



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FISCAL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS AUGUST 10, 2017

Meeting Contents

Agenda	2
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the July 7, 2017 Meeting	4
Draft Minutes from the July 11, 2017 Action by E-mail Between Meetings	6
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts Requests (Action Item) Attachments:	
Attachment A: Summary of New Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Courts.....	7
Attachment B: Butte Superior Court Application – Purchase of new audio system.....	8
Attachment C: Kern Superior Court Application – Delays in completing remodeling project.....	15
Attachment D: Merced Superior Court Application – Critical Information Technology Replacement/Upgrade.....	19
Attachment E: Napa Superior Court Application – Additional implementation costs for Tyler Case Management System.....	25
Attachment F: Summary of Amended Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Courts.....	29
Attachment G: Kern Superior Court Amended Application – Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System.....	30
Attachment H: Napa Superior Court Amended Application – Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System.....	34
Attachment I: Napa Superior Court Amended Application – Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System.....	38
Attachment J: Sacramento Superior Court Amended Application – Delayed implementation of Family Law and Traffic Case Management Systems.....	43
Attachment K: Sacramento Superior Court Amended Application – Delayed implementation of Case Management Systems.....	48
Attachment L: <i>Judicial–Council Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts</i>	53



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE FISCAL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE 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: August 10, 2017
Time: 4:00 p.m. - 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 July 7, 2017, Fiscal Planning Subcommittee meeting and minutes of the July 11, 2017 Fiscal Planning Subcommittee action by email.

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, 2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833, attention: Suzanne Blihovde. Only written comments received by 4:00 p.m. on August 9, 2017 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts Requests (Action Item)

Consideration of whether to recommend that the Judicial Council approve TCTF funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts in response to the four new requests from four trial courts and five amended requests from three trial courts.

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

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
FISCAL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

July 7, 2017

12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Conference Call: 1-877-820-7831, Listen only code: 1884843

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair)
Executive Officers: Mr. Michael D. Planet, Mr. Brian Taylor, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judges: Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson and Hon. Glenda Sanders
Executive Officers: Mr. Kevin Harrigan

Others Present: Mr. Patrick Ballard, Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Ms. Tammy Laframboise, and Mr. Chris Stewart.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:12 p.m. and roll was called.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the April 13, 2017 Fiscal Planning Subcommittee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

Item 1 – Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts Requests (Action Item)

Consideration of whether to recommend that the Judicial Council approve TCTF funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts in response to the two new requests from two trial courts and two amended requests from two trial courts.

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 Fiscal Planning Subcommittee unanimously approved the two new Funds Held on Behalf requests for Alameda Superior Court and Mono Superior Court and the amended Funds Held on Behalf request for Alameda Superior Court. The Orange Superior Court amended request was deferred to an email vote because a subcommittee member of the quorum was from Orange Superior Court.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

DRAFT



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FISCAL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS
JULY 11, 2017

Email Proposal

The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee was asked to vote to recommend that the Judicial Council approve the amended Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) funds held on behalf request from Orange Superior Court:

1. This request asks that the Judicial Council hold \$642,384 in encumbered funds on the court's behalf beyond June 30, 2017, in order to allow the court to complete the Case Management System (CMS) implementation by June 30, 2018.

Notice

On July 7, 2017, a notice was posted advising that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Fiscal Planning Subcommittee was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(A).

Public Comment

No public comments were received on any of the four requests being considered at the July 7, 2017 Fiscal Planning Subcommittee meeting.

Action Taken

Fiscal Planning Subcommittee members were asked to vote between 9:52 a.m. July 11, 2017 and 4:00 p.m. July 11, 2017. Five members submitted votes via e-mail. For the proposed recommendation, five members voted "yes," no members voted "no," and two members abstained from the vote.

Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court

Table 1: New Requests for September 15, 2017 Judicial Council meeting

Court	Request Number	Amount Requested	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	Total	Category	Quick Summary
Butte	04-17-01-00	120,000	120,000			120,000	Major Equipment	Purchase of a new audio system - Oroville Courthouse
Kern	15-17-01-00	77,325	77,325			77,325	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delays in completing remodel project
Merced	24-17-01-00	107,734	107,734			107,734	Technology Improvement	Using liquidated funds from two prior fiscal years to fund critical IT upgrade and replacement project
Napa	28-17-01-00	418,000	418,000			418,000	Technology Improvement	Various additional costs associated with implementation of new Tyler case management system.
						-		
						-		
						-		
Total - New Requests		723,059	723,059	-	-	723,059		

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:

NEW REQUEST *(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)*

AMENDED REQUEST *(Complete Sections I through IV.)*



SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT: Butte	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Kimberly Flener, Court Executive Officer	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Jarrod Orr, Deputy Court Executive Officer	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 7/19/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: \$120,000 FROM FY2016-17 COURT RESERVES. PROJECT EXPENSES ARE ANTICIPATED IN FY 2017-18, WITH A POSSIBILITY OF EXTENDING THROUGH FY 2018-19.	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$ 120,000

REASON FOR REQUEST *(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):* The Court's audio system in the Oroville Courthouse that runs both the Courtroom audio for each courtroom and the Court-wide public address system is failing and is in urgent need of being replaced. The system is comprised of various components installed over the years some dating as far back as 1980. The Court currently has four of its eleven courtrooms that have audio that is either not functioning at all or functioning on a limited/intermittent basis. Given the age of the system and the recent courtroom audio failures that have occurred in the last few months, more courtrooms could experience similar issues. Based on feedback received by multiple audio companies, continued repairs of the system were not advisable and could cause further damage to the system. A complete replacement of the audio system is therefore a reasonable and financially prudent solution to undertake.

Discussions with the audio companies about a complete replacement of the audio system has led the Court to an approximate cost estimate for this of \$120,000. The Court plans on conducting an RFP to determine the final cost of this project but this information won't be available for three to four months until the RFP process concludes.

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES

A. Identify sections and answers amended.

B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.**

The cost for this project is estimated to be \$120,000 which is a major (one-time) expense for the Court and does not fit within the Court's annual operational budget process. Given the limited state-wide funding augmentation to trial courts in FY 2016-17 and no funding augmentation in FY 2017-18, the Court does not have any extra funding sources that haven't already been programmed into its annual operating budget. Additionally, given the lack of funding augmentation for FY 2017-18 and a slight WAFM reduction to the Court's allocation, the Court's funding has been cut forcing the absorption of on-going cost increases through reductions in other budget expense line item accounts. The Court has no further room in its budget to absorb this major expense.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs? Approval of this request will allow the Court to be more effective in projecting communication that is occurring in the Courtrooms and will allow full operation of the assisted listening devices, required for compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Additionally, a more effective system for crowd management will be realized as the Court's public address system is not fully functioning.

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

The Court will not be in compliance with the ADA and it will also impair the judges'/staff's ability to carry on hearings in the Courtroom if the ability to hear testimony is compromised. Additionally, the Court will be significantly limited in its ability to manage the public in the event of an emergency through the Court's public address system.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

Access to justice will be compromised as the public will either have difficulty hearing testimony or not hearing it all (in the case of the need for an assisted listening device). Also, Court proceedings may proceed more slowly to ensure the Court record is captured accurately in the absence of a fully functioning audio system.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

Replacing the Court's audio system in the Oroville Courthouse is estimated to be a major expense and the cost will likely not be too far removed from the monetary amount allowed to be held as part of the Court's 1% reserve. One funding alternative could be to pay for the replacement from the Court's 1% reserve; however, it would not be financially prudent to tap into this reserve for the replacement cost of the audio system, leaving the Court with little to no monies in reserve. Additionally, the Court does not have the resources to pay for this in one-lump sum from its annual allocation.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

- A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures**

- B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf**

- C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project**

- D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year**

Note: the Court anticipates completing this project in FY 2017-18; however, depending on the timing of the RFP process, overall scope of the project, and vendor availability, it could stretch into FY 2018-19.

Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court

Prior three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

		FUNDS							
▼		General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Description									
Beginning Balance		176,821	318,852	-					495,673
Revenues		12,073,376	554,021	673,268					13,300,665
Expenditures		11,803,614	598,511	673,268					13,075,393
Operating Transfers In (Out)		(28,113)	28,113						-
Ending Fund Balance		418,470	302,475	-					720,945

		FUNDS							
▼		General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Description									
Beginning Balance		1,014,680	329,866	-					1,344,546
Revenues		11,577,854	523,380	743,430					12,844,664
Expenditures		12,403,680	534,394	755,464					13,693,538
Operating Transfers In (Out)		(12,034)		12,034					-
Ending Fund Balance		176,820	318,852	-					495,672

		FUNDS							
▼		General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Description									
Beginning Balance		1,283,997	256,204						1,540,201
Revenues		10,866,128	533,845	694,752					12,094,725
Expenditures		11,121,021	460,183	709,177					12,290,381
Operating Transfers In (Out)		(14,425)		14,425					-
Ending Fund Balance		1,014,679	329,866	-					1,344,545

Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the c

Description	FY 2017-18		FUNDS							TOTAL
	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary			
REVENUES										
State Financing Sources	11,673,127	59,328	-							11,732,455
Grants	-	-	1,119,999							1,119,999
Other Financing Sources	340,151	470,650	-							810,801
TOTAL REVENUES	12,013,278	529,978	1,119,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,663,255
EXPENDITURES										
Salaries	6,161,991	338,172	563,585							7,063,748
Staff Benefits	2,577,593	148,213	250,805							2,976,611
General Expense	429,250	-	44,505							473,755
Printing	7,600	-	-							7,600
Telecommunications	115,666	-	31,529							147,195
Postage	91,500	-	150							91,650
Insurance	5,800	-	-							5,800
Travel in State	42,165	-	7,831							49,996
Travel Out of State	2,000	-	-							2,000
Training	27,781	-	1,500							29,281
Security	472,190	-	-							472,190
Facilities Operations	217,760	-	-							217,760
Utilities	-	-	-							-
Contracted Services	1,381,258	60,513	107,270							1,549,041
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	20,825	-	-							20,825
Information Technology (IT)	238,959	66,508	4,796							310,263
Major Equipment	180,239	-	-							180,239
Other Items of Expense	-	-	-							-
Juror Costs	73,500	-	-							73,500
Other	55,845	-	124,155							180,000
Debt Service	-	-	-							-
Court Construction	-	-	-							-
Distributed Administration & Allocation	-	-	-							-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment	-	-	-							-
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	12,101,922	613,406	1,136,126	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,851,454
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(51,640)	35,513	16,127							-
Fund Balance (Deficit)										
Beginning Balance (Deficit)	418,469	302,475								720,944
Ending Balance (Deficit)	278,185	254,560								532,745

Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court


Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

Expenses Category		Amount
GL Account	Description	
900000	Salaries	
910000	Staff Benefits	
920001	General Expense	
924000	Printing	
925000	Telecommunications	
926000	Postage	
928000	Insurance	
929000	Travel in State	
931000	Travel Out of State	
933000	Training	
934000	Security	
935000	Facilities Operations	
936000	Utilities	
938000	Contracted Services	
940000	Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	
943000	Information Technology (IT)	
945000	Major Equipment	120,000
950000	Other Items of Expense	
972000	Other	
973000	Debt Service	
983000	Court Construction	
990000	Distributed Administration & Allocation	
Total		120,000

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Description	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	Select Fiscal Year	Select Fiscal Year	Select Fiscal Year	Select Fiscal Year	Select Fiscal Year	Total
Contribution	120,000							120,000
Expenditures		120,000						120,000
Cumulative Balance	120,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	240,000

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEW REQUEST <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> AMENDED REQUEST <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
SUPERIOR COURT: Kern	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Terry McNally, Court Executive Officer	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Debra Ostlund, Deputy CEO-Finance debra.ostlund@kern.courts.ca.gov	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 6/16/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2017/18	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$77,325.20
REASON FOR REQUEST <i>(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):</i>		
<p>The Superior Court, County of Kern, had two new courthouse projects that were indefinitely suspended due to state budget problems. One of these projects was to replace the Delano Regional Court facility. As such, when the Delano Police Department, which is adjacent to the Delano Regional Court facility, was vacated it presented an opportunity to address problems related to this court location. Delano serves, in addition to the second fastest growing community in the County of Kern, two large prisons – Kern Valley and North Kern. These two facilities generate a significant amount of case work for the courts which have overtaxed current facilities and necessitated transfer of many of the CDCR related matters to the already overcrowded Metro Bakersfield Court location. The remodeling of the leased facility would enable the court to manage this caseload in a secure and efficient court environment. Further it would save significant tax payer resources as CDCR would no longer have to transport their inmates to Bakersfield, some 45 minutes away from Delano. The remodel project was delayed by approximately eight months due to the requirements of the Office of State Fire Marshall plan review. Thus the Court is requesting authorization to carryover encumbered local funding to complete the remodel project completed June 2017.</p>		
SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES		
<p>A. Identify sections and answers amended.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</p> <p>N/A</p>		
SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE		
<p>A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court’s annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.</p> <p>The funds for this project were originally encumbered in June 2015 and the three-year limitation will expire in June 2017. The original encumbrance amount was for \$792,364 and the unspent balance as of the end of June 2017 was \$77,325.20. (See attached email from the Judicial Council Facilities group.) Although the project is completed, the retention amount cannot be paid until 35 days after final recording, and so will not be paid until 2017/18.</p>		

Rev. Apr. 2016

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)

SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

- B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?

This funding will enable the completion of the remodeled leased facility designed to provide a highly secure, local court facility to serve the two large prisons that generate a considerable amount of workload for the Superior Court. The facility, which is within ten miles of the Delano Court facility, would save time and money by reducing the transportation costs for hearings and trials. While the court is currently using video conferencing for arraignments, subsequent hearings and jury trials will benefit from this newly remodeled facility by reducing wait times and improving the secure management of in-custody inmates.

- C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

N/A

- D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

There are two primary problems with the current facilities. One, the volume of cases emanating from the local prisons necessitate a large number, as many as 15 to 20, of CDCR transport vehicles with their CDCR staff and inmates be parked in the Delano court lot waiting for their hearing. The vehicles are acting as holding cells due to the limited cells in the current building. This poses a significant security concern, potential delays in court calendar management due to shuttling inmates from vehicles to courtrooms, and high costs for inmate management and security. Secondly, due to the physical constraints of the Delano, a large percentage of these cases are transferred to Bakersfield further overtaxing Kern County's busiest court facility and requiring the costly transport of in-custody inmates to and from the County seat on a daily basis.

- E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

The ability to have a secure facility in Delano enables local witnesses, justice partners, CDCR staff, and the public to access hearings and trials without the significant expense and time necessary to commute to Bakersfield.

- F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

If the request is not approved, the only alternative is to use current year revenue, which would involve cutting operational staffing to make up the shortfall.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

N/A

B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

N/A

C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

N/A

D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

N/A

To: Symons, Peggy <Peggy.Symons@jud.ca.gov>
Cc: Allan, Michele <Michele.Allan@jud.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Delano Pay Request #24
Importance: High

Peggy,

I have figured out all the issues and I am sending Invoice #24 to finance for payment. The only issue left is the retention. FY 14-15 retention of \$77,325.20 will revert Monday and be returned to the court. You need to talk to the Court and see if this will take them over their 1% for FY 14-15. If it does, they need to request the Judicial Council hold the FY 14-15 funds so when they use FY 17-18 encumbrance they can use that held cash. They did the same thing for the FY 13-14 funds that reverted last year. This needs to be done quickly.

Michele did I explain it properly?

John Carver, Associate Budget Analyst
Budget Services | Administrative Division
Judicial Council of California
2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95833-3509
Tel: 916-263-2507 Email: john.carver@jud.ca.gov


From: Symons, Peggy
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2017 10:52 AM
To: Carver, John <John.Carver@jud.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: Delano Pay Request #24

FYI...this is what she sent and said they submitted.

Peggy Symons, Sr. Project Manager
Capital Program | Operations and Programs Division
Judicial Council of California
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95833-3509
916-643-8009 office / 916-612-5105 cell | peggy.symons@jud.ca.gov | www.courts.ca.gov
"Serving the courts for the benefit of all Californians."

"Soar with wit. Conquer with dignity. Handle with care"

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEW REQUEST <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> AMENDED REQUEST <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
SUPERIOR COURT: Merced	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Linda Romero Soles	
CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Keri Brasil, CFO Ph: 209-725-4156 or Keri.Brasil@mercedcourt.org		
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 7/20/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$107,734
REASON FOR REQUEST <i>(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):</i>		
<p>Merced Superior Court is requesting that Trial Court Trust Funds be held on behalf of our court for our IT Infrastructure Upgrade Project. Our court is in a detrimental state due to an existing UPS/Server Systems which is in immediate need of replacement. Our court has been working with Brian Cotta, Assistant Clerk Administrator of the Fifth Appellate District on this project. He prepared an assessment of our systems that are in a failed state. Below is a list of some of the findings in the assessment report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The court's existing backup power equipment is in "alarm / red" state and on verge of completely failing. The situation continues to worsen each day as the batteries/equipment age and as electrical load continues to grow in the room due to various court/IT initiatives. • The equipment is long overdue for replacement and has unfortunately not been replaced due to budgetary issues and competing priorities in IT for remediation of other critical infrastructure (e.g. storage area network (SAN)). • Based on massive amounts of server and storage equipment necessary to support the case management system and other IT systems, court IT staff are unable to properly balance electrical load across the existing power equipment (many small UPS'). • The existing/failing equipment cannot be repaired as the units are so old, parts are no longer available due to the equipment being "end of support". In the IT industry, products are phased out by going through three "end" phases. <p>While working with Brian Cotta, Assistant Clerk Administrator of the Fifth Appellate District, and consulting with Ms. Paula Coombs from JCC, the Merced Court has developed a two phase replacement project plan. The first phase funding for this project has already been encumbered. The Court is currently working with vendors to obtain quotes for the cost of the second phase. The Court performed a Request for Information from a few vendors for the second phase in May 2017 and it is estimated that the second phase will cost the Court approximated \$232,096. Due to limited resources the Court is unable to fund this project from our current budget and is requesting that the funds be held on our behalf for completion of the second phase.</p>		
SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES		
A. Identify sections and answers amended.		
B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.		

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.**

The cost of this project is a significant amount needed for replacement and is not part of the court's annual operational budget. The first phase will cost the court \$245,480. The second phase has been estimated to cost \$232,096. These costs are a one-time expense and the Court does not have additional resources to support this project. Based on the 1% cap worksheet submitted by the court, the Court will liquidate \$52,042 of the funds encumbered in fiscal year 14/15 and it will also liquidate \$55,693 of the funds encumbered in fiscal year 15/16. We are seeking approval that these funds be held and not reverted back to the state. These funds will be utilized to upgrade our urgently needed IT Infrastructure Project and any additional funds needed to complete the project will come from other Court resources.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE****B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**

Merced's data center room currently houses critical IT infrastructure components (e.g. network, servers, storage, and UPS units) that serve Judges, staff and the public – all of which are paramount and essential to court operations and provide the ability for the court to conduct business. The request will allow the Court to continue to move forward and replace existing servers that have reached end of life and support. This request will also allow the court to add new servers needed to support our existing case management system. The Merced Superior Court is a paperless court.

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

N/A

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

The court has started upgrading the first phase of the IT Infrastructure replacement which is the UPS System and the funds have already been encumbered. The Court is relying on the remaining TCTF funds of \$107,734 for the second phase of this project.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

The Court is unable to fund the second phase of our project out of our current budget due to limited resources and the Court is relying on the funds that have become liquidated for this project.

If this request is not approved this will limit access to justice not only to the public but our justice partners as well. Online access would be limited, Reverting back to paper documents is not an option as other justice partners have become accustomed to receiving documents electronically. In addition our integration project with the Department of Child Support Services, the Merced District Attorney's Karpel system will be delayed. Future planned interface/integration projects with other justice partners would not materialize. This will also affect information that is provided to other justice partners including the Sheriff's Department who are responsible for the in-custodies.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

Holding the court funds in the TCTF is the preferred alternative to prevent the court from losing funds that are needed to encumber the second phase of our IT infrastructure replacement. We have exhausted our power sources, overloaded our switches and servers which has caused our Court to be on the verge of failing. If the courts request is denied, the Merced Superior Court will not be able to efficiently manage its network that serves

Prior three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

FY 2015-16	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Beginning Balance	1,706,742	360,210	-	2,483,134				4,550,086
Revenues	13,933,224	496,665	929,320	327,240				15,686,449
Expenditures	14,388,330	678,040	1,310,567	306,369				16,683,306
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(385,355)	4,108	381,247					-
Ending Fund Balance	866,281	182,943	-	2,504,005	-	-	-	3,553,229

FY 2014-15	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Beginning Balance	1,477,811	228,472	-	2,483,325				4,189,608
Revenues	13,756,746	246,632	724,884	324,679				15,052,941
Expenditures	13,439,519	117,873	810,201	324,871				14,692,464
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(88,297)	2,979	85,317	0				0
Ending Fund Balance	1,706,742	360,210	0	2,483,134	-	-	-	4,550,086

FY 2013-14	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Beginning Balance	2,649,243	50,057	-	2,363,208				5,062,508
Revenues	12,977,583	341,064	834,972	639,614				14,793,233
Expenditures	13,985,928	168,618	992,090	519,497				15,666,132
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(163,087)	5,968	157,118	0				0
Ending Fund Balance	1,477,811	228,472	0	2,483,325	-	-	-	4,189,609


Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

Expenses Category		Amount
GL Account	Description	
900000	Salaries	
910000	Staff Benefits	
920001	General Expense	
924000	Printing	
925000	Telecommunications	
926000	Postage	
928000	Insurance	
929000	Travel in State	
931000	Travel Out of State	
933000	Training	
934000	Security	
935000	Facilities Operations	
936000	Utilities	
938000	Contracted Services	
940000	Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	
943000	Information Technology (IT)	
945000	Major Equipment	107,734
950000	Other Items of Expense	
972000	Other	
973000	Debt Service	
983000	Court Construction	
990000	Distributed Administration & Allocation	
Total		107,734

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Description	FY 2014-15 ▼	FY 2015-16 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	52,042	55,692							107,734
Expenditures			107,734						107,734
Cumulative Balance	52,042	107,734	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEW REQUEST <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> AMENDED REQUEST <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
SUPERIOR COURT: Napa	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Richard D. Feldstein	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Lisa Skinner 707-299-1248 lisa.skinner@napacourt.com	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 7/19/2017 UPDATED 7/27/17	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2016/17 FUNDS TO BE USED IN 2017/18	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$418,000
<p>REASON FOR REQUEST <i>(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):</i></p> <p>Prior Request (CMS Costs) - Three fiscal years ago (2013/14), the court entered into a collaborative agreement with Tyler Technologies to provide new Case Management Systems (CMS) for Napa, Monterey, and Santa Clara courts in the same project. The collaborative agreement was designed to share expertise among the courts, create a greater uniformity, and for all three courts to be able to share in some of the vendor costs, therefore reducing the overall costs to all three courts. During the project planning phases early in the project, Tyler determined that it did not have sufficient resources to meet the original timeline set out in the initially agreed upon project plan. Specifically, the implementation resources that Tyler needed to support all three courts were needed in one location at a time, and therefore we had to stagger the implementation of the first phase further out to give each of the courts more attention in the months both before and after our implementation dates. This caused significant delays in complete implementation of the system for all case types and pushed the completion of the project into the current fiscal year (2017/18). See amended requests for funds held from prior years.</p> <p>New Request (Additional CMS Costs) – In addition to the initial request described above, the court had planned for a number of Tyler CMS project related expenditures in FY 2016/17. These included costs related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Additional temporary IT and operational staff needed for completion of the project beyond that planned for in FY 2015/16 with funds carried over to FY 2016/17. B. Technological enhancements necessary to keep the court from stepping backwards from the capabilities of its current CMS such as electronic reporting, interfaces with other local and state justice agencies, and attorney check-in system for the courtroom. <p>Furthermore, the court had planned on making its first maintenance contract payment that would have been due and payable in FY 2016/17. However, due to recent changes in the state-wide participation agreement, the required maintenance payment was not due and payable until FY 2017/18. As such, the court is requesting that the funding that would have been used to pay for the system maintenance until FY 2016/17 be held and to be paid in the current fiscal year (2017/18) for that purpose. The following table provides a breakdown of the new request.</p> <p>New Request (Post Earthquake Costs) – A separate long-term project for the court has been the ongoing efforts to re-occupy the Napa Historic Courthouse that was severely damaged in the 2014 earthquake. Although the reconstruction of the building will be paid for by the County of Napa, the court is responsible for furniture, signage, supplies, and equipment necessary to reoccupy the closed portion of the building. The court has begun fiscal planning for this effort by setting aside a portion of its FY 16/17 funding allocation for this purpose. Because we expect to begin the expending funds for the reoccupation in FY 17/18, and this effort will likely extend into FY 18/19 as construction is completed in various portions of the building. Ultimately, we will be reopening and reconfiguring the Civil Clerks Office, 2 courtrooms and jury deliberation rooms, and office space for attorneys, accounting, and other operational and support staff.</p>		

Funding Summary

1	Enhanced Clerk's Edition Support	\$ 50,000
2	Vendor Contract for Interface and Report Development	\$ 25,000
3	Continued IT Temporary Staffing	\$ 100,000
4	Vendor Contract for Attorney Check-In Module	\$ 30,000
5	Temporary Backfill for Operational Staff Assigned to the Project	\$ 25,000
6	Vendor Contract for Electronic Filing Module	\$ 50,000
7	CMS Maintenance Payment (FY 16-17)	\$ 92,000
8	Courthouse Reoccupation Costs	\$ 46,000
	Total	\$ 418,000

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES N/A

A. Identify sections and answers amended.

B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.

The project was based on a cooperative effort share the costs and establish greater intra-court uniformity. As such, it requires more time to allow for joining meetings and coordinating efforts that reduced the cost of the project by approximately 25% for Napa.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?

Our current CMS (Sustain Justice Edition/SJE) is an outdated technology that will no longer be supported by the vendor. This project provides an updated CMS that is uniform with the majority of the other courts throughout the state and allows for greater sharing of future enhancements and maintenance costs. More importantly, the new CMS provides greater access to court services than the current CMS, in particular eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities.

In addition, reoccupying the repaired courthouse facility will provide space to ensure adequate access to court services through additional courtroom and office space.

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

The court would have to either reduce services to the public and our justice partners to shift funding to the completion of this project. This would likely result in additional lay off of employees beyond those that occurred during the Great Recession. Such actions would bring the courts operations to a virtual halt as we have already reduced staffing from 91 FTEs in 2009 to only 69 in 2016. The court would be forced to reduce its operating hours further from its current hours which are already insufficient to provide adequate access to justice services.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

The court has successfully implemented the new CMS for civil, family law, probate, small claims, and juvenile dependency cases. If this request is not approved and the funding reverted back to the Trial Court Trust Fund, the court would be unable to complete its implementation of the CMS for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency matters. As a result, the court would not be able to utilize the systems capabilities in the areas of eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities to increase access by litigants, justice partners, and other members of the public seeking services and information for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency cases.

If the court is unable to reoccupy its prior facilities in the courthouse, it will continue to function in inadequate facilities that lack the number of courtrooms and security features that ensure appropriate access to local justice services.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

The only alternatives available are:

1. The reduction of court services and access and shifting of current operating funds to the project as described in the answer to Item D.
2. Seek additional funding from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Council or through a Budget Change Proposal.

Both of these alternatives are undesirable because:

1. They would potentially draw funding away from other courts who are also in need to technology resources.
2. They would bring the project to a complete halt for one to two years thereby depriving the court's constituency of the badly needed technological improvements described above.
3. Such lengthy delays often result in increased costs as the stop and start process causes a great deal of duplication of project management and technological tasks.
4. We would have to maintain our current CMS system longer than expected and longer than budgeted. This is problematic for several reasons. This version is using very outdated technology. We would need to maintain separate versions of Microsoft products to maintain both the old and the new CMS systems. This platform is also in the process of being obsoleted by the vendor. This will affect our ability to maintain the system and the maintenance costs could skyrocket, if supported at all. We would also need to continue to pay for license costs in addition to paying for the new CMS license costs.

Regarding the reoccupation of the Historic Courthouse, failure to do so would require the county to purchase or lease additional long-term facilities to house court operations. This is not feasible due to the fact that the loss of court facilities is being addressed with Federal Emergency Management Funds, which can only be used to the restoration of that building.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

N/A PER INSTRUCTIONS SINCE EXPENDITURES ARE EXPECTED TO BE COMPLETED DURING 2017/18 FISCAL YEAR

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

- A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

- B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

- C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project


- D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court

Table 2: Amended Requests for September 15, 2017 Judicial Council meeting

Court	Request Number	Last Approved Amount	Does request change \$\$	If yes - \$\$ change +/-	Original Expenditures by FY			Amended Expenditures by FY			Category	Quick Summary
					2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019		
Kern	15-16-02-A2	830,528	No		830,528			153,150	677,378		Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
Napa	28-16-01-A2	126,164	No		126,164				126,164		Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
Napa	28-16-02-A1	243,860	No		243,860			157,162	86,698		Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
Sacramento	34-17-01-A1	333,133	Yes	48,350		171,964	161,169		220,314	161,169	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Family Law and Traffic Case Management System. Increase in funding requested reflects additional delays in services that will need to be paid in 2017-2018.
Sacramento	34-16-01-A2	1,858,731	No		1,858,731			219,145	1,639,586		Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of case management system
Total: Amended Requests		3,392,416		48,350	3,059,283	171,964	161,169	529,457	2,750,140	161,169		

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:		
<input type="checkbox"/> NEW REQUEST <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMENDED REQUEST <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
SUPERIOR COURT: Kern	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Terry McNally, Court Executive Officer	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Debra Ostlund, Deputy CEO-Finance debra.ostlund@kern.courts.ca.gov	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 4/13/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2017/18	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$677,378 (estimated)
REASON FOR REQUEST <i>(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):</i>		
<p>The Superior Court, County of Kern, entered into a contract with Tyler Technologies, Inc. to replace its antiquated, legacy case management system provided by the County for the last 30-years. The new system will enhance court operations by providing a single case management system for all case types improving the operations of the Court. Further, the County of Kern Justice partners have also agreed to migrate to the new case management system providing for a fully integrated system using new technology including a digital file storage, e-filing, and other similar state-of-the-art enhancements that will improve the management of cases through the entire local justice system.</p> <p>The Court's contract with Tyler Technologies Inc. provided for an amount of local programming, integration and development to comply with statutory obligations and requirements for court operations in California. Tyler Technologies Inc. subsequently signed agreements with another 25 or more courts in California. This will enable Courts in California to collaborate on a large number of state-wide development initiatives including DMV and DOJ interface, electronic citation processing, state-wide e-filing, and other similar improvements. However, due to programmer constraints local development efforts have been delayed. In turn, encumbered funds necessary to pay for the remaining project deliverables and any local development will not be expended within the three-year term of the agreement.</p> <p>It is respectfully requested that the Superior Court, County of Kern, be allowed to carryover encumbered local funds to finalize this project, the second phase—Go-live for the Criminal, Traffic and Juvenile case management components—planned for completion in the fall of 2017.</p>		
SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES		
<p>A. Identify sections and answers amended. Amendment 2 -Section I - REQUESTED AMOUNT (was \$830,528 less: \$153,150 spent = \$677,378) Amendment 1 -Section I - REQUESTED AMOUNT (was \$895,286 less: \$64,758 = \$830,528)</p> <p>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</p>		

Amendment 2 – Added the “estimated” notation and reduced the amount by the amount spent so far in 2016/17. Changed Time Period to 2017/18 and the planned completion date to Fall of 2017.

Amendment 1 - Removed the “estimated” notation and reduced the amount by maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that if not expensed in two years is subject to the cap. (\$80,296-15,538=\$64,758)

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

- A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court’s annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.**

The Superior Court, County of Kern, like many other courts in California was anticipating the provision of a new case management system with the launch of CCMS. With the demise of this project, the Court utilized its reserve balances to fund a vendor solution based on a recently approved MSA. The MSA provided for case management solutions from four approved vendors including Tyler Technologies, Inc. These one-time funding resources were accumulated from operational savings accrued over years and would be impossible to replace in the short term. To replace the encumbered funds, the Court would be required to implement reductions in staffing and service levels to save the necessary resources from operational budgets, given the current 1% cap on reserve funding.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)

SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

- B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**

A new case management system will have a significant operational impact on the courts. The new system will include integration with Probation, the Sheriff, Public Defender and the District Attorney. Further it will include e-filing capabilities, integration with a digital document management system, and other similar functionality that have been proven by other Courts in California and the United States to improve efficiency and effectiveness of court operations.

- C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).**

N/A

- D. Describe the consequences to the court’s operations if the court request is not approved.**

The Court would not be able to complete the second phase of the Case management system for the installation of the Criminal, Juvenile and Traffic components of the system. Nor would the court be able to pay for local integration and development programming to fully enhance the interconnecting planned with local justice partners.

- E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.**

Current case management systems do not provide for e-filing or digital document storage. Thus, court users will not be able to access court documents and other case information without the necessity of personal visits to court. Some court locations in Kern are two-hour, one-way trips from the County Seat in Bakersfield.

- F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?**

Maintain the current system that is costing the court in excess of \$1/2 million in annual transaction fees paid to the County of Kern for maintenance of the legacy case management system.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION - N/A

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

N/A

B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

N/A

C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

N/A

D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

N/A

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year


Original Request approved by Judicial Council June 24, 2016

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	830,528								830,528
Contribution									-
Expenditures		830,528							830,528
Cumulative Balance	830,528	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	830,528								830,528
Contribution									-
Expenditures		153,150	677,378						830,528
Cumulative Balance	830,528	677,378	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:		
<input type="checkbox"/> NEW REQUEST <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMENDED REQUEST <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
SUPERIOR COURT: Napa	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Richard D. Feldstein	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Lisa Skinner 707-299-1248 lisa.skinner@napacourt.com	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 4/27/2016 Amended Date 08/01/2016 Amended Date 07/19/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2013/14 FUNDS TO BE USED IN 2017/18	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$228,196 16/17 Amended Amount \$126,164 17/18 Amended Amount \$126,164
REASON FOR REQUEST <i>(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):</i> Original Request: In fiscal year 2013/14, the court entered into a collaborative agreement with Tyler Technologies to provide new Case Management Systems (CMS) for Napa, Monterey, and Santa Clara courts in the same project. The collaborative agreement was designed to share expertise among the courts, create a greater uniformity, and for all three courts to be able to share in some of the vendor costs, therefore reducing the overall costs to all three courts. During the project planning phases early in the project, Tyler determined that it did not have sufficient resources to meet the original timeline set out in the initially agreed upon project plan. Specifically, the implementation resources that Tyler needed to support all three courts were needed in one location at a time, and therefore we had to stagger the implementation of the first phase further out to give each of the courts more attention in the months both before and after our implementation dates. The same strategy will need to be used for Phase II of each of our courts implementation, staggering out the three implementation dates through the end of fiscal year 2016/17.		
SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES		
<p>A. Identify sections and answers amended. Carry over the full \$126,164 amount into 2017/18 for the remaining balance on the Tyler Technologies contract.</p> <p>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request. At the time we requested to carry over funds into 2016/17, we were projecting a final Tyler Odyssey implementation date in April 2017. Throughout the course of the 2016/17 fiscal year, we have had additional delays due to continued Tyler staffing constraints, particularly related to turnover in Tyler's project management and support employees.</p>		
SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE		
<p>A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.</p> <p>The project was based on a cooperative effort share the costs and establish greater intra-court uniformity. As such, it requires more time to allow for joining meetings and coordinating efforts that reduced the cost of the project by approximately 25% for Napa.</p>		

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)

SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?

Our current CMS (Sustain Justice Edition/SJE) is an outdated technology that will no longer be supported by the vendor. This project provides an updated CMS that is uniform with the majority of the other courts throughout the state and allows for greater sharing of future enhancements and maintenance costs. More importantly, the new CMS provides greater access to court services than the current CMS, in particular eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities.

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).**D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.**

The court would have to either reduce services to the public and our justice partners to shift funding to the completion of this project. This would likely result in additional lay off of employees beyond those that occurred during the Great Recession. Such actions would bring the courts operations to a virtual halt as we have already reduced staffing from 91 FTEs in 2009 to only 69 in 2016. The court would be forced to reduce its operating hours further from its current hours which are already insufficient to provide adequate access to justice services.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

The court has successfully implemented the new CMS for civil, family law, probate, small claims, and juvenile dependency cases. If this request is not approved and the funding reverted back to the Trial Court Trust Fund, the court would be unable to complete its implementation of the CMS for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency matters. As a result, the court would not be able to utilize the systems capabilities in the areas of eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities to increase access by litigants, justice partners, and other members of the public seeking services and information for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency cases.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

The only alternatives available are:

1. The reduction of court services and access and shifting of current operating funds to the project as described in the answer to Item D.
2. Seek additional funding from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Council or through a Budget Change Proposal.

Both of these alternatives are undesirable because:

1. They would potentially draw funding away from other courts who are also in need to technology resources.
2. They would bring the project to a complete halt for one to two years thereby depriving the court's constituency of the badly needed technological improvements described above.
3. Such lengthy delays often result in increased costs as the stop and start process causes a great deal of duplication of project management and technological tasks.
4. We would have to maintain our current CMS system longer than expected and longer than budgeted. This is problematic for several reasons. This version is using very outdated technology. We would need to maintain separate versions of Microsoft products to maintain both the old and the new CMS systems. This platform is also in the process of being obsoleted by the vendor. This will affect our ability to maintain the system and the maintenance costs could skyrocket, if supported at all. We would also need to continue to pay for license costs in addition to paying for the new CMS license costs.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

- A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

- B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

- C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

- D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Sec. IV.D

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year


Original Request approved by Judicial Council June 24, 2016

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	126,164								126,164
Contribution									-
Expenditures		126,164							126,164
Cumulative Balance	126,164	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	126,164								126,164
Contribution									-
Expenditures			126,164						126,164
Cumulative Balance	126,164	126,164	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:		
<input type="checkbox"/> NEW REQUEST <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMENDED REQUEST <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
SUPERIOR COURT: Napa	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Richard D. Feldstein	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Lisa Skinner 707-299-1248 lisa.skinner@napacourt.com	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 8/1/2016 Amended Date 7/19/17	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2015/16 FUNDS TO BE USED IN 2017/18	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$243,000 Amended Amount \$86,698
<p>REASON FOR REQUEST <i>(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):</i></p> <p>Original Request: In fiscal year 2013/14, the court entered into a collaborative agreement with Tyler Technologies to provide new Case Management Systems (CMS) for Napa, Monterey, and Santa Clara courts in the same project. The collaborative agreement was designed to share expertise among the courts, create a greater uniformity, and for all three courts to be able to share in some of the vendor costs, therefore reducing the overall costs to all three courts. During the project planning phases early in the project, Tyler determined that it did not have sufficient resources to meet the original timeline set out in the initially agreed upon project plan. Specifically, the implementation resources that Tyler needed to support all three courts were needed in one location at a time, and therefore we had to stagger the implementation of the first phase further out to give each of the courts more attention in the months both before and after our implementation dates. The same strategy will need to be used for Phase II of each of our courts implementation, staggering out the three implementation dates through the end of fiscal year 2016/17.</p> <p>Due to the implementation timeline extension for this CMS project, several other aspects of the project have been pushed out to the 2016/17 fiscal year in addition to the Tyler Contract. Since we are still working on Phase II of the project, we were not able to complete the contracts for all goods and services budgeted for Phase II in 2016/17. Estimated additional costs to complete this project are estimated at \$300,000, well over the \$243,000 that we are requesting to be held as follows:</p> <p>IT Professional Services for Data Exchange/Integration 2016/17 contract in progress with Sierra-Cedar, Inc – \$45,000 Additional IT Professional Services for Data Exchange/Integration with Sierra-Cedar, Inc (based on draft SOW) - \$100,000 IT Professional Services with New Team Software for transitioning our current document management solution from our legacy CMS to the new CMS - \$25,000 IT Temporary Employee Court Systems Technician salary and benefits for 2016/17 - \$80,000 Legacy Case Management System Maintenance for 2016/17 - \$50,000</p>		
SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES		
<p>A. Identify sections and answers amended. At the time we requested to carry over funds into 2016/17, we were projecting a final Tyler Odyssey implementation date in April 2017. Throughout the course of the 2016/17 fiscal year, we have had additional delays due to continued Tyler staffing constraints, particularly related to turnover in Tyler's project management and support employees.</p>		

- B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.** Out of the \$243,000 requested, we have entered into contracts with several Professional Service providers, and have added Limited Term and temporary staffing to work on the Tyler Odyssey project. We have spent a considerable amount of the funds requested, but based on our Criminal implementation date during 2017/18, we will spend the remaining funds this fiscal year as follows:

2015/16	Original Funds Held:	243,860.00	
	Expenditures		
2016/17	Limited Term IT Staff		66,109.38
2016/17	Software Mtnce Spent		50,265.00
2016/17	IT Professional Services		40,787.50
	Total Expenditures 16/17:		157,161.88
	Balance Remaining for 17/18		86,698.12
2017/18	2017/18 Projected Expenditures		
2017/18	Limited Term IT Staff		18,935.12
2017/18	IT Professional Services (contract balances)		67,763.00
	Projected Expenditures 17/18:		86,698.12
	Remaining Balance		0.00

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

- A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.**

The project was based on a cooperative effort share the costs and establish greater intra-court uniformity. As such, it requires more time to allow for joining meetings and coordinating efforts that reduced the cost of the project by approximately 25% for Napa.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)

SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

- B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**

Our current CMS (Sustain Justice Edition/SJE) is an outdated technology that will no longer be supported by the vendor. This project provides an updated CMS that is uniform with the majority of the other courts throughout the state and allows for greater sharing of future enhancements and maintenance costs. More importantly, the new CMS provides greater access to court services than the current CMS, in particular eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities.

- C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).**

- D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.**

The court would have to either reduce services to the public and our justice partners to shift funding to the completion of this project. This would likely result in additional lay off of employees beyond those that occurred during the Great Recession. Such actions would bring the courts operations to a virtual halt as we have already reduced staffing from 91 FTEs in 2009 to only 69 in 2016. The court would be forced to reduce its operating hours further from its current hours which are already insufficient to provide adequate access to justice services.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

The court has successfully implemented the new CMS for civil, family law, probate, small claims, and juvenile dependency cases. If this request is not approved and the funding reverted back to the Trial Court Trust Fund, the court would be unable to complete its implementation of the CMS for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency matters. As a result, the court would not be able to utilize the systems capabilities in the areas of eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities to increase access by litigants, justice partners, and other members of the public seeking services and information for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency cases.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

The only alternatives available are:

1. The reduction of court services and access and shifting of current operating funds to the project as described in the answer to Item D.
2. Seek additional funding from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Council or through a Budget Change Proposal.

Both of these alternatives are undesirable because:

1. They would potentially draw funding away from other courts who are also in need to technology resources.
2. They would bring the project to a complete halt for one to two years thereby depriving the court's constituency of the badly needed technological improvements described above.
3. Such lengthy delays often result in increased costs as the stop and start process causes a great deal of duplication of project management and technological tasks.
4. We would have to maintain our current CMS system longer than expected and longer than budgeted. This is problematic for several reasons. This version is using very outdated technology. We would need to maintain separate versions of Microsoft products to maintain both the old and the new CMS systems. This platform is also in the process of being obsoleted by the vendor. This will affect our ability to maintain the system and the maintenance costs could skyrocket, if supported at all. We would also need to continue to pay for license costs in addition to paying for the new CMS license costs.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

- A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

- B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

- C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

- D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Sec. IV.D

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Original Request approved by Judicial Council October 28, 2016

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	243,860								243,860
Contribution									-
Expenditures		243,860							243,860
Cumulative Balance	243,860	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	243,860								243,860
Contribution									-
Expenditures		157,162	86,698						243,860
Cumulative Balance	243,860	86,698	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:

 NEW REQUEST (Complete Section I, III, and IV only.) **AMENDED REQUEST** (Complete Sections I through IV.)**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION****SUPERIOR COURT:**

Sacramento

PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):

Judge Kevin Culhane, Presiding Judge

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

Rick Beard, Chief Financial Officer (916-874-8133)

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

7/14/2017

TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:

FY14/15 – FY18/19

REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$ 381,483

REASON FOR REQUEST (Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):

The court requests that funds encumbered for its case management system projects be held past the end of the encumbrance period so that the court can complete its projects. The court is currently in the process of replacing three of its oldest case management systems (CMS) projects in the Criminal, Family Law, and Traffic divisions.

- Criminal CMS Project: replaces a county-owned mainframe system that is being phased out by the county. Includes real-time exchange of criminal case data between the court and the county.
- Family Law CMS Project replaces a 25+ year old installation of Sustain. The new Family Law CMS will enable the court to employ e-filing services and improve order generation.
- Traffic CMS Project: this project replaces a 16 year old CMS and will allow the court to expand e-services in the Traffic division.

This request is to have funds that were encumbered in 2014-15 for two of these projects, Family Law and Traffic, held in the TCTF past the original encumbrance end period. These funds are the completion of funding provided over two fiscal years, 2013-14 and 2014-15, which are intended to fully fund the work necessary for the aforementioned CMS projects undertaken by the court. The court was approved to have 2013-14 remaining funds held through June 30, 2018 at the October 2016 Council meeting.

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES**A. Identify sections and answers amended.**

Section I. Requested Amount changed from \$333,133 to \$381,483.

Section III.A. Changed Amount for PO#4300004218 from \$190,641 to \$238,991; adjusted total to reflect change.

Section IV.D. Adjusted Contribution amount and FY17/18 amount.

B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.

The Sacramento court was approved for at the July 2017 Council meeting to have 2014-15 funds held on its behalf in the TCTF. A pending workflow target that was anticipated to be completed was not and the associated payment not made to the vendor, thus additional dollars on the contract were not paid and need to be rolled into 2017-18. The additional funding of \$48,350 will be expended in 2017-18, rather than the expected 2016-17.

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.**

The court is currently in the process of replacing three of its oldest case management systems which support the Criminal, Family Law, and Traffic divisions. These projects have required a greater amount of time to complete due to their complexity and the need to carefully examine and convert business rules, processes, and data into the new systems. Two of the replacement systems, Traffic and Family Law, had additional funding provided in 2014-15 to complete the necessary cost of full development of these CMS systems. This funding is in addition to the funding provided in 2013-14 for all three projects, which has been approved previously to have remaining funds held in the TCTF.

The amount of encumbered funds projected to remain on June 30th, 2017 for the two projects is as follows:

	Original	Remaining
PO #4300004218 – FL CMS	\$261,555	\$238,991 (was \$190,641)
PO #4300004217 – Traffic CMS	<u>\$281,920</u>	<u>\$142,492</u>
Total Contribution –	\$543,475	\$381,483 (was \$333,133)

The original timeline called for the start of the Family Law and Traffic CMS projects in latter half of 2014 and beginning of 2015. However, the start of these projects was delayed due to the increase in time required for the Criminal CMS Project and the concomitant use of resources needed on that project.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE****B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**

The CMS Projects all touch on various goals in the Judicial Council's Strategic Plan including:

- Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity
- Goal II – Independence and Accountability
- Goal III – Modernization of Management and Administration
- Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
- Goal VI – Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

Specific areas where these goals are met by the CMS Projects include:

- *Electronic Case Files:* The court will implement electronic case files in Criminal and Family Law as part of the new CMS implementations. Electronic files eliminate the need for storing, printing, and/or copying case files and thus expedite in-court processing. The case file and documents will be available through an online portal to government agencies, attorneys and/or parties (where appropriate and with secure access), and in the courthouse kiosk for general public. In Traffic, where case files are already electronic, there will be a reduction in the need for document printing and scanning and electronic signatures will be enabled. *(Goals III & VI)*
- *Electronic Filing and Data Exchanges with Justice Agencies:* Electronically filing cases directly into the new CMS means the filing agencies will have more time to file a case. Cases can be filed on a 24/7 basis. Case filing and verification will only take a few minutes, compared to manual filing. Government agencies can exchange data with the court, at any time of the day. *(Goals III & VI)*
- *Case Processing:* Automating current manual processes, where feasible, will add efficiencies for staff by saving time spent on tasks needing a clerk's review and data entry. For those cases that must still be manually entered, data entry will be streamlined through more efficient system configuration. Many workarounds currently in place due to system limitations will be eliminated. *(Goals III & IV)*
- *Government Agency and Public Access to Case Data:* Case files and case data will be made available, on-line, on 24/7 basis for government agencies, attorneys and/or parties (where appropriate and with secure access), and in the courthouse kiosk for general public. This should reduce case-related phone queries and foot-traffic to the courthouse. For Traffic, public kiosks and online access will increase payment/appearance

options and reduce wait times. (Goals I, III, & IV)

- *Accurate Reporting:* The new CMS will improve reporting for JBSIS, and DMV which suffer in accuracy and data collection due to limitations in the existing systems. (Goals II & III)
- *System Integration:* New system will integrate with external court systems like SAP, and also share data with other case categories, like Traffic and eventually Juvenile as well as other areas of the court. Existing integrations with the county and third-party collections will be improved, reducing the need for manual intervention by court staff. Furthermore, the new system will integrate with the court's Electronic Document System (EDS) and Public Case Access site (PCA). Notices, Minute, and Orders would be available to the parties soon after the documents are completed.(Goals IV & VI)

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

- *Reliance on Old Case Management Systems:*
 - Family Law: The CMS in Family Law is failing and must be replaced. The court is at extreme risk of losing data.
 - Traffic: the Traffic system is old and no longer supported by the vendor. What support there is expensive and the maintenance requirements for this system are steep.
 - Technology: continued reliance on the old systems is becoming increasingly difficult as current operating systems and database systems no longer support these systems. The court is required to continue operating old versions of software that are no longer supported by the vendors. Finally, this puts the court out of compliance with various cyber-security requirements.
- *No Electronic Case files:* the court cannot implement electronic files for Family Law cases as the current systems cannot support them. The court will need space to continue to store and process paper files.
- *Business Process Workarounds:* operations staff will continue to apply inefficient workarounds in their business processes due to system limitations.
- *Severely Limits Adoption of Electronic Filing:* current systems do not support e-filing. As a result, the court will be unable to realize any improvement in efficiencies or the ability to improve access to case information.
- *Manual Reporting:* Court will continue to manually collect and report data in various areas such as JBSIS and Title IV-D.
- *No Data Sharing:* no ability to share data among the various case categories due to continued use of disparate systems.
- *Continued phone and foot traffic:* No reduction in foot traffic or case-related phone calls to the courthouse.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

- *Access to Case Files:* access to Family Law case files will continue to be limited to the courthouse and its working hours. Very limited case data will be available online. Parties will have to call the courthouse to get information on the hearing time and status.
- *Strict Filing Deadlines:* the existing strictures for filing deadlines will have to be maintained in order to allow for the time needed to manually review, stamp, and file documents as they are presented to the court for filing. The impact of this is more keenly felt when filing a case for a same-day or next-day calendar.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court’s behalf

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Description	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19
Contribution	\$381,483		
Expenditures		\$220,314	\$161,169

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Original Request approved by Judicial Council July 28, 2017

Description	FY 2014-15 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	333,133								333,133
Contribution									-
Expenditures			171,964	161,169					333,133
Cumulative Balance	333,133	333,133	161,169	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2014-15 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	381,483								381,483
Contribution									-
Expenditures			220,314	161,169					381,483
Cumulative Balance	381,483	381,483	161,169	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:

 NEW REQUEST (Complete Section I, III, and IV only.) **AMENDED REQUEST** (Complete Sections I through IV.)**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION****SUPERIOR COURT:**
Sacramento**PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST** (Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):
Judge Kevin Culhane, Presiding Judge**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**

Rick Beard, Chief Financial Officer (916-874-8133)

DATE OF SUBMISSION:
7/14/2017**TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:**
FY15/16 – FY17/18**REQUESTED AMOUNT:**

\$ 1,639,586 (original approved amount in Oct. 2016 was \$1,858,731 available through 2017-18)

REASON FOR REQUEST (Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):

The court requests that funds encumbered for its case management system projects be held past the end of the encumbrance period so that the court can complete its projects. The court is currently in the process of replacing three of its oldest case management systems (CMS) projects in the Criminal, Family Law, and Traffic divisions.

- Criminal CMS Project: replaces a county-owned mainframe system that is being phased out by the county. Includes real-time exchange of criminal case data between the court and the county.
- Family Law CMS Project replaces a 25+ year old installation of Sustain. The new Family Law CMS will enable the court to employ e-filing services and improve order generation.
- Traffic CMS Project: this project replaces a 16 year old CMS and will allow the court to expand e-services in the Traffic division.

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES**A. Identify sections and answers amended.**

SECTION IV: D Attachment (revises previously approved amount to be expended in second fiscal year)

B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.

The Sacramento court was originally approved at the June 2016 Council meeting to have funds held on its behalf in the TCTF in the estimated amount of \$1,413,142. The amount was amended and approved at the October 2016 Council meeting in the final amount of \$1,858,731 and was made available through the 2017-18 fiscal year (two fiscal years). The court originally estimated expending that amount over the two fiscal years as follows: \$835,389 in 2016-17 and \$1,023,342 in 2017-18. The court now is requesting to adjust the amount that will be expended in 2017-18, based on the anticipated expenditure of \$219,145 in 2016-17. This request changes the original 2017-18 estimate of \$1,023,342 to the new expenditure amount of \$1,639,586 for 2017-18.

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.**

The court is currently in the process of replacing three of its oldest case management systems which support the Criminal, Family Law, and Traffic divisions. These projects have required a greater amount of time to complete due to their complexity and the need to carefully examine and convert business rules, processes, and data into the new systems.

The amount of encumbered funds projected to remain on June 30th, 2016 for the three projects is as follows:

	Original	Remaining for 2017-18
PO #4300003759 – Crim CMS	\$561,918	\$466,709
PO #4300004218 – FL CMS	\$773,149	\$773,149
PO #4300004217 – Traffic CMS	\$523,664	\$399,728
Total Contribution –	\$1,858,731	\$1,639,586

The original timeline called for the start of the Family Law and Traffic CMS projects in latter half of 2014 and beginning of 2015. However, the start of these projects was delayed due to the increase in time required for the Criminal CMS Project and the concomitant use of resources needed on that project.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE****B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**

The CMS Projects all touch on various goals in the Judicial Council's Strategic Plan including:

- Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity
- Goal II – Independence and Accountability
- Goal III – Modernization of Management and Administration
- Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
- Goal VI – Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

Specific areas where these goals are met by the CMS Projects include:

- *Electronic Case Files:* The court will implement electronic case files in Criminal and Family Law as part of the new CMS implementations. Electronic files eliminate the need for storing, printing, and/or copying case files and thus expedite in-court processing. The case file and documents will be available through an online portal to government agencies, attorneys and/or parties (where appropriate and with secure access), and in the courthouse kiosk for general public. In Traffic, where case files are already electronic, there will be a reduction in the need for document printing and scanning and electronic signatures will be enabled. (*Goals III & VI*)
- *Electronic Filing and Data Exchanges with Justice Agencies:* Electronically filing cases directly into the new CMS means the filing agencies will have more time to file a case. Cases can be filed on a 24/7 basis. Case filing and verification will only take a few minutes, compared to manual filing. Government agencies can exchange data with the court, at any time of the day. (*Goals III & VI*)
- *Case Processing:* Automating current manual processes, where feasible, will add efficiencies for staff by saving time spent on tasks needing a clerk's review and data entry. For those cases that must still be manually entered, data entry will be streamlined through more efficient system configuration. Many workarounds currently in place due to system limitations will be eliminated. (*Goals III & IV*)
- *Government Agency and Public Access to Case Data:* Case files and case data will be made available, on-line, on 24/7 basis for government agencies, attorneys and/or parties (where appropriate and with secure access), and in the courthouse kiosk for general public. This should reduce case-related phone queries and foot-traffic to the courthouse. For Traffic, public kiosks and online access will increase payment/appearance options and reduce wait times. (*Goals I, III, & IV*)

- *Accurate Reporting:* The new CMS will improve reporting for JBSIS, DOJ, CDCR and DMV which suffer in accuracy and data collection due to limitations in the existing systems. (*Goals II & III*)
- *System Integration:* New system will integrate with external court systems like SAP, and also share data with other case categories, like Traffic and eventually Juvenile as well as other areas of the court. Existing integrations with the county and third-party collections will be improved, reducing the need for manual intervention by court staff. Furthermore, the new system will integrate with the court's Electronic Document System (EDS) and Public Case Access site (PCA). Notices, Minute, and Orders would be available to the parties soon after the documents are completed. (*Goals IV & VI*)

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

- *Reliance on Old Case Management Systems:*
 - Criminal: The court will continue to rely on a 30 year old mainframe system to process Criminal cases. The mainframe system belongs to the county who is intends to retire the system in next 3-5 years. If the court is that last tenant on the mainframe system, the cost to the court will exceed \$500,000/year, making it impossible to ever fund a new CMS.
 - Family Law: The CMS in Family Law is failing and must be replaced. The court is at extreme risk of losing data.
 - Traffic: the Traffic system is old and no longer supported by the vendor. What support there is expensive and the maintenance requirements for this system are steep.
 - Technology: continued reliance on the old systems is becoming increasingly difficult as current operating systems and database systems no longer support these systems. The court is required to continue operating old versions of software that are no longer supported by the vendors. Finally, this puts the court out of compliance with various cyber-security requirements.
- *No Electronic Case files:* the court cannot implement electronic files for Criminal and Family Law cases as the current systems cannot support them. The court will need space to continue to store and process paper files.
- *Business Process Workarounds:* operations staff will continue to apply inefficient workarounds in their business processes due to system limitations.
- *Severely Limits Adoption of Electronic Filing:* current systems do not support e-filing. As a result, the court will be unable to realize any improvement in efficiencies or the ability to improve access to case information.
- *Manual Reporting:* Court will continue to manually collect and report data in various areas such as AB109 (PRCS/Parole) cases, JBSIS, and Title IV-D.
- *No Data Sharing:* no ability to share data among the various case categories (e.g. Traffic and Criminal) due to continued use of disparate systems.
- *Continued phone and foot traffic:* No reduction in foot traffic or case-related phone calls to the courthouse.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

- *Access to Case Files:* access to Criminal and Family Law case files will continue to be limited to the courthouse and its working hours. Very limited case data will be available online. Parties will have to call the courthouse to get information on the hearing time and status.
- *Strict Filing Deadlines:* the existing strictures for filing deadlines will have to be maintained in order to allow for the time needed to manually review, stamp, and file documents as they are presented to the court for filing. The impact of this is more keenly felt when filing a case for a same-day or next-day calendar.

- F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

- A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

- B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

- C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

- D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Description	FY2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Contribution	1,858,731		
Expenditures		219,145	1,639,586

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Original Request approved by Judicial Council June 26, 2016

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	1,858,731								1,858,731
Contribution									-
Expenditures		1,858,731							1,858,731
Cumulative Balance	1,858,731	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	1,858,731								1,858,731
Contribution									-
Expenditures		219,145	1,639,586						1,858,731
Cumulative Balance	1,858,731	1,639,586	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Judicial–Council Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

Process for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

1. Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance will be held on behalf of trial courts only for expenditures or projects that cannot be funded by a court’s annual budget or three-year encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement.
 - a. Categories or activities include, but are not limited to:
 - i) Projects that extend beyond the original planned three-year term process such as expenses related to the delayed opening of new facilities or delayed deployment of new information systems;
 - ii) Technology improvements or infrastructure such as installing a local data center, data center equipment replacement, case management system deployment, converting to a VoIP telephone system, desktop computer replacement, and replacement of backup emergency power systems;
 - iii) Facilities maintenance and repair allowed under rule 10.810 of the California Rules of Court such as flooring replacement and renovation as well as professional facilities maintenance equipment;
 - iv) Court efficiencies projects such as online and smart forms for court users and RFID systems for tracking case files; and
 - v) Other court infrastructure projects such as vehicle replacement and copy machine replacement.
2. The submission, review, and approval process is as follows:
 - a. All requests will be submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration.
 - b. Requests will be submitted to the Administrative Director by the court’s presiding judge or court executive officer.
 - c. The Administrative Director will forward the request to the Judicial Council director of Finance.
 - d. Finance budget staff will review the request, ask the court to provide any missing or incomplete information, draft a preliminary report, share the preliminary report with the court for its comments, revise as necessary, and issue the report to a formal review body consisting of members from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC); the TCBAC subgroup will meet to review the request, hear any presentation of the court representative, and ask questions of the representative if one participates on behalf of the court; and Finance office budget staff will issue a final report on behalf of the TCBAC subgroup for the council.
 - e. The final report to the TCBAC review subgroup and the Judicial Council will be provided to the requesting court before the report is made publicly available on the California Courts website.
 - f. The court may send a representative to the TCBAC review subgroup and Judicial Council meetings to present its request and respond to questions.

3. To be considered at a scheduled Judicial Council business meeting, requests must be submitted to the Administrative Director at least 40 business days (approximately eight weeks) before that business meeting.
4. The Judicial Council may consider including appropriate terms and conditions that courts must accept for the council to approve designating TCTF fund balance on the court's behalf.
 - a. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions would result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
5. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine need to be revised to reflect a change (1) in the amounts by year to be distributed to the court for the planned annual expenditures and/or encumbrances, (2) in the total amount of the planned expenditures, or (3) of more than 10 percent of the total request among the categories of expense will need to be amended and resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process discussed in 1–3 above.
 - a. Denied revised requests will result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
6. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine have a change in purpose will need to be amended and resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process discussed in 1–3 above, along with a request that the TCTF funds held on behalf of the court for the previously approved request continue to be held on behalf of the court for this new purpose.
 - a. Denied new requests tied to previously approved requests will result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
7. On completion of the project or planned expenditure, courts are required to report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee within 90 days on the project or planned expenditure and how the funds were expended.
8. As part of the courts' audits in the scope of the normal audit cycle, a review of any funds that were held on behalf of the courts will be made to confirm that they were used for their stated approved purpose.

Criteria for Eligibility for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

TCTF fund balance will be held on behalf of the trial courts only for expenditures or projects that cannot be funded by the court's annual budget or three-year encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement.

Information Required to Be Provided by Trial Courts for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

Below is the information required to be provided by trial courts on the *Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court*:

SECTION I

General Information

- Superior court
- Date of submission
- Person authorizing the request
- Contact person and contact information
- Time period covered by the request (includes contribution and expenditure)
- Requested amount
- A description providing a brief summary of the request

SECTION II

Amended Request Changes

- Sections and answers amended
- A summary of changes to request

SECTION III

Trial Court Operations and Access to Justice

- An explanation as to why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term
- A description of how the request will enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs
- If a cost efficiency, cost comparison (*table template provided*)
- A description of the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved
- A description of the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved
- The alternatives that the court has identified if the request is not approved, and the reason why holding funding in the TCTF is the preferred alternative

SECTION IV

Financial Information

- Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures (*table template provided*)
- Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years during which the trial court would either be contributing to the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf (*table template provided*)

- Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project
(table template provided)
- A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year *(table template provided)*