

Although the cost is minimal (\$1,440) we wonder if the work being done by this task force is duplicative to the work now being done by the Futures Commission.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

Despite efforts of many dedicated people, absolutely no progress has been made by the task force.

Will be willing to only pay for actual services on an agreed rate. This seems to belong within the administrative core function and be funded by GF

#33: PHOENIX PROGRAM

Benefit to Branch	# Courts Directly Benefit					Used in Last Year					Value to Court
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	
8.63	9	19	10	9	47	9	19	10	9	47	8.94

5. If this program were eliminated or reduced, does your court have an alternative to this service?

Yes	20.0%	9
No	77.8%	35
Our court is not a direct beneficiary of this program.	2.2%	1

6. If yes, please explain the alternative.

Find another accounting system?
Local Auditor Controller System

Fund in house.
handle internally or contract out

We can provide these services locally.
locally provided or coordinated accounting services can be implemented, although there would be a transition period.
Court would engage a provider for automated HR/Payroll and financial systems
would require an addition FTE

We could resume our prior financial system if necessary.
we can and will be contracting for our own HR/payroll services

7. If IMF funding were eliminated, how likely is it that your court would be willing to pay for this program or service?

Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely	N/A	Total
13	7	7	10	11	0	48

8. Please provide any additional comments you wish about this program.

The branch needs one accounting system shared by all courts to have any chance of establishing credibility and fiscal accountability with the Governor, Legislature, and the public

We don't have the funds to pay for Phoenix right now.
Required.

If IMF is no longer providing financial accounting, we will need to find an alternate solution.

Were this program to be eliminated, the court would have to secure these services in the private market and/or develop the staffing to manage this in house. Under the existing WAFM we don't have enough funding to pay for this service or to do so with our own resources. If we were to receive additional funding we might be able to pay for this service. This is a mature program, in place for many years, and we could not replicate or reconstitute the current level of service. To the extent this service benefits all trial courts, we rate it highly valuable. This is a cost effective way to provide these services to all 58 trial courts.

I believe we are paying for this program.

While this program has become very valuable to our court, initially it was very cumbersome, many improvements over the years have made it valuable. Our transition to payroll recently (upon the improvements to the system) have made the system very efficient for us. Usage throughout the JC between programs/grants and the financial group would be beneficial to the JC and the courts, less or elimination of reports and so on.

#33: PHOENIX PROGRAM

This question is answered as it relates to Phoenix Financials only. We were denied access to Phoenix HR and therefore we must use ADP.

This question inappropriately combines two different programs: Phoenix Financial, as a centralized, mandatory program, should be funded from the JCC budget. Phoenix HR, as an optional program, should be paid for by the trial courts that use it.

Funding any or all portion of this program will be dependent upon available and prioritized funds.

This program continues to benefit all courts for financial services and should continue to be supported.

Just like last year, this question should split out Phoenix Finance and Accounting, two very different services. Phoenix HR is very expensive and should not be subsidized at the state level.

Our operating budget would be severely impacted if the Court had to pay for these services. Not having the funding would likely mean that other services would be impacted and making it very difficult to accomplish our goal of providing access to the residents of Tulare County.

With regard to question #266, if our budget can absorb the additional expense.

Funding issue

This is an essential service that should be funded at the Branch level. This program needs to be coordinated at the branch-wide level.

We moved to the Phoenix system primarily because it was presented as a mandate. The cost is significantly more than the cost of our local financial system.

It is our understanding that the courts on the HR component of Phoenix are reimbursing the cost of that program, so this item only pertains to the Finance portion. The statewide financial reporting system is essential in advocacy and should be funded.

Should be a Trial Court Trust Fund obligation.

Phoenix financial is helpful with ALL courts utilizing, but phoenix HR is NOT helpful and is not a robust program and JC has no business offering this service and funding for just a few courts

Item 4
Fiscal Status of the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
(Discussion Item)

This report provides information related to the level and amount of allocation reductions that need to be considered in order to avoid a negative fund balance in the IMF from 2016–17 to 2019–20.

Attachments 4A1 and 4A2 – IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances, Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016–17 to 2019–20

Attachment 4A provides IMF expenditures and any remaining encumbrances for fiscal years 2012–13, 2013–14 and 2014–15. All expenditure and encumbrance data is as of October 30, 2015. It also displays Judicial Council approved allocations for FY 2015–16 and estimates of allocations that will not be needed, as well as estimated costs/needs for each program for fiscal years 2016–17 through 2019–20.

The JCC Information Technology office, working with court CIOs, has identified three scenarios for rolling out replacement network switches under the Telecommunications Support program. Scenario 1, which integrates IT’s original Telecom Support projections, does not defer the replacement of any network switches and the allocation need is \$30.5 million in FY 2016–17 and \$70.3 million for the four-year period from 2016–17 to 2019–20. Scenario 2 defers the replacement of 536 network switches by two years, and the allocation need is \$16.1 million in 2016–17 and \$61.8 million for the four-year period. Scenario 3 defers the replacement of 422 network switches by one year, and the allocation is \$18.1 million in 2016–17 and \$61.8 million for the four-year period.

Upon recommendation of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, at the April 17, 2015, Judicial Council meeting, the council approved the consideration of shifting certain costs away from the IMF beginning in 2016–17, the assessment on whether costs of the Trial Court Transactional Assistance Program can be provided on a fee-for-service basis, and the viability of a cost recovery model for the Center for Families, Children, and the Courts Publications program and the California Courts Protective Order Registry program. This action would permanently shift approximately \$2.867 million in expenditures to the Judicial Council’s General Fund appropriation to support core central costs of the Court Interpreters Program, Treasury Services-Cash Management, Audit Services, Uniform Civil Fees, and Regional Office Assistance Group and shift \$17,000 in expenditures to the Trial Court Trust Fund, Program 45.45-Court Interpreter appropriation to support the Domestic Violence Family Law Interpreter Program. The council did not identify alternate funding sources and, as such, the programs remain funded from the IMF until further Judicial Council action. The full body of the report that was provided to the council is at the following link:

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4094879&GUID=B04A59DB-4BD2-486B-BEB7-0D8F5CAA4AB3>

Attachment 4B – IMF – Pro Rata Reduction Scenarios

Attachment 4B displays the level of a pro-rata reduction that each program would be given in order to achieve an approximately \$700,000 and \$3.7 million fund balance by the end of 2016–17 for each of the three scenarios.

Attachment 4C – IMF – Fund Condition Statement

Attachment 4C, the IMF fund condition statement, provides the estimated ending fund balance for 2015–16 and 2016–17 for the three scenarios at two different levels of pro-rata reductions. Based on current projections, which relies on JCC office’s estimate of costs/needs and assumes a continued annual 5% decline in certain revenues through FY 2019–20, the IMF would end 2016–17 with a negative fund balance ranging from -\$2.4 million to -\$16.7 million, depending on whether the roll out of network switches under the Telecommunications Support program is done according to the suggested replacement date or delayed by up to 2 years for some courts. Finance is currently estimating unused allocations in the amount of \$1MM for FY 2015-16.

Attachment 4D –“Use” of IMF Funds by Courts
(pending)

Attachment 4A1

IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances, Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016-17 to 2019-20

#	Program/Project	Office	Prior Years' Expenditures and Encumbrances									2016-17 Estimates*			
			2012-13 Exp.	2013-14 Exp.	2013-14 Encum.	2013-14 Exp+Enc	2014-15 Exp.	2014-15 Encum.	2014-15 Exp+Enc	2015-16 Authorized FTE	2015 Council Approved Allocations	Projected Savings from 2015-16 Allocations	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
			A	B	C	D	E (C+D)	F	G	H (F+G)	I	J	L	M	Q
1	Audit Services	AS	\$ -	\$ 679,978	\$ -	\$ 679,978	\$ 570,546	\$ 38	\$ 570,584	0	\$ 660,000	\$ -	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000
2	CFCC Educational Programs	CFCC	\$ 82,497	\$ 90,996	\$ -	\$ 90,996	\$ 80,457	\$ 11,064	\$ 91,521	0	\$ 67,000	\$ -	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000
3	CFCC Publications	CFCC	\$ 19,904	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	0	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
4	Domestic Violence-Family Law Interpreter Program	CFCC	\$ 1,595,650	\$ 20,167	\$ -	\$ 20,167	\$ 1,313	\$ 20,452	\$ 21,765	0	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000
5	Interactive Software-Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	\$ 40,000	\$ 60,009	\$ -	\$ 60,009	\$ 32,706	\$ 27,000	\$ 59,706	0	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
6	Self Help Center	CFCC	\$ 4,926,373	\$ 4,958,176	\$ -	\$ 4,958,176	\$ 4,964,584	\$ 36,003	\$ 5,000,587	0	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000
7	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	CFCC	\$ 114,098	\$ 100,046	\$ -	\$ 100,046	\$ 71,523	\$ 32,889	\$ 104,412	0	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
8	Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	CJER	\$ 103,811	\$ 143,990	\$ -	\$ 143,990	\$ 174,003	\$ -	\$ 174,003	0	\$ 140,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000
9	Distance Learning	CJER	\$ 111,804	\$ 83,113	\$ 54,447	\$ 137,560	\$ 86,489	\$ 47,919	\$ 134,408	0	\$ 138,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000
10	Essential/Other Education for Court Management	CJER	\$ 19,814	\$ 30,168	\$ -	\$ 30,168	\$ 34,438	\$ -	\$ 34,438	0	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
11	Mandated, Essential & Other Education for JOs	CJER	\$ 193,503	\$ 246,197	\$ -	\$ 246,197	\$ 318,673	\$ 6,826	\$ 325,499	0	\$ 654,000	\$ -	\$ 829,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 829,000
12	Faculty and Curriculum Development	CJER	\$ 210,799	\$ 231,395	\$ -	\$ 231,395	\$ 289,859	\$ 7,921	\$ 297,780	0	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500
13	Court Interpreters Program Testing, Development and	COSSO	\$ 128,456	\$ 124,289	\$ 4,926	\$ 129,215	\$ 90,935	\$ 87,687	\$ 178,623	0	\$ 143,000	\$ -	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000
14	Justice Corps	COSSO	\$ 269,773	\$ 322,386	\$ 8,614	\$ 331,000	\$ 132,854	\$ 214,696	\$ 347,550	0	\$ 347,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	COSSO	\$ 6,946	\$ 9,124	\$ -	\$ 9,124	\$ 1,106	\$ -	\$ 1,106	0	\$ 13,000	\$ -	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000
16	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	Finance	\$ 34,316	\$ 51,674	\$ -	\$ 51,674	\$ 50,507	\$ -	\$ 50,507	0	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
17	Treasury Services - Cash Mgt. (Support)	Finance	\$ 235,809	\$ 161,049	\$ -	\$ 161,049	\$ 228,383	\$ -	\$ 228,383	2	\$ 238,000	\$ -	\$ 242,100	\$ 242,100	\$ 242,100
18	Trial Court Procurement	Finance	\$ 128,358	\$ 25,812	\$ -	\$ 25,812	\$ 100,888	\$ -	\$ 100,888	1	\$ 122,000	\$ -	\$ 124,050	\$ 124,050	\$ 124,050
19	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	\$ 23,925	\$ 29,281	\$ -	\$ 29,281	\$ 30,551	\$ -	\$ 30,551	0	\$ 25,700	\$ -	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700
20	Adobe Live Cycle Reader Service Extension	IT	\$ -	\$ 129,780	\$ -	\$ 129,780	\$ 133,700	\$ -	\$ 133,700	0	\$ 141,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
21	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	\$ 608,840	\$ 327,725	\$ -	\$ 327,725	\$ 173,427	\$ 21,452	\$ 194,879	2	\$ 861,200	\$ -	\$ 669,827	\$ 669,827	\$ 669,827
22	Data Integration	IT	\$ 3,568,942	\$ 2,760,250	\$ 21,955	\$ 2,782,206	\$ 2,062,125	\$ 615,775	\$ 2,677,900	4	\$ 3,849,600	\$ -	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,508,907
23	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	IT	\$ 3,362,989	\$ 1,391,991	\$ 152,473	\$ 1,544,464	\$ 329,292	\$ 295,688	\$ 624,980	0	\$ 2,832,140	\$ -	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 8,021,425
24	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	\$ 747,262	\$ 587,047	\$ 461,540	\$ 1,048,587	\$ 415,157	\$ 593,639	\$ 1,008,796	0	\$ 1,246,800	\$ -	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,039,684
25	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	IT	\$ 7,003,614	\$ 7,435,526	\$ 255,789	\$ 7,691,315	\$ 5,703,694	\$ 2,839,626	\$ 8,543,320	11	\$ 8,534,969	\$ -	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,690,839
26	Telecommunications Support	IT	\$ 8,560,629	\$ 14,684,666	\$ 859,248	\$ 15,543,914	\$ 4,440,388	\$ 7,260,897	\$ 11,701,285	0	\$ 16,159,000	\$ -	\$ 30,484,269	\$ 16,144,196	\$ 18,120,956
27	Jury Management System	IT	\$ 581,770	\$ 100,229	\$ 499,510	\$ 599,739	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	\$ 465,000	\$ -	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000
28	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3)	IT	\$ 5,017,228	\$ 5,066,840	\$ 5,926	\$ 5,072,766	\$ 3,456,425	\$ 1,568,236	\$ 5,024,661	9	\$ 5,658,100	\$ -	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,163,956
29	Uniform Civil Fees	IT	\$ -	\$ 271,850	\$ -	\$ 271,850	\$ 352,323	\$ -	\$ 352,323	2	\$ 366,000	\$ -	\$ 368,931	\$ 368,931	\$ 368,931
30	Litigation Management Program	LSO	\$ 3,874,153	\$ 3,853,397	\$ 147,676	\$ 4,001,074	\$ 3,941,326	\$ -	\$ 3,941,326	0	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000
31	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	\$ 875,966	\$ 919,892	\$ -	\$ 919,892	\$ 920,794	\$ -	\$ 920,794	0	\$ 966,600	\$ 4,279	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600
32	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	\$ 15,205	\$ 15,694	\$ -	\$ 15,694	\$ 12,447	\$ -	\$ 12,447	0	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
33	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	\$ 1,364,544	\$ 1,217,816	\$ 317	\$ 1,218,133	\$ 1,342,807	\$ 312	\$ 1,343,119	6	\$ 1,460,000	\$ -	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,472,300
34	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	LSO	\$ 450,682	\$ 444,217	\$ -	\$ 444,217	\$ 416,197	\$ 34,803	\$ 451,000	0	\$ 451,000	\$ -	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000
35	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	TCAS	\$ -	\$ 1,855	\$ -	\$ 1,855	\$ 12,407	\$ -	\$ 12,407	0	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
36	Phoenix Program	TCAS	\$ 6,354,165	\$ 6,393,681	\$ -	\$ 6,393,681	\$ 6,456,288	\$ 8,230	\$ 6,464,519	58	\$ 12,121,114	\$ -	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 14,004,200
	Total		\$ 62,593,612	\$ 66,720,836	\$ 2,576,915	\$ 69,297,752	\$ 48,252,563	\$ 15,278,747	\$ 63,531,310	95	\$ 67,215,823	\$ 24,779	\$ 88,380,384	\$ 74,040,310	\$ 76,017,070

*Estimates provided by JCC offices. The only difference between the scenarios are the estimates for the Telecommunications Support allocation.

IT scenario 1 (original projection)

IT scenario 2 (defer replacement of 536 network switches up to 2 years past end of life)

IT scenario 3 (defer replacement of 422 switches 1 year past end of life)

Attachment 4A2

IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances, Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016-17 to 2019-20

#	Program/Project	Office	2015 Council Approved Allocations	Projected Savings from 2015-16 Allocations	Scenario 1 Estimates*				Scenario 2 Estimates*				Scenario 3 Estimates*				
					2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
					A	J	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V
1	Audit Services	AS	\$ 660,000	\$ -	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000
2	CFCC Educational Programs	CFCC	\$ 67,000	\$ -	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000
3	CFCC Publications	CFCC	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
4	Domestic Violence-Family Law Interpreter Program	CFCC	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000
5	Interactive Software-Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
6	Self Help Center	CFCC	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000
7	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	CFCC	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
8	Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	CJER	\$ 140,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 137,000
9	Distance Learning	CJER	\$ 138,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000
10	Essential/Other Education for Court Management	CJER	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
11	Mandated, Essential & Other Education for JOs	CJER	\$ 654,000	\$ -	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 794,000
12	Faculty and Curriculum Development	CJER	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500
13	Court Interpreters Program Testing, Development and	COSSO	\$ 143,000	\$ -	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000
14	Justice Corps	COSSO	\$ 347,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	COSSO	\$ 13,000	\$ -	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000
16	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	Finance	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
17	Treasury Services - Cash Mgt. (Support)	Finance	\$ 238,000	\$ -	\$ 242,100	\$ 240,519	\$ 245,733	\$ 251,229	\$ 242,100	\$ 240,519	\$ 245,733	\$ 251,229	\$ 242,100	\$ 240,519	\$ 245,733	\$ 251,229	\$ 251,229
18	Trial Court Procurement	Finance	\$ 122,000	\$ -	\$ 124,050	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 124,050	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 124,050	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000
19	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	\$ 25,700	\$ -	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700
20	Adobe Live Cycle Reader Service Extension	IT	\$ 141,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
21	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	\$ 861,200	\$ -	\$ 669,827	\$ 678,235	\$ 689,947	\$ 701,634	\$ 669,827	\$ 678,235	\$ 689,947	\$ 701,634	\$ 669,827	\$ 678,235	\$ 689,947	\$ 701,634	\$ 701,634
22	Data Integration	IT	\$ 3,849,600	\$ -	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,512,747	\$ 3,538,180	\$ 3,577,048	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,512,747	\$ 3,538,180	\$ 3,577,048	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,512,747	\$ 3,538,180	\$ 3,577,048	\$ 3,577,048
23	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	IT	\$ 2,832,140	\$ -	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 5,787,892	\$ 5,947,363	\$ 6,111,618	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 5,787,892	\$ 5,947,363	\$ 6,111,618	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 5,787,892	\$ 5,947,363	\$ 6,111,618	\$ 6,111,618
24	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	\$ 1,246,800	\$ -	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,194,939	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,194,939	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,194,939	\$ 1,194,939
25	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	IT	\$ 8,534,969	\$ -	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,969,479	\$ 9,732,157	\$ 9,369,067	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,969,479	\$ 9,732,157	\$ 9,369,067	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,969,479	\$ 9,732,157	\$ 9,369,067	\$ 9,369,067
26	Telecommunications Support	IT	\$ 16,159,000	\$ -	\$ 30,484,269	\$ 11,259,793	\$ 12,784,784	\$ 15,791,250	\$ 16,144,196	\$ 16,146,909	\$ 13,743,328	\$ 15,791,250	\$ 18,120,956	\$ 18,106,329	\$ 9,807,148	\$ 15,791,250	\$ 15,791,250
27	Jury Management System	IT	\$ 465,000	\$ -	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000
28	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3)	IT	\$ 5,658,100	\$ -	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,137,490	\$ 5,180,862	\$ 5,375,150	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,137,490	\$ 5,180,862	\$ 5,375,150	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,137,490	\$ 5,180,862	\$ 5,375,150	\$ 5,375,150
29	Uniform Civil Fees	IT	\$ 366,000	\$ -	\$ 368,931	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 368,931	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 368,931	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595
30	Litigation Management Program	LSO	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000
31	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	\$ 966,600	\$ 4,279	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600
32	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
33	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	\$ 1,460,000	\$ -	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000
34	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	LSO	\$ 451,000	\$ -	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000
35	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	TCAS	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
36	Phoenix Program	TCAS	\$ 12,121,114	\$ -	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300
Total			\$ 67,215,823	\$ 24,779	\$ 88,380,384	\$ 67,268,993	\$ 68,775,429	\$ 71,839,424	\$ 74,040,310	\$ 72,156,109	\$ 69,733,973	\$ 71,839,424	\$ 76,017,070	\$ 74,115,529	\$ 65,797,793	\$ 71,839,424	\$ 71,839,424

*estimates derived from projections provided by the offices
IT scenario 1 (original projection)
IT scenario 2 (defer replacement of 536 network switches upto 2 years past end of life)
IT scenario 3 (defer replacement of 422 switches 1 year past end of life)

Attachment 4B

IMF -- Pro Rata Reduction Scenarios

#	Description	2014-2015 (Year-end Financial Statement)	Estimated 2015-2016	2016-17 Estimated Cost/Need								
				Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3		
				No Reduction	19% Reduction	22.5% Reduction	No Reduction	3.5% Reduction	7.5% Reduction	No Reduction	6% Reduction	10% Reduction
B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
1	Beginning Balance	26,207,006	8,956,870	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	2,880,385	992,266	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	29,087,391	9,949,136	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310	8,951,310
4	<i>Revenues</i>											
5	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	23,702,658	21,671,895	19,908,627	19,908,627	19,908,627	19,908,627	19,908,627	19,908,627	19,908,627	19,908,627	19,908,627
6	2% Automation Fund Revenue	14,730,023	13,843,182	13,202,385	13,202,385	13,202,385	13,202,385	13,202,385	13,202,385	13,202,385	13,202,385	13,202,385
7	Jury Instructions Royalties	532,783	597,025	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815
8	Interest from SMIF	100,734	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810
9	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	30,233	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	<i>Transfers</i>											
11	From State General Fund	38,709,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000
12	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	(20,594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)
13	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)
14	Net Revenues and Transfers	43,814,431	66,423,912	63,974,637	63,974,637	63,974,637	63,974,637	63,974,637	63,974,637	63,974,637	63,974,637	63,974,637
15	Total Resources	72,901,822	76,373,048	72,925,947	72,925,947	72,925,947	72,925,947	72,925,947	72,925,947	72,925,947	72,925,947	72,925,947
16	<i>Expenditures</i>											
17	Allocation	71,466,600	67,215,823	88,380,384	71,455,540	68,494,797	74,040,310	71,448,899	68,487,287	76,017,070	71,456,046	68,415,363
18	Less: Unused Allocation	(7,823,266)	(1,500,000)	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>
19	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	301,618	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091
20	Total Expenditures	63,944,952	67,421,738	89,147,475	72,222,631	69,261,888	74,807,401	72,215,990	69,254,378	76,784,161	72,223,137	69,182,454
21	Fund Balance	8,956,870	8,951,310	(16,221,528)	703,316	3,664,059	(1,881,454)	709,957	3,671,569	(3,858,214)	702,810	3,743,493
22	Revenue/Transfers Over/(Under) Exp	(20,130,521)	(997,826)	(25,172,838)	(8,247,994)	(5,287,251)	(10,832,764)	(8,241,353)	(5,279,741)	(12,809,524)	(8,248,500)	(5,207,817)

*estimates derived from projections provided by the offices

IT scenario 1 (original projection)

IT scenario 2 (defer replacement of 536 network switches upto 2 years past end of life)

IT scenario 3 (defer replacement of 422 switches 1 year past end of life)

IMF -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description				Scenario 1				Scenario 2				Scenario 3			
		2013-2014 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2014-2015 (Year-end Financial Statement)	Estimated 2015-2016	Estimated 2016-17*	Estimated 2017-18*	Estimated 2018-19*	Estimated 2019-20*	Estimated 2016-17*	Estimated 2017-18*	Estimated 2018-19*	Estimated 2019-20*	Estimated 2016-17*	Estimated 2017-18*	Estimated 2018-19*	Estimated 2019-20*
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1	Beginning Balance	44,827,741	26,207,006	8,956,870	8,451,310	(16,721,528)	(22,621,908)	(31,746,613)	8,451,310	(2,381,454)	(13,168,949)	(23,252,199)	8,451,310	(4,358,214)	(17,105,130)	(23,252,199)
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	4,410,172	2,880,385	992,266	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	49,237,913	29,087,391	9,949,136	8,451,310	(16,721,528)	(22,621,908)	(31,746,613)	8,451,310	(2,381,454)	(13,168,949)	(23,252,199)	8,451,310	(4,358,214)	(17,105,130)	(23,252,199)
4	Revenues															
5	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	26,873,351	23,702,658	21,671,895	19,908,627	18,415,480	17,034,319	15,756,745	19,908,627	18,415,480	17,034,319	15,756,745	19,908,627	18,415,480	17,034,319	15,756,745
6	2% Automation Fund Revenue	15,242,700	14,730,023	13,843,182	13,202,385	12,856,600	12,519,871	12,191,962	13,202,385	12,856,600	12,519,871	12,191,962	13,202,385	12,856,600	12,519,871	12,191,962
7	Jury Instructions Royalties	445,365	532,783	597,025	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815	551,815
8	Interest from SMIF	124,878	100,734	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810	84,810
9	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	24,476	30,233	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Transfers															
11	From State General Fund	38,709,000	38,709,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000	44,218,000
12	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	(20,594,000)	(20,594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)	(594,000)
13	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)	(13,397,000)
14	Net Revenues and Transfers	47,428,770	43,814,431	66,423,912	63,974,637	62,135,705	60,417,815	58,812,332	63,974,637	62,135,705	60,417,815	58,812,332	63,974,637	62,135,705	60,417,815	58,812,332
15	Total Resources	96,666,683	72,901,822	76,373,048	72,425,947	45,414,176	37,795,907	27,065,719	72,425,947	59,754,251	47,248,865	35,560,133	72,425,947	57,777,490	43,312,685	35,560,133
16	Expenditures															
17	Allocation	73,961,680	71,466,600	67,215,823	88,380,384	67,268,993	68,775,429	71,839,424	74,040,310	72,156,109	69,733,973	71,839,424	76,017,070	74,115,529	65,797,793	71,839,424
18	Less: Unused Allocation	(4,082,985)	(7,823,266)	(1,000,000)	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>
19	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	580,982	301,618	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091	767,091
20	Total Expenditures	70,459,677	63,944,952	67,921,738	89,147,475	68,036,084	69,542,520	72,606,515	74,807,401	72,923,200	70,501,064	72,606,515	76,784,161	74,882,620	66,564,884	72,606,515
21	Fund Balance	26,207,006	8,956,870	8,451,310	(16,721,528)	(22,621,908)	(31,746,613)	(45,540,797)	(2,381,454)	(13,168,949)	(23,252,199)	(37,046,382)	(4,358,214)	(17,105,130)	(23,252,199)	(37,046,383)
22	Revenue/Transfers Over/(Under) Exp	(23,030,907)	(20,130,521)	(1,497,826)	(25,172,838)	(5,900,379)	(9,124,705)	(13,794,184)	(10,832,764)	(10,787,495)	(10,083,249)	(13,794,184)	(12,809,524)	(12,746,915)	(6,147,069)	(13,794,184)

*estimates derived from projections provided by the offices
 IT scenario 1 (original projection)
 IT scenario 2 (defer replacement of 536 network switches upto 2 years past end of life)
 IT scenario 3 (defer replacement of 422 switches 1 year past end of life)

Item 6
Preliminary State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund 2016–2017
Allocation Recommendations
(Action Item)

At its March 10-11, 2015 meeting, the TCBAC’s Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee adopted the following criteria or principles to help guide them in their decision-making process during their deliberations:

- whether programs/projects are mandated
- the number of courts served
- value to the courts and the branch according to the survey results
- the appropriateness of the IMF as the fund source
- the impact program and project funding reductions would have on individual courts and the judicial branch.

Attachment 4A1 Revised

IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances, Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016-17 to 2019-20

#	Program/Project	Office	Prior Years' Expenditures and Encumbrances						2015-16 Authorized FTE	2015 Council Approved Allocations	Projected Savings from 2015-16 Allocations	2016-17 Estimates*			
			2012-13 Exp.	2013-14 Exp.	2013-14 Encum.	2013-14 Exp+Enc	2014-15 Exp.	2014-15 Encum.				2014-15 Exp+Enc	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
			A	B	C	D	E (C+D)	F				G	H (F+G)	I	J
1	Audit Services	AS	\$ -	\$ 679,978	\$ -	\$ 679,978	\$ 570,546	\$ 38	\$ 570,584	0	\$ 660,000	\$ -	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000
2	CFCC Educational Programs	CFCC	\$ 82,497	\$ 90,996	\$ -	\$ 90,996	\$ 80,457	\$ 11,064	\$ 91,521	0	\$ 67,000	\$ -	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000
3	CFCC Publications	CFCC	\$ 19,904	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	0	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
4	Domestic Violence-Family Law Interpreter Program	CFCC	\$ 1,595,650	\$ 20,167	\$ -	\$ 20,167	\$ 1,313	\$ 20,452	\$ 21,765	0	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000
5	Interactive Software-Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	\$ 40,000	\$ 60,009	\$ -	\$ 60,009	\$ 32,706	\$ 27,000	\$ 59,706	0	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
6	Self Help Center	CFCC	\$ 4,926,373	\$ 4,958,176	\$ -	\$ 4,958,176	\$ 4,964,584	\$ 36,003	\$ 5,000,587	0	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000
7	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	CFCC	\$ 114,098	\$ 100,046	\$ -	\$ 100,046	\$ 71,523	\$ 32,889	\$ 104,412	0	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
8	Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	CJER	\$ 103,811	\$ 143,990	\$ -	\$ 143,990	\$ 174,003	\$ -	\$ 74,615	0	\$ 140,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000
9	Distance Learning	CJER	\$ 111,804	\$ 83,113	\$ 54,447	\$ 137,560	\$ 86,489	\$ 47,919	\$ 140,496	0	\$ 138,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000
10	Essential/Other Education for Court Management	CJER	\$ 19,814	\$ 30,168	\$ -	\$ 30,168	\$ 34,438	\$ -	\$ 34,438	0	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
11	Mandated, Essential & Other Education for JOs	CJER	\$ 193,503	\$ 246,197	\$ -	\$ 246,197	\$ 318,673	\$ 6,826	\$ 798,613	0	\$ 654,000	\$ -	\$ 829,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 829,000
12	Faculty and Curriculum Development	CJER	\$ 210,799	\$ 231,395	\$ -	\$ 231,395	\$ 289,859	\$ 7,921	\$ 322,365	0	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500
13	Court Interpreters Program Testing, Development and Implementation	COSSO	\$ 128,456	\$ 124,289	\$ 4,926	\$ 129,215	\$ 90,935	\$ 87,687	\$ 178,623	0	\$ 143,000	\$ -	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000
14	Justice Corps	COSSO	\$ 269,773	\$ 322,386	\$ 8,614	\$ 331,000	\$ 132,854	\$ 214,696	\$ 347,550	0	\$ 347,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	COSSO	\$ 6,946	\$ 9,124	\$ -	\$ 9,124	\$ 1,106	\$ -	\$ 1,106	0	\$ 13,000	\$ -	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000
16	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	Finance	\$ 34,316	\$ 51,674	\$ -	\$ 51,674	\$ 50,507	\$ -	\$ 50,507	0	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
17	Treasury Services - Cash Mgt. (Support)	Finance	\$ 235,809	\$ 161,049	\$ -	\$ 161,049	\$ 228,383	\$ -	\$ 228,383	2	\$ 238,000	\$ -	\$ 242,100	\$ 242,100	\$ 242,100
18	Trial Court Procurement	Finance	\$ 128,358	\$ 25,812	\$ -	\$ 25,812	\$ 100,888	\$ -	\$ 100,888	1	\$ 122,000	\$ -	\$ 124,050	\$ 124,050	\$ 124,050
19	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	\$ 23,925	\$ 29,281	\$ -	\$ 29,281	\$ 30,551	\$ -	\$ 30,551	0	\$ 25,700	\$ -	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700
20	Adobe Live Cycle Reader Service Extension	IT	\$ -	\$ 129,780	\$ -	\$ 129,780	\$ 133,700	\$ -	\$ 133,700	0	\$ 141,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
21	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	\$ 608,840	\$ 327,725	\$ -	\$ 327,725	\$ 173,427	\$ 21,452	\$ 194,879	2	\$ 861,200	\$ -	\$ 669,827	\$ 669,827	\$ 669,827
22	Data Integration	IT	\$ 3,568,942	\$ 2,760,250	\$ 21,955	\$ 2,782,206	\$ 2,062,125	\$ 615,775	\$ 2,677,900	4	\$ 3,849,600	\$ -	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,508,907
23	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	IT	\$ 3,362,989	\$ 1,391,991	\$ 152,473	\$ 1,544,464	\$ 329,292	\$ 295,688	\$ 624,980	0	\$ 2,832,140	\$ -	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 8,021,425
24	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	\$ 747,262	\$ 587,047	\$ 461,540	\$ 1,048,587	\$ 415,157	\$ 593,639	\$ 1,008,796	0	\$ 1,246,800	\$ -	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,039,684
25	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	IT	\$ 7,003,614	\$ 7,435,526	\$ 255,789	\$ 7,691,315	\$ 5,703,694	\$ 2,839,626	\$ 8,543,320	11	\$ 8,534,969	\$ -	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,690,839
26	Telecommunications Support	IT	\$ 8,560,629	\$ 14,684,666	\$ 859,248	\$ 15,543,914	\$ 4,440,388	\$ 7,260,897	\$ 11,701,285	0	\$ 16,159,000	\$ -	\$ 30,484,269	\$ 16,144,196	\$ 18,120,956
27	Jury Management System	IT	\$ 581,770	\$ 100,229	\$ 499,510	\$ 599,739	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	\$ 465,000	\$ -	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000
28	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	IT	\$ 5,017,228	\$ 5,066,840	\$ 5,926	\$ 5,072,766	\$ 3,456,425	\$ 1,568,236	\$ 5,024,661	9	\$ 5,658,100	\$ -	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,163,956
29	Uniform Civil Fees	IT	\$ -	\$ 271,850	\$ -	\$ 271,850	\$ 352,323	\$ -	\$ 352,323	2	\$ 366,000	\$ -	\$ 368,931	\$ 368,931	\$ 368,931
30	Litigation Management Program	LSO	\$ 3,874,153	\$ 3,853,397	\$ 147,676	\$ 4,001,074	\$ 3,941,326	\$ -	\$ 3,941,326	0	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000
31	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	\$ 875,966	\$ 919,892	\$ -	\$ 919,892	\$ 920,794	\$ -	\$ 920,794	0	\$ 966,600	\$ 4,279	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600
32	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	\$ 15,205	\$ 15,694	\$ -	\$ 15,694	\$ 12,447	\$ -	\$ 12,447	0	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
33	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	\$ 1,364,544	\$ 1,217,816	\$ 317	\$ 1,218,133	\$ 1,342,807	\$ 312	\$ 1,343,119	6	\$ 1,460,000	\$ -	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,472,300
34	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	LSO	\$ 450,682	\$ 444,217	\$ -	\$ 444,217	\$ 416,197	\$ 34,803	\$ 451,000	0	\$ 451,000	\$ -	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000
35	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	TCAS	\$ -	\$ 1,855	\$ -	\$ 1,855	\$ 12,407	\$ -	\$ 12,407	0	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000
36	Phoenix Program	TCAS	\$ 6,354,165	\$ 6,393,681	\$ -	\$ 6,393,681	\$ 6,456,288	\$ 8,230	\$ 6,464,519	58	\$ 12,121,114	\$ -	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 14,004,200
Total			\$ 62,593,612	\$ 66,720,836	\$ 2,576,915	\$ 69,297,752	\$ 48,252,563	\$ 15,278,747	\$ 63,531,310	95	\$ 67,215,823	\$ 24,779	\$ 88,380,384	\$ 74,040,310	\$ 76,017,070

*Estimates provided by JCC offices. The only difference between the scenarios are the estimates for the Telecommunications Support allocation.

IT scenario 1 (original projection)

IT scenario 2 (defer replacement of 536 network switches up to 2 years past end of life)

IT scenario 3 (defer replacement of 422 switches 1 year past end of life)

IMF Prior-Year Expenditures & Encumbrances, Current-Year Allocation, and Estimated Costs/Needs from 2016-17 to 2019-20

#	Program/Project	Office	2015 Council Approved Allocations	Projected Savings from 2015-16 Allocations	Scenario 1 Estimates*				Scenario 2 Estimates*				Scenario 3 Estimates*			
					2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
					M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X
A	J	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X		
1	Audit Services	AS	\$ 660,000	\$ -	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	
2	CFCC Educational Programs	CFCC	\$ 67,000	\$ -	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	
3	CFCC Publications	CFCC	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	
4	Domestic Violence-Family Law Interpreter Program	CFCC	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	
5	Interactive Software-Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	
6	Self Help Center	CFCC	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	
7	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	CFCC	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
8	Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	CJER	\$ 140,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 137,000	\$ 72,000	
9	Distance Learning	CJER	\$ 138,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	\$ 124,000	
10	Essential/Other Education for Court Management	CJER	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	
11	Mandated, Essential & Other Education for JOs	CJER	\$ 654,000	\$ -	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	\$ 794,000	\$ 829,000	
12	Faculty and Curriculum Development	CJER	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	\$ 309,500	
13	Court Interpreters Program Testing, Development and Implementation	COSSO	\$ 143,000	\$ -	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	
14	Justice Corps	COSSO	\$ 347,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
15	Trial Court Performance Measures Study	COSSO	\$ 13,000	\$ -	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	
16	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	Finance	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	
17	Treasury Services - Cash Mgt. (Support)	Finance	\$ 238,000	\$ -	\$ 242,100	\$ 240,519	\$ 245,733	\$ 251,229	\$ 242,100	\$ 240,519	\$ 245,733	\$ 251,229	\$ 242,100	\$ 240,519	\$ 245,733	
18	Trial Court Procurement	Finance	\$ 122,000	\$ -	\$ 124,050	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 124,050	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 124,050	\$ 122,000	\$ 122,000	
19	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	\$ 25,700	\$ -	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	\$ 25,700	
20	Adobe Live Cycle Reader Service Extension	IT	\$ 141,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
21	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	\$ 861,200	\$ -	\$ 669,827	\$ 678,235	\$ 689,947	\$ 701,634	\$ 669,827	\$ 678,235	\$ 689,947	\$ 701,634	\$ 669,827	\$ 678,235	\$ 689,947	
22	Data Integration	IT	\$ 3,849,600	\$ -	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,512,747	\$ 3,538,180	\$ 3,577,048	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,512,747	\$ 3,538,180	\$ 3,577,048	\$ 3,508,907	\$ 3,512,747	\$ 3,538,180	
23	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	IT	\$ 2,832,140	\$ -	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 5,787,892	\$ 5,947,363	\$ 6,111,618	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 5,787,892	\$ 5,947,363	\$ 6,111,618	\$ 8,021,425	\$ 5,787,892	\$ 5,947,363	
24	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	\$ 1,246,800	\$ -	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,194,939	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,194,939	\$ 1,039,684	\$ 1,218,907	\$ 1,194,939	
25	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	IT	\$ 8,534,969	\$ -	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,969,479	\$ 9,732,157	\$ 9,369,067	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,969,479	\$ 9,732,157	\$ 9,369,067	\$ 9,690,839	\$ 9,969,479	\$ 9,732,157	
26	Telecommunications Support	IT	\$ 16,159,000	\$ -	\$ 30,484,269	\$ 11,259,793	\$ 12,784,784	\$ 15,791,250	\$ 16,144,196	\$ 16,146,909	\$ 13,743,328	\$ 15,791,250	\$ 18,120,956	\$ 18,106,329	\$ 9,807,148	
27	Jury Management System	IT	\$ 465,000	\$ -	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	\$ 465,000	
28	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	IT	\$ 5,658,100	\$ -	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,137,490	\$ 5,180,862	\$ 5,375,150	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,137,490	\$ 5,180,862	\$ 5,375,150	\$ 5,163,956	\$ 5,137,490	\$ 5,180,862	
29	Uniform Civil Fees	IT	\$ 366,000	\$ -	\$ 368,931	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 368,931	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	\$ 368,931	\$ 369,595	\$ 369,595	
30	Litigation Management Program	LSO	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	
31	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	\$ 966,600	\$ 4,279	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	\$ 966,600	
32	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	
33	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	\$ 1,460,000	\$ -	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,472,300	\$ 1,460,000	\$ 1,460,000	
34	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	LSO	\$ 451,000	\$ -	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 451,000	
35	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	TCAS	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	
36	Phoenix Program	TCAS	\$ 12,121,114	\$ -	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 14,004,200	\$ 13,885,300	\$ 13,885,300	
	Total		\$ 67,215,823	\$ 24,779	\$ 88,380,384	\$ 67,268,993	\$ 68,775,429	\$ 71,839,424	\$ 74,040,310	\$ 72,156,109	\$ 69,733,973	\$ 71,839,424	\$ 76,017,070	\$ 74,115,529	\$ 65,797,793	\$ 71,839,424

*estimates derived from projections provided by the offices

IT scenario 1 (original projection)

IT scenario 2 (defer replacement of 536 network switches upto 2 years past end of life)

IT scenario 3 (defer replacement of 422 switches 1 year past end of life)

Attachment 4D

Use of IMF Funds by Courts

#	Program/Project	Office	FY 2015-16 Allocation	Direct Distribution to The Courts	# of Courts Receiving Distribution	Court Cost Subsidized	Estimated # of Courts Receiving Subsidy for FY 2014-15	Notes
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Audit Services	AS	\$ 660,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
2	CFCC Educational Programs	CFCC	\$ 67,000	No	n/a	Yes	Available to all courts	CFCC program supports Youth Summit available to Youth/Peer Court youth and programs in every court; Family Law Educational programs meeting training requirements and mandates for court professionals is available to employees of all courts.
3	CFCC Publications	CFCC	\$ 20,000	No	n/a		Available to all courts	CFCC Publications program supports online information available to all courts and dependency professionals across the state.
4	Domestic Violence-Family Law Interpreter Program	CFCC	\$ 17,000	No	n/a		Available to all courts	DV - FLIP program provides translations of DV-related forms.
5	Interactive Software-Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	\$ 60,000	No	n/a	Yes	Available to all courts	Interactive Software program develops smart forms and document assembly products to specifications from local court, then scales them to statewide availability.
6	Self Help Center	CFCC	\$ 5,000,000	Yes	58			
7	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support	CFCC	\$ 100,000	No	n/a		Available to all courts	Self-Represented Litigants Statewide Support program primarily supports web-based resources (e.g., Statewide Self-Help Website) that are available to all courts and to the public.
8	Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	CJER	\$ 140,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
9	Distance Learning	CJER	\$ 138,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
10	Essential/Other Education for Court Management	CJER	\$ 20,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Required for new judges. Needs vary with annual judicial appointments.
11	Mandated, Essential & Other Education for JOs	CJER	\$ 654,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	Required for new judges. Needs vary with annual judicial appointments.
12	Faculty and Curriculum Development	CJER	\$ 250,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts eligible to participate	
13	Court Interpreters Program Testing, Development and Implementation	COSSO	\$ 143,000	No	n/a			All courts who use certified/registered interpreters benefit. Courts are required to use certified/registered interpreters on the council's master list if and when available.
14	Justice Corps	COSSO	\$ 347,600	Yes	3	Yes	6	Justice Corps members provide services at 6 courts.
15	Workload Assessment Advisory Committee	COSSO	\$ 13,000	No	n/a	No		Reimbursement of Workload Assessment Advisory Committee members who travel to in-person meetings and trial court staff who participate in focus groups.
16	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	Finance	\$ 50,000	No	n/a	No		The program reimburses the members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee for attending in-person meetings and covers non-staff costs related to budget training for trial court staff (e.g., conference line for webinars).
17	Treasury Services - Cash Mgt.	Finance	\$ 238,000	No	n/a	Yes	58	
18	Trial Court Procurement	Finance	\$ 122,000	No	n/a	Yes	All courts can use master contracts	
19	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	\$ 25,700	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
20	Adobe Live Cycle Reader Service Extension	IT	\$ 141,000	Yes	1	Yes	58	
21	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	\$ 861,200	No	n/a	Yes	40	
22	Data Integration	IT	\$ 3,849,600	No	n/a	Yes	47	
23	Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	IT	\$ 2,832,140	No	n/a	Yes	58	
24	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	\$ 1,246,800	No	n/a	Yes	8	
25	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	IT	\$ 8,534,969	No	n/a	Yes	58	
26	Telecommunications Support	IT	\$ 16,159,000	No	n/a	Yes	58	
27	Jury Management System	IT	\$ 465,000	Yes			n/a	There was no allocation in 2014-15.
28	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	IT	\$ 5,658,100	No	n/a	Yes	5	
29	Uniform Civil Fees	IT	\$ 366,000	No	n/a	Yes	58	
30	Litigation Management Program	LSO	\$ 4,000,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
31	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	\$ 966,600	No	n/a	Yes	58	
32	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	\$ 19,000	No	n/a		All courts provide jury instructions	The program funds the two advisory committees that prepare the official jury instructions that are used by all courts.
33	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	\$ 1,460,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
34	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	LSO	\$ 451,000	No	n/a	Yes	Varies year to year	
35	Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	TCAS	\$ 19,000	No	n/a		Available to all courts	
36	Phoenix Program	TCAS	\$ 12,121,114	No	n/a	Yes	58	
Total			\$ 67,215,823					

Telecommunications Program

LAN WAN Technology Refresh
IMF Budget

December 14, 2015



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Combined 169

Agenda

- Program Overview
- Budgeting Challenges
- Solving the Issue: Process & Methodology
- Options Identified
- CITMF Review
- Consensus
- Looking Forward
- Q&A



Program Overview

- The Telecommunications Program is multifaceted, and provides the following services to the courts:
 - Network Hardware Implementation
 - Network Hardware Annual Maintenance
 - Network Hardware Refresh
 - Equipment Trade-In Program
 - Security Monitoring
 - Training

Guiding Principles

- Maintain the ability for all courts to fully and equitably participate in the program
- Ensure system interoperability throughout the Courts.
- Maintain adherence to architectural standards
- Reduce cost, complexity and administrative overhead by maintaining a:
 - Single vendor platform
 - Single managed service provider
- Trial Courts and Judicial Council work in partnership. Decisions are not made unilaterally.

Program Goals

- Provide a common foundation for meeting court needs
- Ensure all courts have a reliable, supportable, secure networking infrastructure
- Simplify the technical decisions required to implement LAN technology
- Provide infrastructure at good “value”
- Equitable, fully inclusive, predictably consistent
- Leverage statewide technical experts
- Maintain the right balance of physical inventory (e.g. spare parts vs. maintenance coverage)
- Educate policy makers on benefits, costs, and risks
- Create a predictable, transparent approach to multi-year funding

Budgeting Challenges

- Five year budget projections show a significant spike in FY 16-17 to \$29M
- \$19M in onetime costs are attributed to large number network hardware reaching End Of Support (EOS)
- Funding limitations require methods to level the budget to an annual target of \$16.15M

Solving the Issue

- Discussions with CITMF, Judicial Council Finance, technology vendors, and our managed service provider.
 - Dozens of meetings to discuss options and pricing were conducted with Cisco and AT&T between June 2015 and the present, and near-daily emails and phone calls.
- Options were identified based on analysis of the following:
 - End of support date
 - Function, quantity and cost
 - Complexity of replacement
 - Risks associated with replacement after end of support
 - Alternatives to replacement, including third party post-end of support maintenance contracts and service-based options

Option 1 (Preliminary Forecast)

Defer replacement of 536 network switches up to 2 years past end of support

Option	TECHNOLOGY REFRESH FIVE YEAR BUDGET FORECAST					Program Totals
	FY 2015 (TR9)	FY 2016 (TR10)	FY 2017 (TR11)	FY 2018 (TR12)	FY 2019 (TR13)	
1	\$16,133,633	\$18,120,956	\$18,106,329	\$9,807,148	\$15,791,250	\$77,959,316

- Redistribution of equipment refresh across 4 years will yield a flat spend projection.
- Technology inequality between courts is inevitable, as some courts and devices must be refreshed later than others.
- Delays replacement of critical switch infrastructure for 2 years past End of Life.
- No security patches or bug fixes. Replacement hardware is limited to what can be redeployed from other courts.
- Possible interoperability and capacity problems with other technology courts want to implement.
- Runs counter to core LAN WAN principles; the program has spent millions of dollars to ensure a baseline level of security and infrastructure at all courts.
- Not supported by CITMF

Option 2 (Preliminary Forecast)

Defer replacement of 422 network switches 1 year past end of support

Option	TECHNOLOGY REFRESH FIVE YEAR BUDGET FORECAST					Program Totals
	FY 2015 (TR9)	FY 2016 (TR10)	FY 2017 (TR11)	FY 2018 (TR12)	FY 2019 (TR13)	
2	\$16,133,633	\$18,120,956	\$18,106,329	\$9,807,148	\$15,791,250	\$77,959,316

- Reduces duration EOL switches are in the field from 24 months to 12 months
- Does not perfectly smooth the budget; moderate fluctuations between years.
- Risks and tradeoffs are the same as Option 1:
 - Technology inequality between courts
 - No security patches, bug fixes; limited replacement hardware
 - Capacity and interoperability issues may limit courts' ability to implement new applications or services.
 - Runs counter to core LAN WAN principles
- Not supported by CITMF

Option 3 (Preliminary Forecast)

Lease/Finance

Option	TECHNOLOGY REFRESH FIVE YEAR BUDGET FORECAST					Program Totals
	FY 2015 (TR9)	FY 2016 (TR10)	FY 2017 (TR11)	FY 2018 (TR12)	FY 2019 (TR13)	
3	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

- 3 year financing of refresh equipment with \$1 buyout (estimated APR: 2%)
- This option is under review and pending on Judicial Council Finance and TCBC approval
- Financing of refresh equipment will yield a flat spend projection.
- Avoids delays in replacement of critical equipment.
- Reduce / eliminate risk of impact to daily courts operation.
- Supports core LAN WAN principles; the program has spent millions of dollars to ensure a baseline level of security and infrastructure at all courts.
- Enables equipment trade-in at 3 to 4% to compensate the financing charges
- Supported by CITMF

Summary: Effectiveness

Option Number	Single Vendor	Single Service Provider	Level of Smoothing	Risk of Impact to Daily Court Operations	Equipment Trade-In	Lease/ Finance Charges
1. Defer replacement of 536 network switches up to two years past end of support	No Guarantee	No Guarantee	Flat	Very High	No	No
2. Defer replacement of 422 network switches up to one year past end of support	No Guarantee	No Guarantee	Moderate	High	No	No
3. Financing	Yes	Yes	Flat	Very Low	Yes	Yes

Summary: Financial

Option 1: Defer replacement of 536 network switches up to 2 years past end of support

Option	TECHNOLOGY REFRESH FIVE YEAR BUDGET FORECAST					Program Totals
	FY 2015 (TR9)	FY 2016 (TR10)	FY 2017 (TR11)	FY 2018 (TR12)	FY 2019 (TR13)	
1	\$16,133,633	\$16,144,196	\$16,146,909	\$13,743,328	\$15,791,250	\$77,959,316

Option 2: Defer replacement of 422 network switches 1 year past end of support

Option	TECHNOLOGY REFRESH FIVE YEAR BUDGET FORECAST					Program Totals
	FY 2015 (TR9)	FY 2016 (TR10)	FY 2017 (TR11)	FY 2018 (TR12)	FY 2019 (TR13)	
2	\$16,133,633	\$18,120,956	\$18,106,329	\$9,807,148	\$15,791,250	\$77,959,316

Option 3: Lease/Finance

Option	TECHNOLOGY REFRESH FIVE YEAR BUDGET FORECAST					Program Totals
	FY 2015 (TR9)	FY 2016 (TR10)	FY 2017 (TR11)	FY 2018 (TR12)	FY 2019 (TR13)	
3	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

CITMF Review

Options 1 & 2: Potential Impact to Courts

- Switch failures, whether caused by bugs, hardware, or security vulnerabilities, affect every device and service connected to the defective switch. This can result in inability to conduct proceedings due to limited or no access to resources such as:
 - Phone systems
 - Case management systems
 - Building management systems (e.g. HVAC)
 - Wireless networks
 - Internet
 - CCTC hosted applications
 - Printers
 - Calendars
 - Jury IVR
 - Video surveillance
 - Door badge access sensors
 - DMV, DOJ records

CITMF Review (Cont.)

Case Study: Switch Failure at Contra Costa

- Walnut Creek courthouse, 11/16/2015, two switches failed:
 - The entire network was down for over 7 hours, including VOIP phones.
 - 50+ employees at this site were unable to work.
 - Courthouse handles all Traffic Department transactions; the public was unable to pay tickets, fines, or to register to make in person appearances.
 - Central Traffic Unit is also located at this facility; typical incoming phone volume for this unit is 400 calls a day from the public. No calls were possible while the phones were down.

Consensus

- Option 1 – A completely smooth budget, but with significant trade-offs
- Option 2 – A somewhat smooth budget with fewer trade-offs, and provides a better balance between fiscal reality and program objectives
- Option 3 – Lease/Financing
 - Completely smooths the budget
 - The least risk of impact to the courts' daily operation
 - Maintains a Single Vendor Platform
 - Maintains a Single Managed Service Provider
 - Adheres to the program's goals and principles

We can smooth the budget, but options 1 and 2 compromise the program's guiding principles

Request

- Consideration for stable ongoing funding for predictable hardware refresh planning.
- Latitude for Lease/Financing as an option to smooth out the budget while also replacing hardware in a timely manner.

Looking Forward

- Identify and commit to stable baseline funding of \$16.15M
- Gradually increase the funding (10% per year) for this program.
 - Bandwidth is getting cheaper, cloud is becoming more prevalent
 - Higher capacity (and more expensive) equipment will be required to support increased bandwidth needs
 - Upcoming initiatives such as CMS, the Next Generation Data Center Hosting, eFiling and Disaster Recovery workstreams may lead to the need for additional infrastructure funds to ensure the success
 - Continued improvements in the protection of court infrastructure from data security threats and power outages should be considered as well.
- Procure and deploy new hardware in a manner that minimizes budget spiking

Questions and Answers



Telecommunications Support

Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$10,650,000

FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$16,159,000 (with \$5.5M ongoing BCP funding)

Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$ TBD

FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Video Conferencing	\$5,000	TBD	
Tuition and Registration Fees	\$100,000	TBD	
Consultants – Information Systems	\$1,125,000	TBD	
Maintenance - Hardware	TBD	TBD	
IS Supplies/Minor Software/Licenses	\$5,000,000	TBD	
IT Equipment	TBD	TBD	
Total	TBD	TBD	

Footnote: The total budget will include the new ongoing BCP allocation of \$5.5M received in FY 2015-2016.

Description

The telecommunications program provides a secure, robust and scalable network infrastructure aligned with emerging needs of enterprise court services. The program was originally responsible for providing the trial courts with the infrastructure required to physically separate from their county partners. The program maintains this infrastructure on an ongoing basis, and continually refreshes equipment and technology to ensure the courts have the infrastructure required to offer the public reliable and continuous court access. Since its inception in 2001, the program has grown to benefit all 58 courts.

This program allows the branch to leverage more competitive hardware and service discounts through the economies of scale, and courts have the added benefit of having access to a pool of expert network engineering resources. The telecommunications program support model allows the branch to pool resources and funding, and provides a standard network infrastructure and security architecture across the branch.

The telecommunications program develops and supports a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local and enterprise system applications, which eases the deployment overhead on local courts, provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources. In support of the objective to continually refresh equipment and maintain the judicial branch's original investment in technology, the program forecasts replacement needs by working with service integrators and hardware vendors to create an annual technology roadmap identifying the technology requiring replacement while reviewing both existing and new technologies available

to the branch. In addition, program staff works with individual trial court IT personnel to review local requirements.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

The original projected cost to replace network devices that are currently due for refresh (a list which includes over 1,600 firewalls, VPN concentrators, IDS devices, and closet switches) prior to the manufacturer's designated end of support date resulted in an estimated budget need of \$23M in FY 2016-2017. This represents a large spike in comparison to the FY 2015-2016 budget of \$16.15M. In light of this, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and the Judicial Council requested that the program look at options that would smooth the funding over the next several years to eliminate the projected \$23M spike in FY 2016-2017.

In support of this request, program staff have been working with the Court Information Technology Management Forum (CITMF) to develop options for the program which will smooth the projected spike for FY 2016-2017 across multiple fiscal years in a manner that is acceptable to court IT operational and security needs. Three options are currently being reviewed, analyzed, and costed.

The three proposed options achieve the objective of smoothing the budget to varying degrees. These options include financing equipment normally purchased, delaying the purchase and implementation of some hardware past the end of support date, and migrating to a fully managed security platform for firewall, intrusion prevention services (IPS), and virtual private networking (VPN) services. It is important to note, however, that despite addressing the short term funding issue, each option involves compromises, either through increased risks to court operations, increased total cost of ownership, or both.

Option 1: Defer replacement of 536 network switches up to 2 years past end of support

- Replacing equipment on this schedule will smooth the budget, but will leave unsupported equipment in the field for up to 36 months. This is the least desirable option in terms of technical and performance tradeoffs.

Option 2: Defer replacement of 422 network switches 1 year past end of support

- Replacing equipment on this schedule will smooth the budget to a slightly lesser degree, but leave unsupported equipment in the field for up to 24 months. While more acceptable from a technical and performance perspective than Option 1, this is still a less than desirable option in terms of court IT operations and security.

Option 3: Financing

- Financing equipment and services over 5 years will enable the program to refresh all hardware before its end of support date. The Judicial Council is in the process of acquiring information on the costs, terms, and conditions of the approach. This approach is the most desirable in terms of technical and performance tradeoffs, and is the preferred option by the CITMF.

Currently, the FY 2016-2017 proposed budget is TBD since it is dependent on Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee direction and the final selection of one of the above options.

Program Components

The Network Maintenance component provides trial courts with critical vendor support coverage for all network and security infrastructure. Contracts for maintaining equipment have been negotiated to leverage the volume of the entire branch, resulting in savings that allows the program to cover these charges centrally. This relieves individual courts from this burden and allows them to redirect local funding to other operational needs. The program has negotiated a branch-wide maintenance agreement that has saved the branch 31% over five years. All 58 trial courts participating in the network technology refresh are covered by this program.

The Network Security Services component maintains network system security and data integrity of court information by offering three managed security services: managed firewall and intrusion prevention, vulnerability scanning, and web browser security. These network security tools mitigate the risk of court data being erroneously exposed without proper authority and ensure continuous court operations to the public. Currently, 55 trial courts subscribe to at least one of the security services, and 58 courts subscribe to the managed firewall and intrusion prevention system.

The Network Technology Training component affords court IT staff the opportunity to attend foundational and specialized network training courses via state-of-the-art training centers and comprehensive on-line courses. This ensures that the courts have the necessary skill sets to operate, maintain, and expand their infrastructure in response to local and enterprise needs.

The Ad Hoc Network Consulting component provides independent consultants that are engaged to provide expert network engineering and program management as part of the network technology refresh project. These consultants are commonly utilized by the individual trial courts to offer local engineering services for court projects and issues outside of technology refresh projects.

The Network Equipment Trade-in component provides an avenue for the courts to dispose of outdated network technology. This option includes the ability for the branch to obtain trade-in credits for old equipment which in turn maximizes our purchasing power for future court technology refresh projects. The core objective of the trade-in program is to maintain the investment made in the original telecommunications project by updating equipment that is no longer supported due to aging technology. The project forecasts the refresh cycle by working with our service integrators and hardware vendors to create an annual technology roadmap identifying the technology requiring replacement while reviewing both existing and new technologies available to the branch.

California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)

Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$1,047,954

FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$861,200

Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$665,727

FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Salaries/Benefits/Rent	\$298,205	44.79%	Rent: \$38,714; 2.0 FTEs
Tuition and Registration Fees	\$1,200	0.18%	
Travel and Training	\$1,200	0.18%	
Communications	\$10,214	1.53%	
Data Center Services	\$307,333	46.17%	SAIC contracted data center charges
IS Software / Maintenance	\$47,575	7.15%	DOJ Gateway maintenance and support
Total	\$665,727	100.00%	

Description

The CCPOR team provides primary production support for this centralized application, and develops court-requested enhancements and defect fixes, as well as system updates required by legislative changes and corresponding modifications to the Department of Justice California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS). The CCPOR program does not directly distribute funds to the courts, only services. As of December 2015, 43 courts and their law enforcement partners depend on CCPOR for restraining and protective order processing.

A data exchange that will enable integration with court case management systems (CMS) has been developed and a full documentation package is available and has been distributed to several CMS vendors. Existing and future court deployments will use this exchange to integrate with CCPOR.

For FY 2016-2017, the California DOJ does not anticipate any grant funds to be available for continued CCPOR deployments.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

The decrease from the FY 2015-2016 allocation which include cost savings realized as a result of renegotiating the CCTC contract, renegotiated the DOJ Gateway contract, as well as a reduction of the FY 2015-2016 one-time allocation of \$120,000 that was required for an application software stack upgrade.

Purpose

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. CCPOR was developed by the trial courts and the Judicial Council, based on a recommendation submitted by the Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force to provide a statewide protective order registry.

CCPOR provides major improvements to victim safety and peace officer safety in domestic violence cases and cases involving violent crimes. CCPOR counties depend on the CCPOR system for operational cost savings and improvements to victim and officer safety. Without CCPOR these counties would need to print and file the currently 80,000-plus restraining and protective order files currently managed in CCPOR, reverting to a manual business processes.

The courts have committed significant staff resources for training and use of the CCPOR system, in some cases deferring other vital projects. They have convinced their law enforcement partners to do the same because of the difference CCPOR makes in their counties. Law enforcement also benefits by using CCPOR by having the ability to retrieve the electronic copy of an order in seconds to ensure the mandated hit confirmation occurs, thus streamlining the manual process of retrieving the hardcopy orders.

Issuance of restraining and protective orders is authorized in statutes Pen. Code, § 136.2 and 136.3; Pen. Code, § 646.91 and 646.91a; Gov. Code, § 77209(b)(f) (g) and (j); and Fam. Code 6380, 6404. CCPOR facilitates the entry of these orders into CARPOS, which is a specific court responsibility. In addition, by promoting victim safety and perpetrator accountability, CCPOR supports the Judicial Council's strategic plan Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public, and the related operational plan objective (IV.1.e) for "[i]mproved practices and procedures to ensure fair, expeditious, and accessible administration of justice for litigants in domestic violence cases."

CCPOR provides judges with critical information necessary to prevent issuance of multiple protective orders with conflicting terms and conditions. It also provides law enforcement with complete images of these orders, including handwritten notes and enforcement warnings that are not captured by any other system. By creating a system that is shared by courts and their law enforcement partners, CCPOR bridges communication gaps and improves inter-agency cooperation. These benefits work together to safeguard victims of crime, and peace officers in the field.

California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) – Operations

Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$10,583,037

FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$8,534,970

Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$9,668,289

FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Salaries/Benefits/Rent	\$2,047,056	21.17%	Rent: \$154,856; 11.0 FTEs
Travel and Training	\$3,000	0.03%	
Consultants – Information Systems	\$1,295,680	13.40%	6 consultants (1 infrastructure architect, 2 technical analysts, 2 network engineers, 1 IT project manager)
Data Center Services	\$6,262,553	64.77%	SAIC contracted data center charges
Maintenance - Software	\$60,000	0.62%	
Total	\$9,668,289	100.00%	

Description

The CCTC budget maintains the baseline services for the program, which consists primarily of paying monthly invoices for services as obligated by the existing CCTC vendor contract and consulting services to support CCTC operations.

The CCTC provides consistent, cost effective, and secure hosting services, including ongoing maintenance and operational support; data network management; desktop computing and local server support; tape back-up and recovery; help desk services; email services; and a dedicated service delivery manager. Today, the CCTC hosts service for all 58 California Superior Courts.

CCTC also provides a comprehensive disaster recovery program for court management systems, including Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Systems (SAP), California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR), CMS V3, and Interim Case Management Systems (ICMS). 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.

Funding will be expended on maintaining core services and court requested services. These services allow the courts to rely on the skills and expertise of the maintenance and support staff to remediate defects, implement legislative updates, configure and install software and hardware upgrades, and address other minor and critical issues. Core services include:

- Data center application hosting services
- Local court server monitoring and remote site backup

- Data center and local network management
- Help desk services
- Desktop and local server management and support services
- Hosted email services for 6 trial courts
- Network and Security
- Disaster Recovery

None of the funding is distributed directly to the courts.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

The original FY 2015-16 projected budget for CCTC was \$11.7M. Per TCBAC and Judicial Council direction, the CCTC program's requested budget was reduced in FY 2015-2016 twice. The first reduction was to remain consistent with the FY 2014-2015 CCTC budget of \$10.5M and the second reduction was to cut the reduced \$10.5M budget by an additional \$1.9M. This \$1.9M one-time reduction was based on one-time savings in FY 2014-2015 that could be encumbered by year-end and used to offset the FY 2015-2016 funding needs for the program. These variances account for the appearance of a significant increase in the program for FY 2016-2017, but is the result of the actual FY 2016-2017 full year needs for the program, which include cost savings realized as a result of renegotiating the CCTC contract (signed in June 2015).

Purpose

In alignment with Judicial Council directives to affirm development and implementation of statewide technology initiatives, the CCTC program provides a Judicial Branch Technology Center for use by all courts. Benefits to the courts through the CCTC include enterprise-wide hardware and software license agreements, including bulk volume purchasing discounts. Centralized changes (e.g., hardware and software patches) are more efficient to track and install using centralized change management. The CCTC help desk support provides the courts a centralized point of contact and minimizes the impact of major incidents.

In the event of a significant interruption of court services, the disaster recovery program ensures that infrastructure, network, services and trial court applications hosted in the CCTC can be safely and securely backed-up, redirected, and restored. Disaster recovery exercises routinely test the strength of the CCTC recovery strategy and ensure that vital court services, as well as data and communications, can be restored at a designated location.

This program supports Judicial Council objectives to allow the courts to take advantage of operational efficiencies and cost effective services, eliminating redundant expenditures, and providing a coordinated approach to addressing statewide technology initiatives.

The program provides public benefit by utilizing technology to achieve efficiencies in the superior courts. It provides ongoing cost-effective maintenance and support for programs which allows the consistent and accessible administration of justice throughout the state.

Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health Case Management System (CMS V3)

Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$5,658,100

FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$5,658,100 (held to FY 2014-2015 allocation)

Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$5,145,506

FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Salaries/Benefits/Rent	\$1,172,351	22.78%	Rent: \$135,499; 9.0 FTE's
Travel and Training	\$16,295	0.32%	
Communications	\$5,200	0.10%	
Consultants – Information Systems	\$2,749,200	53.43%	12 consultants (4 developers, 2 application architects, 3 analysts, 1 database analyst, 2 quality assurance testers)
Data Center Services	\$910,123	17.69%	SAIC contracted data center charges.
Maintenance - Software	\$292,337	5.68%	Adobe and SAP
Total	\$5,145,506	100.00%	

Description

Funds in FY 2016–2017 will be used to provide ongoing support for operations and maintenance of CMS V3. This program is currently deployed in four superior courts: Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties. It is used to automate the processing and management of approximately 25% of the civil, small claims, probate, and mental health cases statewide, and includes e-filing capability.

Funding will be used for:

- Product releases including: judicial branch requirements, legislative changes, and court requests;
- Hardware and software maintenance;
- Infrastructure support and hosting services for all environments: Development, Test, Training, Stage and Production ;
- Software product support including: on-going technical support to the CCTC and locally hosted courts; and
- Day to day application support and service requests for court operations.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

The projected amount of cost savings for CMS V3 are a result of renegotiating the CCTC contract.

Purpose

The Civil, Small Claims, and Probate and Mental Health Interim Case Management System (CMS V3) functionality enables the courts to process and administer their civil caseloads, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, work queue, payment and financial processing. Updates to the CMS V3 program are deployed at the California Courts Technology Center and made available to the locally hosted courts (Orange and San Diego County Courts). This model enables a common deployed version of the software, avoiding the cost of three separate development efforts. E-filing has been successfully deployed at the Orange and San Diego County Courts, saving time and resources. Sacramento Superior Court has also deployed E-filing for their Employment Development Department cases (about 46,000 annually). Sacramento and Ventura integrate CMS V3 with public kiosks. E-filing and public kiosks are recognized as providing the public and justice partners with an increased ease of use and efficiencies.

At its April 2015 meeting, the Judicial Council approved the Judicial Council Technology Committee's (JCTC) recommendation to cease branch funding for the CMS V3 program after a period of four years starting on July 1, 2015, and ending June 30, 2019. Program costs are projected beyond that end date in the event courts are unable to transition off.

Data Integration*Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$3,850,213**FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$3,849,600**Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$3,500,706***FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category**

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Salaries/Benefits/Rent	\$615,814	17.59%	Rent: \$38,714; 3.0 FTEs
Communications	\$17,425	0.50%	
Tuition and Registration Fees	\$3,500	0.10%	
Consultants – Information Systems	\$918,592	26.24%	4.5 consultants: 1 IT project manager, 2 Sr. TIBCO Engineers, .5 Technical Analyst; and Journal Technologies contract
Data Center Services	\$1,069,157	30.54%	SAIC technology center hosting
Maintenance - Software	\$823,023	23.51%	TIBCO branch-wide license agreement
IS Supplies/Minor Software/Licenses	\$3,000	0.09%	
H/W and Maintenance	\$50,195	1.43%	
Total	\$3,500,706	100.00%	

Description

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. Centralized exchanges reduce the number of connections partners have to maintain and enable faster delivery to the courts once secure connections are established with the partners. Funding for the DI program enables the technical infrastructure and support necessary to facilitate this integration. Funding is not distributed directly to the courts.

The technical infrastructure includes sophisticated hardware and software hosted at the CCTC to facilitate communication between the courts and their justice partners such as the California Department of Justice, California Department of Motor Vehicles, various law enforcement agencies, and financial institutions. Many of the applications hosted at the CCTC rely on the Integrated Services Backbone (ISB) infrastructure, including California Courts Protective Order

Registry to function with external justice and integration partners. ISB infrastructure is also used to gather Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) data from the Superior Courts.

The technical support provided by the Data Integration program is necessary to ensure the hosted technical infrastructure is adequately maintained and enhanced. Technical support is provided in the following ways:

- Hardware maintenance is funded for the refresh of aging and out-of-support hardware.
- Software maintenance is funded for TIBCO products (the foundation of the ISB) and the DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products, which facilitate ad hoc DMV access. For all of these products, the maintenance allows for product support necessary to obtain version upgrades, patches and vendor support for production issues.
- TIBCO development services maintain and support the ISB infrastructure and the production interfaces, as well as, the common services that are used to simplify interface development and support.
- Services to provide steady-state support for the DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

There is a reduction in the FY 2016-2017 allocation cost savings realized as a result of renegotiating the CCTC contract.

Purpose

The ISB infrastructure provides a central communications hub that reduces the complexity and cost of maintaining numerous point to point interfaces between centrally hosted systems, court systems, and their justice and integration partners.

The number of courts benefitting from data integration steady state support of the following products and production ISB interfaces are identified below:

- DOJ California Restraining and Protective Order System interface in support of 43 courts using CCPOR.
- Warrants/FTA (Failure to Appear), Justice Partner web portal, and credit card payment interfaces for three courts.
- Phoenix HR and Financial interfaces for two courts and seven integration partners.
- Support for different partners and systems are funded by DI, not by individual programs, in a leveraged model, where personnel and system resources are shared among various programs; costs are not easily attributable to specific programs.
- Web portal for submitting JBSIS information, supporting 37 courts.
- Document Management System (DMS), index, file service and Employment Development Department interfaces for two CMS V3 courts.
- DMVQUERY and DMVGATEWAY products, which facilitate ad hoc DMV access, support 11 superior courts that use the Sustain case management system.

Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)*Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$5,220,500**FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$2,832,140**Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$7,848,836***FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category**

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Communications	\$2,000	0.03%	
Consultants – Information Systems	\$297,600	3.79%	1 enterprise architect
Maintenance - Software	\$7,501,495	95.57%	Oracle branch-wide enterprise license maintenance (Advance Security, Enterprise Database, BEA WebLogic, ID Manager) and Adobe LiveCycle
IS Supplies/Minor Software/Licenses	\$47,741	0.61%	Innotas PPM licenses
Total	\$7,848,836	100.00%	

Description

This budget primarily funds the Oracle Branch-wide License Agreement (BWLA), 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.

The Oracle BWLA provides the entire branch with the identified Oracle products and use of these licenses. The EA program identifies interdependencies between branch-wide data and systems to improve investments in technology, and the Innotas project portfolio management tool supports the organization's project management discipline by providing a centralized, web-based project information repository. This program does not directly distribute funds to the trial courts.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

Per TCBAC and JC direction, the EPP program was reduced in FY 2015-2016 by \$2.38M on a one-time basis to move Oracle maintenance encumbrances from the program to FY 2016-2017. This accounts for the appearance of a significant increase to the program for FY 2016-2017, but is actually the result of the movement of the FY 2015-2016 encumbered expense (\$2.38M) to FY 2016-2017 for payment due plus the inclusion of the full annual Oracle maintenance cost of \$5M. In addition, the EPP budget now includes \$141K for Adobe LiveCycle maintenance.

Purpose

The Oracle BWLA provides the entire branch with use of the covered Oracle software licenses, which frees local courts from having to burden resources with complex software asset management and costly annual maintenance renewals for the four components. Instead, local

courts may access and install these Oracle products at no charge in any environment, whenever needed, without the expense of license administration. Enterprise architects provide support to guide the development and implementation of statewide applications and ensure compatibility with CCTC infrastructure, communications and security protocols. The Innotas project portfolio tool provides a comprehensive view of all IT projects in process, giving IT management the needed visibility to ensure that the highest priority projects get IT resources first.

The efforts of the EA program align with Judicial Council Goal 3, Modernization of Management and Administration and Goal 6, Branch-wide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. In addition, the program promotes standardized, repeatable processes throughout the system development lifecycle that were requested by the Bureau of State Audits and the California Technology Agency in their review of the CCMS program, and recommended to be applied to all future technology projects.

The products included in the Oracle BWLA are key components to the courts' current and future application infrastructure throughout the branch, for both production and non-production environments. These Oracle products are an intrinsic part of CMS V3, Phoenix and the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR). The licenses are also widely used by applications that are hosted at local superior court facilities. Courts may also request consultation from enterprise architects to assist with their local initiatives.

With responsibility for optimizing the scope and accessibility of accurate statewide judicial information, and the technical delivery of key branch-wide systems, IT supports and coordinates the application of technology throughout the judicial branch and manages centralized statewide technology projects. The Oracle BWLA and EA programs support a sound technological infrastructure and effective case management, facilities, finance, human resource, and other court systems to meet the needs of the public.

Testing Tools - Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)

Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$619,699

FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$0.00 (one-time reduction)

Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$159,094

FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Data Center Services	\$43,705	27.47%	SAIC contracted data center charges
Maintenance - Software	\$115,389	72.53%	ClearQuest, Rational, HP
Total	\$159,094	100.00%	

Description

The Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS) is a program that provides a suite of software quality assurance tools. Funding in FY 2015–2016 will continue to be used to operate the ETMS software and provide software maintenance.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

In FY 2015-2016 the program funding was eliminated on a one-time basis per the Judicial Council. The proposed FY 2016-2017 allocation (\$159,094) is significantly less than the previous funding for this program (\$619,699). The single contractor used for administration and troubleshooting of ETMS has been eliminated. Software to store system requirements and automated functional testing has been eliminated, leaving only maintenance on performance testing software, defect/enhancement tracking software, software version control, and test planning/execution software in ETMS. Additional savings were realized with the renegotiated CCTC contract which further reduced ETMS operational costs.

For FY 2015-2016, since funding was eliminated for this program on a one-time basis, the ETMS program was reviewed for ways to reduce costs and keep essential services operating. The ETMS administrator contractor position was eliminated and this function was distributed out to three people.

The types of tools used in ETMS are essential for professional software development. Courts do not directly use the ETMS tools, but they make possible development and enhancement of important software for the courts such as the California Courts Protective Order Registry, the V3 Case Management System and the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System.

Purpose

The ETMS program helps the courts receive more reliable Judicial Council Information Technology developed software. Its value is in identifying priorities for fixing defects, documenting steps taken to remedy the defect, documenting the resolution of defects, and is

specifically beneficial to custom-developed software. It is also used for off-the-shelf software to estimate performance when new hardware and software is deployed.

ETMS also provides a centralized repository for detailed descriptions of defects, service requests and requested enhancements. This facilitates request prioritization, provides a repository for documenting actions, and allows the team to record the steps to test changes to the applications and manage defect resolution. From this repository, release notes are generated for every major release of software and reviewed with court staff before installation and court testing. Reports from the repository are used to track the numbers of defects, service requests and enhancements over time, look for trends, and help proactively identify areas which need further improvement.

The ETMS tools are part of the larger quality assurance program, which develops and uses continuously improving processes to improve the quality and reliability of software. Software benefitting the trial courts that utilize the ETMS tools includes: the California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR), Civil, Probate and Mental Case Management System (V3), , California Disposition Reporting Exchange, and the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS).

Interim Case Management System (ICMS)

Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$1,789,509

FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$1,246,800 (held to FY 2014-2015 allocation)

Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$1,039,684

FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Travel and Training	\$4,000	0.38%	
Consultants – Information Systems	\$597,630	57.48%	3 consultants; 1 IT Project Manager, 1 Business Analyst, 1 Technical Analyst
Data Center Services	\$437,254	42.06%	SAIC contracted data center charges.
Maintenance - Software	\$800	0.08%	
Total	\$1,039,684	100.00%	

Description

The ICMS program provides project management and technical expertise to support the 8 trial courts which have their Sustain Justice Edition (SJE) case management system hosted at the CCTC. As a result of reduced ICMS program funding, the ICMS support has been primarily focused on maintenance and operations activities which are required such as implementation of legislative updates, production support, patch management, CCTC infrastructure support and CCTC hosting services. There is also ICMS support for minimal enhancements requested by the courts.

Additionally, the ICMS program provides support to the SJE Court Consortium as the SJE courts evaluate alternatives to replacing the SJE application. Funding for FY 2016-2017 will support:

- Production support;
- Patch Management;
- Legislative updates (e.g., Uniform Bail Schedule);
- CCTC infrastructure support and hosting services; and
- SJE Court Consortium’s effort to identify a replacement to the SJE case management system.

There are no funds distributed directly to the courts from the ICMS program. Additionally, the SJE courts are responsible for paying their own court’s SJE licensing costs directly to Journal Technologies, Inc. (previously known as Sustain Technologies, Inc.).

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

The proposed allocation request in FY 2015-2016 was \$1.8 million. However, the Judicial Council approved the TCBCAC recommendation to hold the ICMS program at the FY 2014-2015 level of \$1.2 million. The reduced FY 2015-2016 budget required service level reductions to the SJE courts such as

eliminating the disaster recovery environment for those courts hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), reducing the amount of funding for Journal Technologies (Sustain) support and eliminating the service delivery manager consultant. The reduced funding required in FY 2016-2017 for the ICMS program is a combination of the service level reductions initiated in FY 2015-2016 as well as cost savings realized as a result of renegotiating the CCTC contract.

Purpose

The SJE courts hosted at the CCTC include the Superior Courts of Humboldt, Imperial, Lake, Madera, Modoc, Plumas/Sierra, San Benito and Trinity counties. As the Sierra court processes only their traffic citations using the Plumas Court's SJE instance, it is not included as a separate court when counting the 8 courts hosted at the CCTC.

The 8 CCTC hosted Sustain courts are deployed on a common architecture and benefit from a shared hosting environment which provides services such as system redundancy, layered security architecture, help desk and centralized production support resources. Among other benefits, this common architecture enables a single solution for interfaces to justice partners such as the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV).

The SJE courts continue to realize efficiencies by having a JCC consultant who has a more favorable billing rate than the SJE vendor perform tasks such as writing business requirements, making SJE configuration changes and testing which are needed to incorporate maintenance and operations activities such as legislative updates into the SJE application. Another benefit available to SJE courts is the volume discount on licensing provided by the vendor for courts hosted at the CCTC. The greater the number of CCTC users, the lower the licensing cost per user.

Jury Management System Grants*Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$465,000**FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$465,000**Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$465,000***FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category**

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Maintenance - Software	\$465,000	100.00%	Grants to the courts for their jury management systems
Total	\$465,000	100.00%	

Description

In fiscal years when funding is allocated to the Jury Management System Grant program, all trial courts are eligible to apply for the grant funding to use on projects which improve their jury management systems. The number of courts receiving grants varies according to the number and size of grant requests received from the trial courts as well as grant funding available. In FY 2015-2016, \$465,000 was allocated for the jury management system grant program. The Judicial Council Technology Committee Chair sent a memo to all 58 trial court PJ's and CEO's on October 16, 2015 soliciting jury management system grant applications be sent to JCC staff for consideration by December 18, 2016.

In FY 2013-2014, \$600,000 was allocated to the Jury Management System Grant program and 22 trial courts submitted jury grant applications which included 39 different projects totaling \$802,899. Given there was only \$600,000 in funding available, not all of the jury projects submitted could be funded. However, of the 22 trial courts submitting jury grant applications, all 22 received some level of grant funding to assist with 33 of the 39 submitted projects. Funded projects ranged from keeping existing functionality intact by replacing aging hardware or upgrading jury management systems to implementing newer technology such as a juror self check-in module and short message service (SMS) module that sends jury reminders via text/phone messages.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

There is no change in the level of funding for the Jury Management System Grant program from FY 2015-2016 to the proposed amount for FY 2016-2017. If additional grant funds are available, the program will increase the amount of grants available to the trial courts.

Purpose

Funding for the jury grant program started in FY 2000–2001 for trial courts to improve their jury management systems. The impetus for providing technology funding was implementation of one-day or one-trial juror service in all superior courts, which required courts to summon and process many more jurors than the earlier practice of two-week availability for service common throughout the state. When the program began, courts were working with outdated DOS versions of jury management systems that were vendor- or in-house developed. These systems had reached the end of their useful life and required upgrading as they could not adequately support

the new requirements of one-day or one-trial.

All 58 trial courts have an opportunity to participate and take advantage of this program and, to date, 55 of 58 courts have received some level of funding. As a result of this program, system improvements have provided benefits to potential jurors, jurors, and the courts. Courts have been able to meet Judicial Council goals of modernization and service to the public by receiving funding to implement their jury system improvement projects.

The public has benefited by being able to use technology to streamline communication with the court as a potential juror. Potential jurors are able to use either a computer or telephone to change their address, postpone, or decline service as permitted. Courts that have implemented IVR, for example, report that when they formerly summoned a large pool, the jury office voice mailbox would quickly fill up. Jurors no longer encounter that obstacle to communicating with the court. Jurors no longer have to listen to long telephone messages the night before reporting, but are able to go directly to their own record by keying in their bar code on their telephone or personal computer.

The courts have benefited by being able to free up staff from dealing with routine, repetitive tasks that occur when a new pool is summoned. Data entry has been greatly reduced, with accuracy improved by direct entry of personal data by the juror. Courts report that IVR systems pick up between 50 and 75 percent of routine callers, far exceeding typical IVR projects in other businesses that normally pick up 30 to 40 percent of callers. Staff is now available to deal with more complex matters in the jury office, or can be reassigned to other court operations.

The Branch has benefited by receiving more accurate statistical information about jury service. Courts have reported high levels of satisfaction with their completed projects. This program provides courts the ability to introduce new, more efficient solutions for managing their jury programs.

Uniform Civil Filing System (UCFS)*Proposed FY 2015–2016 Allocation – \$366,000**FY 2015-2016 Allocation - \$366,000**Proposed FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation - \$364,831***FY 2016-2017 Proposed Allocation by Category**

Budget Category	Amount	% of Total Budget	Comments
Salaries/Benefits/Rent	\$358,831	98.36%	Rent: \$38,714; 2.0 FTEs
Travel and Training	\$6,000	1.64%	
Total	\$364,831	100.00%	

Description

The FY 2016–2017 allocation will be used to fund two full-time staff that provide ongoing maintenance and support for the UCFS program. FY 2016–2017 funding for UCFS will support the following activities:

- Support for legislated and mandated changes to distribution rules to ensure accurate and timely civil fee distributions from the 58 trial courts to appropriate entities within the mandated timeframes.
- Full application support that provides a high level of system availability and reliability in order to help trial courts avoid penalties to state, county, court, and third parties for late reporting and distribution of funds.
- Technology upgrades to ensure application remains technically viable, secure, and supported.
- Support for system improvements to address changes to the business process.

Explanation of Increase/Decrease from FY 2015-2016 Allocation

The minor decrease in the FY 2016-2017 budget is primarily due to reduced staffing costs.

Purpose

UCFS supports the distribution and mandated reporting of uniform civil fees collected by all 58 trial courts, with an average of \$51 million distributed per month. In July 2005, the Legislature, through section 68085.1(b), required that the 58 trial courts submit a schedule of AB 145 remitted civil fees by code section at the end of each month to the Judicial Council of California (JCC). Under section 68085.1, the JCC is responsible for the reporting and remittance of Uniform Civil Fees (UCF) cash collections. Accordingly, the Uniform Civil Fees System (UCFS) was developed to support the centralized reporting and distribution of UCF cash collections. A failure to distribute fees to the appropriate entities within 45 days after the end of the month would result in the state assessing penalties up to \$24,000 per day that the distribution is late. The UCF System is used to calculate the correct distribution of 200 categories of fees collected by the 58 trial courts. The fees are distributed to up to 31 different funds or entities, such as the Trial Court Trust Fund's children's waiting room program, or a county law library. The distributions vary depending on the court, the fee, and the fund or entity receiving the funds.

The system generates reports for the State Controller's Office and various entities that receive the distributed funds. Calculations are used by the JCC Fiscal Services Office to distribute funds to various entities as required by law.

UCFS benefits the public by minimizing the amount of penalties paid to the state for incorrect or late distributions and ensuring that the entities entitled to a portion of the civil fees collected, as mandated by law, receive their correct distributions.