



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR MAY 23, 2017

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the April 13, 2017 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Prioritization of Trial Court Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Concepts for 2018-2019 (Action Item)	6



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))
THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS
THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: May 23, 2017
Time: 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831, Pass code: 1884843 (listen only)

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 Minutes

Approve minutes of the April 13, 2017, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

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

Written Comment

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. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Ms. Brandy Sanborn. Only written comments received by May 22, 2017 by 3:00 p.m. will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

Prioritization of Trial Court Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Concepts for 2018-2019 (Action Required)

Review and prioritize trial court BCP concepts as well as BCP concept submissions in which the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee was identified as having purview and the opportunity to provide input for submission to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee for its review.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

April 13, 2017

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

JCC Veranda Rooms, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento Ca, 95833

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Hon. James E. Herman (phone), Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson, Hon. Ira R. Kaufman, Hon. Paul M. Marigonda, Hon. Brian L. McCabe, and Hon. Glenda Sanders (phone).

Executive Officers: Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Mr. Jake Chatters, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Jeffrey E. Lewis (phone), Mr. Michael D. Planet, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Ms. Linda Romero-Soles, Mr. Brian Taylor, Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Judicial Council staff advisory members: Ms. Jody Patel, Ms. Millicent Tidwell, and Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judges: Hon. Andrew S. Blum

Others Present: Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Mr. Patrick Ballard, Ms. Natalie Daniel, Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Ms. Angela Guzman, Mr. Don Will, Ms. Kris Errecart, Mr. Chad Finke, Ms. Stephanie Gomez, Mr. Bob Fleshman, Mr. David Koon (Phone), and Ms. Virginia Sanders-Hinds (phone).

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. Roll was called.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 9, 2017 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

INFORMATIONAL ONLY ITEMS (ITEMS 1)

Info 1 – Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Structural Shortfall

Review of the TCTF Fund Condition Statement and structural shortfall.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic gave a presentation of the TCTF structural shortfall to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee members.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 5)

Item 1 – Recommendation of the Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee (Action Item)

Consideration of recommendations of the R&E Subcommittee regarding 2017–2018 allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF).

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Co-Chair, Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee; Sherri R. Carter, Co-Chair, Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services.

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously approved the following option:

Option 1: TCBAC could approve 2017-2018 allocations of \$73.457 million as requested. This results in a net allocation adjustment of -\$3.889 million dollars impacting four offices, whose current council approve 2016-2017 allocations total \$77.346 million from the IMF.

Item 2 – Superior Court of California, County of Monterey Children’s Waiting Room (CWR) Fund (Action Item)

Consideration of continued receipt of CWR funds to Superior Court of California, County of Monterey.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Fiscal Planning Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services.

Action: The members of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee voted to approve the following option in a vote as follows:

Approve the continuation of the distribution of CWR funds to the Monterey Superior Court to allow them to accumulate sufficient funding for start-up costs as well as the ongoing costs to begin operating their CWR.

Yes: 24

No: 1

Abstain: 0

Item 3 – Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin CWR Fund (Action Item)

Consideration of distribution of funds for CWR to Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Fiscal Planning Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services.

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously approved the following option:

Approve a distribution of CWR funds to the San Joaquin Superior Court to facilitate the opening of the court's CWR to provide these services for the first time in San Joaquin County.

Item 4 – Recommendation of the Small Court Dependency Workload Working Group Methodology (Discussion Item)

Action: No action taken.

Item 5 – Open Discussion (Discussion Item)

Action: No action taken.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

(Action Item)

Title: Budget: Prioritization of Trial Court Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Concepts for 2018-2019

Date: 5/15/2017

Contact: Brandy Sanborn, Manager, Budget Services
415-865-7195 brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Issue 1

Review and prioritize the trial court BCP concepts identified by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC). The prioritized BCP concepts will be submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC) for final review, approval, and prioritization for submission to the Judicial Council:

Table 1

#	BCP Concept (in alphabetical order)	2018-2019 Dollar Amount
1	Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings	\$22,000,000
2	Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings	\$44,100,000
3	Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings	\$66,100,000
4	Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings	\$88,200,000
5	Funding for 10 of the 50 Judgeships Authorized by AB 159	\$8,300,000 to \$15,400,000
6	Stabilization of Civil Assessment Revenue	\$147,000,000
7	Support for Trial Court Operations	\$450,000,000 to \$500,000,000

- 1. Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings.** TCBAC proposes an augmentation of \$22.0 million General fund beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. The total need, based on the current workload model to achieve the Judicial Council’s statewide caseload standard of 141 clients per attorney, is \$202.9 million; however, existing funding of \$114.7 million is provided in the annual Budget Act specifically for this purpose. This request represents

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

25 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317. Inadequate funding and subsequent high caseloads lead to high attorney turnover and lack of retention of qualified advocates for children. Effective counsel will ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays, improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge, and ultimately shortening the time children spend in foster care.

2. **Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings.** TCBAC proposes an augmentation of \$44.1 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. This request represents 50 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317.
3. **Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings.** TCBAC proposes an augmentation of \$66.1 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. This request represents 75 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317.
4. **Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings.** TCBAC proposes an augmentation of \$88.2 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. This request represents 100 percent of the remaining outstanding need of \$88.2 million to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 317.
5. **Funding for 10 of the 50 Judgeships Authorized by AB 159.** TCBAC proposes a General Fund augmentation, estimated between \$8.3 million and \$15.4 million, to support 10 of the 50 trial court judgeships authorized by Assembly Bill 159 (Ch. 722, Stats. 2007), accompanying support staff, and county-provided sheriff security. While the latest Judicial Needs Assessment (2016) shows that the branch needs just over 188 judgeships based on workload metrics, efforts to secure funding for the 50 previously-authorized judgeships have been unsuccessful. This request for a more modest number of judgeships is to address the most critical judicial shortage in the trial courts with the greatest need. The allocation of the 10 judgeships would be based on the methodology outlined in Government Code section 69614 (b), which states that judges shall be allocated, in accordance with the uniform standards for factually determining additional judicial need in each county, as updated and approved by the Judicial Council, pursuant to the Update of Judicial Needs Study, based on the following criteria: (1) Court filings

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

data averaged over a period of three years; (2) Workload standards that represent the average amount of time of bench and non-bench work required to resolve each case type; (3) A ranking methodology that provides consideration for courts that have the greatest need relative to their current complement of judicial officers. The allocation would also take into consideration, if enacted, any of the currently pending bills to reallocate vacant judgeships. At the time of the writing of this concept proposal three bills have been introduced relating to reallocation of vacant judgeships—AB 414 (Medina), SB 39 (Roth) and proposed Trailer Bill language included in the 2017-18 Governor’s Budget.

6. **Stabilization of Civil Assessment Revenue.** TCBAC proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$147 million beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to transition the deposit of civil assessment revenues, including the \$48.3 million in Maintenance of Effort (MOE buyout), into the General Fund instead of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). Instead, provide a General Fund amount of \$147 million into the TCTF to replace the civil assessment revenues that will be paid into the General Fund. Civil assessment revenues, as imposed pursuant to Penal Code (PC) 1214.1, are currently deposited into the TCTF, net of cost recovery pursuant to PC 1463.007. Per Judicial Council policy, the remitted civil assessment revenues are allocated to the trial courts one hundred percent, net the civil assessment buyout amount. The civil assessment buyout amount of \$48.3 million is maintained in the TCTF to replace the reduced MOE payments made by the counties, and supports the courts’ base allocations.

7. **Support for Trial Court Operations.** TCBAC proposes an ongoing General Fund augmentation of \$450 million to \$500 million beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support trial court operations, which will allow the courts to hire additional staff, retain existing staff, and improve the public’s access to justice. The request consists of the following (with requested funding amounts to be determined by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee if this IFR is recommended to move forward): 1) Funding needed by the trial courts based on the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) estimate to reduce the gap between the funding needed to support trial court operations and the funding available and continue to support progress towards 100 percent of funding; 2) Discretionary funding not allocated via WAFM to for inflationary increases to offset the rising cost of operations, 3) Funding for a cost of living increase for all trial court employees, consistent with the salary increases provided for executive branch staff in recent years, which would be utilized to provide any of the following (or any combination thereof): the reduction or elimination of budget reduction-related concessions such as furloughs, reduced work weeks, previously enacted or planned future layoffs, a cost of living increase, enhanced employee benefits, or to address other personnel matters as deemed appropriate by each trial court in negotiations with their related employee representatives; 4) Funding for recent legislation signed by the Governor in August 2017 and several Propositions that were passed by the voters which increased workload to the trial courts but did not include additional funding to support

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

workload, and 5) Funding to address the structural imbalance in the Trial Court Trust Fund.

Issue 2

Review and prioritize BCP concept submissions developed by other committees in which the TBCAC was identified as having purview and the opportunity to provide input for submission to the JBBC for its review:

Table 2

#	BCP Concept (in alphabetical order)	2018-2019 Dollar Amount
A	Advancing the Implementation of the <i>Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts</i>	\$8,100,000
B	Case Management System Replacement	TBD
C	Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) in Juvenile Dependency Court	\$500,000
D	Deploy a Single Sign-On Solution for the Judicial Branch	\$3,300,000
E	Deploy and Maintain California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) for the Superior Courts	\$974,000
F	Digitizing Paper and Filmed Case Files for the Superior Courts and Appellate Courts	\$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000
G	Funding for Programs Supporting Trial Courts Statewide	\$7,500,000
H	Judicial Branch Litigation Management Program	\$5,800,000
I	Phoenix System Required Updates	\$7,929,000
J	Self Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Solution	TBD
K	Statewide Security Systems and Equipment – Maintenance and Replacement	\$3,000,000
L	Trial Court Facilities Operations Costs	\$18,000,000 to \$25,000,000

Reference Attachment A for details on the above BCP concepts listed A-L.

Background

At its February 9, 2017 meeting, the TCBAC reviewed and discussed potential 2018-2019 BCPs after a survey was conducted of the membership to assist in identifying trial court priorities for submission to the JBBC and then to the Judicial Council for approval and prioritization for submission to the Department of Finance.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

The TCBAC meeting resulted in a total of four BCP concepts without order of prioritization or finalized figures, of which seven BCP concepts were drafted to assist in capturing the need for each request for final review and prioritization.

Effective December 16, 2016, a new BCP process was approved by the Judicial Council which provides an opportunity for applicable advisory bodies to provide input and prioritize BCP concepts developed by other committees as time permits. In preparation for the upcoming JBBC meeting on June 15, 2017 to review and prioritize all BCPs for submission to the Judicial Council, all BCPs under TCBAC purview have been included for TCBAC to provide input and prioritize as necessary.

Options for Discussion

Option 1

Review and prioritize *only* the BCP concepts recommended by the TCBAC (Table 1) for submission to the JBBC.

Option 2

Review and prioritize BCP concepts recommended by the TCBAC (Table 1) and *some or all* of the additional BCP concepts for submission to the JBBC (Table 2).

Option 3

Submit *all* of the BCP concepts to the JBBC *without* prioritization (Table 1 and Table 2).

Attachments

Attachment A – Summaries of additional BCP concepts

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

- A. Advancing the Implementation of the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*.** The Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force proposes a General Fund augmentation of \$8.1 million and 2.0 positions beginning in 2018-2019, and \$7.4 million in 2019-2020 and ongoing to advance the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts adopted in January 2015. The funding will implement the following provisions of the Language Access Plan (LAP): 1) expanding interpreter services into all civil proceedings; 2) establishing a grant program for signage in courthouses in multiple languages; 3) establishing a grant program for infrastructure support and non-video remote interpreting equipment in support of courts' language access expansion efforts; 4) maintenance of the branch's online Language Access Toolkit; and 5) staff to administer the grant programs and maintain the online Language Access Toolkit. These efforts support the implementation of the Judicial Council's Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts, adopted January 2015. The LAP consists of eight goals and 75 recommendations, including priorities in three phases. The Judicial Council and the courts are working to implement these recommendations in the courts over the 5-year period from 2015-2020. The LAP also aligns with the United States Department of Justice's recommendations for California to expand its language access efforts. Further, it also aligns with recent legislation in California (Assembly Bill 1657; Stats. 2014, ch. 721) that sets priorities for the provision of court interpreters in civil proceedings. No funds were secured with the adoption of the LAP.
- B. Case Management System Replacement.** The Judicial Council Technology Committee proposes a General Fund augmentation (amount TBD) to replace outdated and/or no longer supported case management systems with a vendor-supplied case management system. Many courts still have outdated or unsupported case management applications developed with older technology. These legacy systems do not have the ability to integrate with document management systems and e-filing services - foundations for modern case management systems. Obtaining funding to replace these outdated or unsupported systems with a modern case management system is the next step towards the first goal in the Court Technology Strategic Plan (Goal 1: Promote the Digital Court). The Judicial Council Technology Committee and Judicial Council staff have previously worked with courts on a path forward to replace the V3 and Sustain Justice Edition case management system. This initiative will address the remaining courts in need of a replacement for their outdated legacy systems.
- C. Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) in Juvenile Dependency Court.** The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee proposes a \$500,000 General Fund augmentation beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to support the court-appointed special

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

advocates grants program. CASA programs are nonprofit organizations which provide trained volunteers who are assigned by a juvenile court judge to a child in foster care. The program is well-utilized by the juvenile courts, with nearly all programs unable to meet all of the requests for volunteer assignments made by the courts. The number of volunteers that CASA's are able to provide can serve only about 12 percent of the total dependency population or 20 percent of the out-of-home foster care population. Since all CASA volunteers must be supervised by professional staff, growth of CASA programs to meet the full need of the courts is limited by the programs' ability to pay professional staff. The 2006 Budget Act provided an additional \$64,000 (3 percent) specifically to the CASA grants program. Since then, CASA programs have expanded from 39 to 50 courts, and have increased the number of children they serve by approximately 35 percent, from 8,000 to 11,000. With approximately 55,000 children in court-supervised out-of-home foster care, this represents an unmet need of 44,000 children or 80 percent. Increasing the Judicial Council grant program by \$500,000 will allow programs to increase their volunteer supervisor hours and serve up to 20 percent more children statewide.

D. Deploy a Single Sign-On Solution for the Judicial Branch. The Judicial Council Technology Committee proposes an augmentation of \$3.3 million General Fund in 2018-2019 and \$800,000 in 2019-20 and ongoing to acquire, design, and deploy an enterprise single sign-on system for the branch. The request includes \$2.5 million to modify case management systems from the three major case management software vendors in order to take advantage of the unique identifier assigned by the single sign-on solution. It also includes \$800,000 in ongoing costs for software licenses for judicial branch employees. This system will assign a unique identifier to members of the judicial branch, attorneys, members of the public and justice partners who access judicial branch computer systems and electronic services. It is envisioned that this system will be deployed using the software as a service model so there are no direct costs such as hardware, in-house support and operational costs.

E. Deploy and Maintain California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) for the Superior Courts. The Judicial Council Technology Committee proposes a \$974,000 augmentation beginning in 2018-2019, \$1 million in 2019-2020 and ongoing, and 1.0 position to deploy the CCPOR program to five courts and provide a stable source of funding for the on-going operations of the program. The program delivers support for deployment, onboarding, enhancements, defect fixes, legislative changes, and modifications required by the Department of Justice to provide a central repository of restraining and protective orders (RPO's). CCPOR data includes scanned images of actual RPO's signed by the judge which can be accessed by court staff and law enforcement officers across the state. Access to the RPO images signed by the judge

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

improves the accuracy of critical public safety information available to legal enforcement and court staff. Currently, CCPOR serves 43 courts and their respective law enforcement agencies plus 13 tribal courts with read-only access. We expect 10 additional trial courts will be implemented in FY 2017-18. Additional funding is needed in FY 2018-19 to provide funding to deploy the remaining five trial courts, add 1.0 position to support the increased workload, and provide a stable funding source for on-going operations of the program.

F. Digitizing Paper and Filmed Case Files for the Superior Courts and Appellate Courts. The Judicial Council Technology Committee proposes a General Fund augmentation, estimated to be between \$20 and \$25 million, beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to digitize paper and filmed case files for the Superior and Appellate Courts. Many courts are still operating with paper case files and often historical files are stored on deteriorating microfilm and microfiche. As the courts migrate from older legacy case management systems, they can take advantage of electronic documents and electronic document processing, but they need a mechanism to convert existing paper and filmed case files into electronic format. The request would allow for a vendor to prepare the physical documents for conversion, scanning into electronic digital format, and also for providing quality assurance that the documents were converted accurately. The proposed approach would enable “back scanning” of existing files and be used to increase the capacity of a court’s electronic storage infrastructure to hold all the converted documents and to purchase a limited number of scanning devices to convert any new incoming paper documents to electronic format. There are at least 15 courts which have a need for digitizing paper and film documents. The listing of courts must be finalized, then the courts must determine the number of files needed to digitize. It is expected that by December 2017, the courts and volumes will be identified.

G. Funding for Programs Supporting Trial Courts Statewide. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency proposes an augmentation of \$7.5 million General Fund beginning in 2018-19 and ongoing to shift costs supporting programs that provide services to trial courts statewide currently funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) to the General Fund. Impacted Judicial Council programs include staffing for Treasury Services Cash Management; Trial Court Procurement; Audit Services; California Courts Protective Order Registry; Data Integration; California Courts Technology Center; Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS staff; Uniform Civil Fees; and Regional Office Assistance Group units. This proposal will ensure that statewide operations costs of the Judicial Branch are funded from the General Fund rather than from the IMF, and would provide a stable funding source to serve the branch’s needs.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

- H. Judicial Branch Litigation Management Program.** The Litigation Management Committee office proposes an augmentation of \$5.8 million (General Fund) beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to support the defense and indemnification of all Judicial Branch entities for government claims and litigation. The request will also propose provisional language to allow the Judicial Council one additional year to encumber funds, beyond existing Budget Act authority, which will provide greater flexibility to schedule contract payments. Approximately \$5.4 million is traditionally budgeted annually from the General Fund and the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) (see detail below). Shifting IMF expenditures to the General Fund will assist with the long term solvency of the IMF as well as centralize the Litigation Management Program into a consolidated pool of available funds to be used for all entities of the Judicial Branch.
- I. Phoenix System Required Updates.** The Judicial Council Technology Committee proposes an augmentation of \$7.9 million General Fund in 2018-2019, \$7.6 million in 2019-2020, and \$6.3 million in 2020-2021 and ongoing to update and expand the Phoenix System to improve the administrative infrastructure supporting trial courts. This request will also provide funding to the Judicial Council to support 3.0 positions to be phased in over three years. The Phoenix System is the financial and procurement system for the 58 trial courts, and the payroll system for 12 trial courts. This request will update the Phoenix system to stay ahead of the end-of-life of the current on-premise version of SAP, and add functional requirements requested by the trial courts. The last major upgrade of the Phoenix system was completed in 2008-2009. The Program is nearing the end of support on its current platform, and there are not sufficient resources available to improve it to a more efficient and desired state. It is necessary to update the current technology and advisable to invest in new functionality that the trial courts require according to recent studies of their needs. These studies included review of past requirements and requests, a comprehensive stakeholder survey, and requirement workshops with key stakeholders across the state.
- J. Self Represented Litigants Statewide E-Services Solution.** The Information Technology Advisory Committee proposes a one-time General Fund augmentation (amount TBD) in 2018-2019 to envision, design, and deploy a statewide Self-Represented Litigants e-services portal. While several counties across the state offer some degree of virtual or online assistance, a statewide e-services portal would serve all Californians and deliver state-of-the-art interactive educational content, online diagnostic tools, real-time chat and call centers to help Californians successfully resolve legal issues without an attorney. As envisioned, the SRL e-services portal would establish a framework for integrating numerous new and existing e-services, including: account

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

creation and personalization; intelligent ‘triage’ to provide automated intake; instructional content, document assembly to correctly complete the right forms; and online chat, supported by call center assistance. The e-services portal would integrate with trial courts across the state and provide seamless hand-offs to enable site visitors to conduct document assembly and e-filing, where available. Funding would support acquisition of a new judicial branch web content management platform; development of interactive instructional tools and resources for various civil case types, as well as traffic and non-traffic misdemeanors; and deployment of a statewide online chat problem resolution platform. Funding would also support integration with existing document assembly programs, identity management solutions, and e-filing systems at local trial courts throughout the state.

K. Statewide Security Systems and Equipment - Maintenance and Replacement. The Court Security Advisory Committee proposes a \$3.0 million General Fund augmentation beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to refresh, maintain and replace security equipment including aging camera, access control, and duress alarm systems. Security systems, which include security cameras, electronic access control, duress alarms, online continuity, security and emergency planning tool (COOP) and intrusion alarms, are vital components in ensuring the safety and security of the public, judicial officers, and court personnel. Many trial court facilities have aging or inadequate security systems. Currently, long term planning for repairs, maintenance and refreshing of security systems cannot be accomplished due to a lack of funding. The current run to fail approach results in costly, piecemeal repairs and exponentially adds to the long term costs to address the needs of security equipment. This request would provide ongoing dedicated funding to address not only maintenance and repairs statewide, but would allow for replacement and refreshing of systems and equipment that have failed and or become obsolete. In addition, funding would be used to provide system maintenance of the web based COOP planning tool, as well as on-site training for courts to develop, improve and exercise their emergency plans.

L. Trial Court Facilities Operations Costs. The Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee propose a General Fund augmentation, estimated to be between \$18 and \$25 million, beginning in 2018-2019 and ongoing to be transferred to the Court Facilities Trust Fund (CFTF) to support trial court facilities operations costs. The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 provided for the transfer of court facilities from the counties to the state and also stipulated that the counties provide a County Facility Payment (CFP) based on the historical costs of operating each transferred facility. The CFP was not intended to provide for inflationary cost increases beyond the date of transfer. Additionally, CFPs do not support the growth in square footage resulting from newly

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

constructed trial court facilities, which remains unfunded, and the costs associated with maintaining those facilities has been absorbed within existing resources. The additional funds will augment the CFPs provided by counties and fund the growth of square footage due to newly constructed trial court facilities, providing ongoing necessary resources to support trial court facilities operations costs, such as utility and maintenance.