



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**FISCAL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE**

**MATERIALS OCTOBER 4, 2017**

**Meeting Contents**

<b>Agenda</b> .....	2
<b>Minutes</b>	
Draft Minutes from the August 10, 2017 Meeting.....	4
<b>Discussion and Possible Action Items</b>	
<b>Item 1</b> – Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts Requests (Action Item) .....	6
<b>Item 2</b> – Consideration of Children’s Waiting Room Fund Balance Cap Adjustment Requests (Action Item) .....	46
<b>Item 3</b> – TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts Procedures (Action Item).....	61



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)  
[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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:** October 4, 2017  
**Time:** 12:00 p.m. - 1:00 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 August 10, 2017, Fiscal Planning Subcommittee meeting.

---

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

---

#### **Written Comment**

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to [tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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 12:00 p.m. on October 3, 2017 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

### **III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE 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 request from two trial courts and three 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

**Item 2**

**Consideration of Children’s Waiting Room Fund Balance Cap Adjustment Requests (Action Item)**

Consideration of whether to recommend that the Judicial Council approve Children’s Waiting Room fund balance cap adjustments in response to 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

**Item 3**

**TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts Procedures (Action Item)**

Consideration of whether to recommend that the Judicial Council approve revisions to the *Judicial–Council Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the 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](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)  
[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov)

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FISCAL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

August 10, 2017

4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

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

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

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Judges: Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson

**Others Present:** Ms. Suzanne Blihovde; Mr. Rick Beard; Ms. Linda Romero-Soles; Ms. Keri Brasil; Mr. Jarrod Orr; Ms. Debra Ostlund; Mr. Rick Feldstein; Terry McNally

OPEN MEETING

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. and roll was called.

**Approval of Minutes**

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the July 7, 2017 and July 11, 2017 Fiscal Planning Subcommittee meetings.

DISCUSSION AND 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

*Action: The Fiscal Panning Subcommittee unanimously approved the four new Funds Held on Behalf requests and the five amended Funds Held on Behalf request.*

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Report to the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee**

(Agenda Item 1)

**Title:** Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts Requests

**Date:** 10/4/2017

**Contact:** Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-263-1754 | [suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov](mailto:suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

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 request from two trial courts and three amended requests from three trial courts.

**Background**

At the Judicial Council's April 15, 2016 business meeting, the council approved the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommended process, criteria, and required information for trial courts to request TCTF reduced allocations (see Attachment H), related to the 1% fund balance cap, be retained in the TCTF as restricted fund balance for the benefit of those courts.

Categories or activities for which funds can be requested to be held include, but are not limited to: projects that extend beyond the original planned three-year process such as delayed deployment of information systems; technology improvements or infrastructure such as a new case management system; facilities maintenance or repair allowed under rule 10.810 of the California Rule of Court; court efficiencies such as online and smart forms for court users; and other court infrastructure projects such as vehicle replacement or copy machine replacement.

**TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Requests**

The TCTF funds held on behalf of the trial courts process requires that courts submit their requests at least 40 business days before the Judicial Council business meeting. Five courts have submitted requests within this time frame to be considered for Judicial Council's November 17, 2017 business meeting. Attachment A summarizes the new TCTF funds held on behalf requests totaling \$97,561. Amended requests, summarized in Attachment B, reduces the amount of approved TCTF funds by \$1,022,286. Greater detail on each court's request is provided in the attachments listed below.

**Attachments**

**Attachment A:** Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court (new requests)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Report to the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee**

**Attachment B:** Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court (amended requests)

**Attachment C:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Butte County

**Attachment D:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Siskiyou County

**Attachment E:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Mono County

**Attachment F:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of San Bernardino County

**Attachment G:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Sutter County

**Attachment H:** *Judicial Council—Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts*

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

Table 1: New Requests for November 17, 2017 Judicial Council meeting

Court	Request Number	Amount Requested	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	Total	Category	Quick Summary
Butte	04-17-02-00	53,561	53,561			53,561	Major Equipment	Purchase of a new electronic calendar system - Oroville Courthouse
Siskiyou	47-17-01-00	44,000	44,000			44,000	Technology Improvement	Replace CMS and operating servers
						-		
						-		
						-		
						-		
<b>Total - New Requests</b>		<b>97,561</b>	<b>97,561</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>97,561</b>		




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

Table 2: Amended Requests for November 17, 2017 Judicial Council meeting

Court	Request Number	Last Approved Amount	request change \$\$ amount?	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 +		
Mono	26-17-01-A1	115,000	Yes	18,279		75,000	40,000		93,279	40,000	Technology Improvement	Saving for new case management system. Anticipated additional funding of \$385K thru BCP process reduced to \$366K due to additional funds from court.
San Bernardino	36-17-01-A1	1,718,000	Yes	(1,020,568)		1,718,000			697,432		Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
Sutter	51-17-01-A1	80,837	Yes	(19,998)		80,837			60,840		Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of case management system
<b>Total: Amended Requests</b>		<b>1,913,837</b>		<b>(1,022,286)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,873,837</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>851,551</b>	<b>40,000</b>		

## APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>NEW REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>AMENDED REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
<b>SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION</b>		
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> Butte	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> <b>Kimberly Flener, Court Executive Officer</b>	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> <b>Jarrold Orr, Deputy Court Executive Officer</b>	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 9/20/2017	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:</b> \$53,561 FROM FY 2016-17 COURT RESERVES. PROJECT EXPENSES ARE ANTICIPATED IN FY 2017-18, WITH A POSSIBILITY OF EXTENDING THROUGH FY 2018-19	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> \$53,561
<b>REASON FOR REQUEST</b> <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> The project will replace the Court's current calendar posting process (manually posting of hardcopy printouts) at the Oroville Courthouse facility (04-A1) by expanding the electronic calendar posting board system recently installed in the new Chico Courthouse facility (04-F1).  Large electronic display flat panels will be installed at the main public entrance of 04-A1 in place of current cork board use for posting of paper calendars. This project will fund the hardware, software, and infrastructure (data cabling and power) aspects of this installation. If funding allows, smaller boards will also be installed outside each of the 11 individual courtrooms at the facility for posting of Courtroom-specific hearing information and messages.		
<b>SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES</b>		
<b>A. Identify sections and answers amended.</b>   <b>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</b>		
<b>SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b>		
<b>A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.</b>  The cost of the project is estimated to be \$53,561 which is a major capital (one-time) expense for the Court. The costs can't be absorbed by the Court's existing budget. Given the lack of a funding augmentation from the State in FY 2017-18 and a 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 operational budget to absorb this major capital 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?**

Our recent experience with electronic calendar boards at the Chico facility has proven them to be much more reliable, flexible, and efficient than the manual paper-posting process. In addition to offering the information in a much clearer and easier to follow format for the public than posting dozens of separate 8.5 x 11 pieces of paper, the information is automatically updated on the fly as changes occur in the Court's Case Management System throughout the day, ensuring that the public is seeing the most up-to-date information. The system also allows more flexibility to the Court in manipulating the data such as providing the ability to filter sensitive or confidential data than does the posting of a paper calendar. Because calendar changes are posted automatically, Court staff will not have to go into the public space, or interfere with the public who are actively attempting to view the calendars, when calendar changes occur throughout the day.

**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 need to maintain its paper process. In addition to losing the opportunity for improving public access for the public as described above, it continues to require Court staff to go into unsecured (public) areas of the facility to post daily calendars and to disrupt the public when posting calendar changes. The unnecessary time and effort that this takes on the part of staff would continue.

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

See D above. In reality, this means that the data posted for the public to review is more likely to be out-of-date and inaccurate, resulting either in longer lines at the counters or in parties going to the wrong courtroom. Because paper calendar information cannot be updated until a calendar is completely finalized, the significant delays in notification to the public will continue. The Oroville facility is Butte's principal Criminal Courthouse, so day-of calendar changes are frequent and ongoing, not only in terms of last-minute calendar add-ons, but also calendars such as in-custody arraignments which are constantly in flux until the last minute (and sometimes after). It is essentially impossible to keep this information up-to-date in the public areas by posting paper calendars.

**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 identified alternative is to maintain the status quo with the aforementioned paper process. The Court does not have the funding in its operational budget to move forward with this project as it is a major capital expense. Had the Court received an augmentation to its allocation for this fiscal year, it may have been possible to consider funding it out of the current year funding.

**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 procurement 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									
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL	
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>176,821</b>	<b>318,852</b>	-					<b>495,673</b>	
Revenues	12,110,521	564,351	687,376					<b>13,362,248</b>	
Expenditures	11,840,660	598,511	703,503					<b>13,142,674</b>	
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(51,255)	35,128	16,127					-	
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>395,427</b>	<b>319,820</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>715,247</b>	

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

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

Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court

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									
	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL	FUNDS	
<b>REVENUES</b>										
State Financing Sources	11,651,909	80,332								11,732,241
Grants	-		1,074,950							1,074,950
Other Financing Sources	341,151	473,850								815,001
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>11,993,060</b>	<b>554,182</b>	<b>1,074,950</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>13,622,192</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>										
Salaries	5,653,865	338,172	522,254							6,514,291
Staff Benefits	3,090,706	148,213	249,651							3,488,570
General Expense	455,169	-	44,755							499,924
Printing	7,750									7,750
Telecommunications	115,666		31,529							147,195
Postage	91,500		150							91,650
Insurance	5,800									5,800
Travel in State	47,165		7,831							54,996
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	1,412,238	57,733	104,456							1,574,427
Consulting and Professional Services										
- County Provided	19,675									19,675
Information Technology (IT)	238,883	67,339	4,796							311,018
Major Equipment	180,239									180,239
Other Items of Expense										-
Juror Costs	73,500									73,500
Other	209,700									209,700
Debt Service										-
Court Construction										-
Distributed Administration & Allocation	(124,155)		124,155							-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment										-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>12,197,432</b>	<b>611,457</b>	<b>1,091,077</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>13,899,966</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(48,860)	32,733	16,127							-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>										
Beginning Balance (Deficit)	395,426									715,276
Ending Balance (Deficit)	142,194	295,308	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	437,502

Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court

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

GL Account	Expenses Category		Amount
	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		53,561
950000	Other Items of Expense		
972000	Other		
973000	Debt Service		
983000	Court Construction		
990000	Distributed Administration & Allocation		
<b>Total</b>			<b>53,561</b>

**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	Select Fiscal Year	Total
Contribution	53,561								53,561
Expenditures		53,561							53,561
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>									<b>107,122</b>



## 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

<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> Siskiyou	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> <b>Reneé McCanna Crane, CEO</b>	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> <b>Lorena Barnes 530-842-8368 lbarnes@siskiyou.courts.ca.gov</b>	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 8/9/2012	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FY 2017/2018</b>	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> <b>\$44,000.00</b>

**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 reason for this request is to replace our servers, which are used to maintain our case management and operating systems. Our servers are coming up on their 5<sup>th</sup> birthday and as you may or may not be aware, the typical lifespan is 3.5 years pursuant to the IT world. As workloads on servers increase, replacing aging hardware becomes mission critical.

### 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.**
- Siskiyou had remaining funds from fiscal year 2016/2017 of \$44,000.00 which we could use to replace our servers. Siskiyou would like to use these funds from FY 2016/2017 since Siskiyou suffered a reduction of \$86,737 for FY 2017/2018. This reduction would limit the Court's ability to provide coverage on other operating expenses because of how much it will cost to replace our servers.

**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 replacement of our servers will ensure a continuation of a functional and effective case management and operating system without interruptions and downtime for the court and the public.
- 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.**  
 Having interruptions and downtime on the systems will cause a delay in services provided to the public, as well as create a backlog of work for court staff.
- E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.**  
 It would cause a delay in providing information in a timely manner to the public, whether providing case specific information or taking payments. It would also affect the public's access to case and calendar information through our court website.
- 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 Court would have to use other funds in order to replace the servers which in turn would then cut into other resources from our operating budget. The extra funds from FY 2016/2017 would be the best option to utilize in replacing our servers.

**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**  
See attachment

- 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**  
  
See attachment

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

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

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

FY 2016-17	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>75,558</b>	<b>111,491</b>						<b>187,048</b>
Revenues	3,676,461	42,057	758,384					<b>4,476,901</b>
Expenditures	3,559,431	2,999	818,713					<b>4,381,144</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(60,330)		60,330					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>132,258</b>	<b>150,548</b>	<b>0</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>282,806</b>

FY 2015-16	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>279,026</b>	<b>67,917</b>						<b>346,943</b>
Revenues	3,710,688	44,398	897,965					<b>4,653,051</b>
Expenditures	3,832,452	824	979,670					<b>4,812,946</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(81,705)		81,705					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>75,558</b>	<b>111,491</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>187,048</b>

FY 2014-15	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>502,074</b>	<b>27,839</b>						<b>529,914</b>
Revenues	3,665,890	44,903	760,329					<b>4,471,122</b>
Expenditures	3,764,881	4,825	884,386					<b>4,654,092</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(124,057)		124,057					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>279,026</b>	<b>67,917</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>346,943</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 c

	FY 2017-18		FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL	
<b>REVENUES</b>									
State Financing Sources	3,542,876							3,542,876	
Grants	354,924							354,924	
Other Financing Sources	399,705							399,705	
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>4,297,505</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>4,297,505</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>									
Salaries	1,889,808							1,889,808	
Staff Benefits	1,359,944							1,359,944	
General Expense	78,085							78,085	
Printing	5,500							5,500	
Telecommunications	42,308							42,308	
Postage	33,000							33,000	
Insurance	1,500							1,500	
Travel in State	19,575							19,575	
Travel Out of State								-	
Training	2,500							2,500	
Security								-	
Facilities Operations								-	
Utilities	17,400							17,400	
Contracted Services	586,505							586,505	
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	143,239							143,239	
Information Technology (IT)	52,250							52,250	
Major Equipment	50,000							50,000	
Other Items of Expense	2,000							2,000	
Juror Costs	64,000							64,000	
Other	50,000							50,000	
Debt Service								-	
Court Construction								-	
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-	
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>4,397,614</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>4,397,614</b>	
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-	
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>									
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>								-	
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>(100,109)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>(100,109)</b>	


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	44,000
950000	Other Items of Expense	
972000	Other	
973000	Debt Service	
983000	Court Construction	
990000	Distributed Administration & Allocation	
<b>Total</b>		<b>44,000</b>

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 ▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	Total
Contribution	44,000								44,000
Expenditures		44,000							44,000
Cumulative Balance	44,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEW REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>AMENDED REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
<b>SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION</b>		
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> Click here to enter court MONO	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> <b>Hector Gonzalez</b>	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> <b>Tammy Laframboise 760-923-2304</b>	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 9/21/2017	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:</b> <b>FY 16-17 – FY 19-20</b>	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> <del>\$115,000</del> <b>\$133,279</b>
<b>REASON FOR REQUEST</b> <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>  Mono Court needs to replace the current case management system that is over 15 years old. It is being phased out by our current vendor who will no longer offer technical support.		
<b>SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES</b>		
<b>A. Identify sections and answers amended.</b>  Section I, II, Section IV.B tab & Section IV.D tab		
<b>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</b>  Now that FY 16-17 has been finalized, the FY 16-17 contribution amount changed from \$75,000 to \$93,729 and the BCP funding was reduced by the \$18,729 increase.		
<b>SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b>		
<b>A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.</b> The preliminary estimate for a new Case Management System is approximately \$500,000 including all hardware, software and staff training. This is nearly one fourth of our annual budget so it would be very difficult to cover that expenditure as well as the operating expenses without assistance.		



**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?**  
 Funding is needed to replace our case management system that provides the foundation of important operational functions such as maintenance of case information, defendant information, party information and attorney information. Current case management system is antiquated and is still a DOS based system. It is difficult to use since it requires keyboard stroke commands and is highly inefficient given the amount of staff time necessary to use the system. Replacing it with a graphic user interface Windows based system will increase staff productivity.
- C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).**  
 Cost efficiency is not the main benefit. Replacement of the current case management system with a reliable system that will be supported is the main benefit and increased staff productivity is a secondary benefit.
- D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.**  
 Current case management system is operating; however, it needs frequent technical support. Our current case management vendor is creating a new case management system platform that will replace the current system and has indicated that at some point in the future, technical support will not be provided for the old system. Failure to replace our current case management system will leave us vulnerable to system failures which could lead to the inability to do our basic court operations and the potential loss of irreplaceable court case data.
- E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.**  
 Court customer service to the public would be substantially impaired and significantly delayed if our case management system is not replaced and becomes unreliable. We may not be able to fulfill the public's request for case information or for search requests. We will have difficulty providing necessary information for our justice partners which will also negatively impact the flow of 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?**  
 If necessary, our court will seek supplemental funding from the Judicial Council. However, we believe that use of our own funding to reduce the amount of supplemental funding needed from the Judicial Council will place us in a stronger position to be approved for supplemental funding. Rather than expend all our surplus funds on vitally important materials supplies and equipment, we decided it would be a better long-term investment to place the money in the Judicial Council holding fund.

**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**

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. A tab

**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**

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. D tab

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

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. C tab

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

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. B tab

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
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	-	-	-					-
Revenues	1,942,902	49,060	132,957					2,124,919
Expenditures	1,904,795	36,599	139,591					2,080,985
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(6,634)		6,634					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>31,473</b>	<b>12,461</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>43,934</b>

FY 2014-15	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	10	24,915	-					24,925
Revenues	1,663,886	47,763	92,930					1,804,579
Expenditures	1,663,896	72,678	92,930					1,829,504
Operating Transfers In (Out)	-	-	-					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

FY 2013-14	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	466,046	12,453	-					478,499
Revenues	1,437,860	12,622	78,195					1,528,677
Expenditures	1,903,896	160	78,195					1,982,251
Operating Transfers In (Out)	-	-	-					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24,915</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>24,925</b>

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

	FY 2016-17		FUNDS				
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary
<b>REVENUES</b>							
State Financing Sources	1,936,627	12,694					
Grants			145,596				
Other Financing Sources	33,990	45,905					
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>1,970,617</b>	<b>58,599</b>	<b>145,596</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>							
Salaries	732,060	23,985	17,371				
Staff Benefits	589,045	4,059	10,746				
General Expense	141,467	1,746	11,451				
Printing	1,449	112	186				
Telecommunications	18,251	1,065	4,269				
Postage	10,180	784	79				
Insurance	1,813	-	-				
Travel in State	1,193	-	1,000				
Travel Out of State	-	-	-				
Training	495	-	115				
Security	900	-	230				
Facilities Operations	28,556	3	10,050				
Utilities	-	-	-				
Contracted Services	196,381	4,677	89,272				
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,353	-	-				
Information Technology (IT)	114,666	7,350	2,838				
Major Equipment	42,480	-	-				
Other Items of Expense	4,802	-	724				
Juror Costs	589						
Other		290					
Debt Service							
Court Construction							
Distributed Administration & Allocation							
Prior Year Expense Adjustment							
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>1,888,680</b>	<b>44,071</b>	<b>148,332</b>	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)							
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>							
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>							
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>81,937</b>	<b>14,528</b>	<b>(2,736)</b>	-	-	-	-

Current detailed budget projectionance held on the court’s behalf

		FY 2017-18	FUNDS							
Description	TOTAL	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL	
<b>REVENUES</b>										
State Financing Sources	1,949,321	1,998,953	11,757						2,010,710	
Grants	145,596			111,738					111,738	
Other Financing Sources	79,895	35,915	40,248						76,163	
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>2,174,812</b>	<b>2,034,868</b>	<b>52,005</b>	<b>111,738</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>2,198,610</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>										
Salaries	773,417	831,491	16,481	13,299					861,271	
Staff Benefits	603,849	662,464	11,980	6,509					680,953	
General Expense	154,664	90,812	1,545	8,612					100,969	
Printing	1,747	1,811	100	-					1,911	
Telecommunications	23,586	22,504	921	3,853					27,277	
Postage	11,043	11,604	547	43					12,193	
Insurance	1,813	2,394	-	-					2,394	
Travel in State	2,193	3,504	-	536					4,040	
Travel Out of State	-	-	-	-					-	
Training	610	283	-	127					409	
Security	1,131	684	-	101					786	
Facilities Operations	38,609	35,640	3	3,310					38,953	
Utilities	-	-	-	-					-	
Contracted Services	290,330	181,639	3,800	71,561					257,000	
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,353	4,405	-	-					4,405	
Information Technology (IT)	124,853	112,155	17,425	2,449					132,029	
Major Equipment	42,480	47,588	-	-					47,588	
Other Items of Expense	5,527	5,636	-	797					6,432	
Juror Costs	589								-	
Other	290								-	
Debt Service	-								-	
Court Construction	-								-	
Distributed Administration & Allocation	-								-	
Prior Year Expense Adjustment	-								-	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>2,081,084</b>	<b>2,014,612</b>	<b>52,802</b>	<b>111,197</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>2,178,611</b>	
Operating Transfers In (Out)	-								-	
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>										
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	-	81,937	14,528	(2,736)	-	-	-	-	93,729	
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>93,729</b>	<b>102,193</b>	<b>13,730</b>	<b>(2,195)</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>113,729</b>	

Current detailed budget projection

	FY 2018-19		FUNDS				
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary
<b>REVENUES</b>							
State Financing Sources	2,383,953	11,757					
Grants			111,738				
Other Financing Sources	35,915	40,248					
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>2,419,868</b>	<b>52,005</b>	<b>111,738</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>							
Salaries	831,491	16,481	13,299				
Staff Benefits	662,464	11,980	6,509				
General Expense	90,812	1,545	8,612				
Printing	1,811	100	-				
Telecommunications	22,504	921	3,853				
Postage	11,604	547	43				
Insurance	2,394	-	-				
Travel in State	3,504	-	536				
Travel Out of State	-	-	-				
Training	283	-	127				
Security	684	-	101				
Facilities Operations	35,640	3	3,310				
Utilities	-	-	-				
Contracted Services	181,639	3,800	71,561				
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,405	-	-				
Information Technology (IT)	112,155	17,425	2,449				
Major Equipment	47,588	-	-				
Other Items of Expense	5,636	-	797				
Juror Costs							
Other							
Debt Service							
Court Construction							
Distributed Administration & Allocation							
Prior Year Expense Adjustment							
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>2,014,612</b>	<b>52,802</b>	<b>111,197</b>	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)							
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>							
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>102,193</b>	<b>13,730</b>	<b>(2,195)</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>507,450</b>	<b>12,933</b>	<b>(1,654)</b>	-	-	-	-

Current detailed budget projection:

		FY 2019-20	FUNDS							
Description	TOTAL	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL	
<b>REVENUES</b>										
State Financing Sources	2,395,710	1,998,953	11,757						2,010,710	
Grants	111,738			111,738					111,738	
Other Financing Sources	76,163	35,915	40,248						76,163	
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>2,583,610</b>	<b>2,034,868</b>	<b>52,005</b>	<b>111,738</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>2,198,610</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>										
Salaries	861,271	851,490	16,481	13,299					881,270	
Staff Benefits	680,953	662,464	11,980	6,509					680,953	
General Expense	100,969	90,812	1,545	8,612					100,969	
Printing	1,911	1,811	100	-					1,911	
Telecommunications	27,277	22,504	921	3,853					27,277	
Postage	12,193	11,604	547	43					12,193	
Insurance	2,394	2,394	-	-					2,394	
Travel in State	4,040	3,504	-	536					4,040	
Travel Out of State	-	-	-	-					-	
Training	409	283	-	127					409	
Security	786	684	-	101					786	
Facilities Operations	38,953	35,640	3	3,310					38,953	
Utilities	-	-	-	-					-	
Contracted Services	257,000	281,639	3,800	71,561					357,000	
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,405	4,405	-	-					4,405	
Information Technology (IT)	132,029	512,155	17,425	2,449					532,029	
Major Equipment	47,588	47,588	-	-					47,588	
Other Items of Expense	6,432	5,636	-	797					6,432	
Juror Costs	-								-	
Other	-								-	
Debt Service	-								-	
Court Construction	-								-	
Distributed Administration & Allocation	-								-	
Prior Year Expense Adjustment	-								-	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>2,178,611</b>	<b>2,534,611</b>	<b>52,802</b>	<b>111,197</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>2,698,610</b>	
Operating Transfers In (Out)	-								-	
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>										
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>113,729</b>	<b>507,450</b>	<b>12,933</b>	<b>(1,654)</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>518,728</b>	
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>518,728</b>	<b>7,707</b>	<b>12,135</b>	<b>(1,113)</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>18,729</b>	

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	100,000
940000	Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	
943000	Information Technology (IT)	400,000
945000	Major Equipment	
950000	Other Items of Expense	
972000	Other	
973000	Debt Service	
983000	Court Construction	
990000	Distributed Administration & Allocation	
<b>Total</b>		<b>500,000</b>



**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 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	Select Fiscal Year	Select Fiscal Year	Select Fiscal Year	Select Fiscal Year	Total
Contribution	75,000	20,000	20,000						115,000
BCP Funding			385,000						385,000
Expenditures				500,000					500,000
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>75,000</b>	<b>95,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description									Total
Contribution	93,279	20,000	20,000						133,279
BCP Funding			366,721						366,721
Expenditures				500,000					500,000
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>93,279</b>	<b>113,279</b>	<b>500,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Mono Court has put in a request to be included in the next consortium of courts to receive additional funding to assist with the purchase of a new case management system. We anticipate that may happen in 2018-19 so included in the budget for that year is an additional \$366,721 to add to the \$115,000 that the court will have saved by using the TCTF Funds Held on Beheld of the Court process. The purchase will be paid in full (\$500,000) in the following 2019-20.

## APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEW REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>AMENDED REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
<b>SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION</b>		
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> San Bernardino	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Raymond L. Haight III	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> Nancy CS Eberhardt, Court Executive Officer, 909-708-8769	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 9/5/2017	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FY 2017-18</b>	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> <del>\$ 1,718,000.00</del> \$ 697,432.41
<b>REASON FOR REQUEST</b> <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 San Bernardino Superior Court is requesting the Judicial Council of California to hold court monies subject to the 1% fund balance restriction in the Trial Court Trust Fund in order to effectively implement the second stage (Project 2) of the court's new case management system (CMS). For purposes of this discussion, Project 1 refers to criminal &amp; traffic case types and Project 2 refers to civil, family, small claims/unlawful detainers, and probate case types.</p> <p>Due to unforeseen delays and complications that have significantly extended the CMS rollout beyond the original schedule, the court is now facing certain funding restrictions and seeks an extension on the encumbered funds dedicated to this project.</p>		
<b>SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES</b>		
<p><b>A. Identify sections and answers amended. Requested Amount</b></p> <p><b>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</b> The San Bernardino Superior Court requests an amendment to the previously submitted TCTF funds held request from an amount of \$1,718,000.00 in expiring FY 2014-15 funding to the updated amount of \$697,432.41. This change results from a review of the 2014-15 fund balance, which when factored in results in the reduced amount noted above.</p>		
<b>SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b>		
<p><b>A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.</b></p> <p>This CMS rollout does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process or the three-year encumbrance term because of the additional year required to fully implement certain deliverables associated with the project.</p> <p>The Court began planning for the first phase, Project 1, in FY 2013-14 when it entered into contract with Tyler Technologies for the implementation of its Odyssey CMS solution. Planning for the second phase, Project 2, which included all other cases types began in FY 2014-15.</p> <p>The rollout of Project 1 was delayed multiple times and then suffered serious setbacks after go-live, which caused and resulted in the delay for Project 2. The implementation timeline for Project 2 was projected to</p>		

be completed by the end of fiscal year FY 2016-17. However, due to the difficulties in implementation of Project 1 as mentioned above, funds originally reserved for Project 2 will not be liquidated within the three-year encumbrance term. This will require funds to be held on behalf of the court in the TCTF.

**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 request will allow the court to continue its current CMS roll-out schedule, while utilizing the funds originally designated and prevent funding impacts to other critical services to court users. With the full implementation of CMS Projects 1 & 2, the court anticipates case flow processing improvements, increased accuracy of case information and reporting, enhanced digital access for court users, and a better customer service experience for the public and stakeholders alike.

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

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

**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 funds reserved for Project 2 from FY 2014-15 are currently set to expire on June 30, 2017. The amount of funds reserved exceeds the 1% fund balance limit for that fiscal year and will ultimately lead to monies being lost, if this request is not approved. The court does not currently have an available fund balance to replace the previously reserved funds. If this request is not approved, the ability of the court to maintain access to justice at its current levels will be compromised because the court may be forced to halt implementation of Project 2. Highlighting the need for a replacement system and further compounding the court's technology situation, the vendor for the legacy CMS—currently supporting civil, family, probate, and other case types—cannot continue to provide support to the court beyond June 30, 2019. This situation puts the court in an extremely precarious position.

To put it bluntly, the loss of these funds would require the use of dedicated operational money. This will adversely affect the court's ability to maintain current levels of access, including plans to reopen a remote courthouse, reduce our ability to fund programs like self-help, homeless court, and other critical court functions. Further, there is no option but to fund this rollout since the legacy CMS will not be supported after June 2019.

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

Any issues that will affect the legacy CMS beyond June 30, 2019 will go unsupported. Without local resources, the court could suffer downtime or other system related issues which will affect public services and access to justice.

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

San Bernardino Superior Court has made the implementation of Project 2 a top priority and, due to our investment of time and resources to date, switching vendors at this point is not a viable option. As an alternative, should the request not be approved, the court will find the funds for Project 2 by cutting funding in other areas of the court—which would ultimately negatively impact court user access to the San Bernardino Superior Court system.

As part of our governance structure, there are weekly meetings between the Executive Management Team and the CMS Vendor to resolve pending issues. Collaboratively, we have fixed a large volume of outstanding items and plan to continue to meet weekly to complete implementation successfully.

The Court has broken the rollout of Project 2 into smaller and separate implementation tracks. While this will extend the original implementation timeline, the court believes this change in strategy will better manage changes to business processes and any necessary troubleshooting throughout the project.

While current estimates of costs and implementation milestones indicate that the funds being held on behalf of the court will be liquidated within FY 2017-18, we request approval for any unspent funds to be available in FY 2018-19 should any phases associated with these funds not be completed by the end of next fiscal year.

**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**  
Not applicable for one year extension requests.
- 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**  
Not applicable for one year extension requests.
- C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project**  
Not applicable for one year extension requests.
- D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year**  
Not applicable for one year extension requests.

**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 May 19, 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	1,718,000								1,718,000
Contribution									-
Expenditures			1,718,000						1,718,000
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>1,718,000</b>	<b>1,718,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	697,432								697,432
Contribution									-
Expenditures			697,432						697,432
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>697,432</b>	<b>697,432</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEW REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>AMENDED REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
<b>SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION</b>		
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> Sutter	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Stephanie M. Hansel, Court Executive Officer	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> Joe Azevedo, Court Fiscal Manager, (530) 822-3340; jazevedo@suttercourts.com	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 9/8/2017	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FISCAL YEAR</b> 2017-2018	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> \$60,839.69
<b>REASON FOR REQUEST</b> <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>JSI: Professional services and deliverables on jury management system that is partially implemented (\$13,948.76).</p> <p>Tyler: Professional services and deliverables on new case management system that is partially implemented (\$34,526.20).</p> <p>Ricoh: Final term of purchase agreement for copiers (\$12,364.73).</p>		
<b>SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES</b>		
<p><b>A. Identify sections and answers amended.</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Section I, Requested Amount, JSI amount, and Ricoh amount.</p> <p><b>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">JSI: The Court used \$17,324.80 in FY 16-17 Court Operation funds towards this project. Therefore, the amount is being revised down from \$31,273.56 to \$13,948.76.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Ricoh: The Court used \$2,672.70 in FY 16-17 Court Operation funds towards this lease agreement. Therefore, the amount is being revised down from \$15,037.43 to \$12,364.73.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Total Requested Amount is being revised from \$80,837.19 to \$60,839.69.</p>		
<b>SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE</b>		
<p><b>A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.</b></p>		

The JSI funds encumbered in 2014 were impacted by the delay of our new courthouse completion for one year and the delay of our new case management system implementation by 8 months. The kiosks have been installed, however configuration of the programming that is utilized by the public is in progress but not completed and we expect that configuration to be completed in fiscal year 17-18.

The Tyler funds encumbered in 2014 are the remaining project of our Odyssey case management system. The clerk's edition component requires four months of configuration. The multiple delays of our implementation date and substantial staff resources devoted to ongoing issues with functionality have delayed our ability to implement the next phase until a date outside of the three year encumbrance period. The project will be completed in fiscal year 17-18.

The copier lease to purchase agreement covered a term that extends beyond the original three year encumbrance period. The structure of the encumbrance and cap process has changed substantially over this time period and extending this encumbrance into fiscal year 17-18 will allow the current administration to satisfy the contractual obligation entered into at the time of the encumbrance.

#### 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 JSI project will provide additional services and resources to jurors through our web portal as opposed to a phone call or visit to the courthouse during business hours.

The Tyler project will increase efficiency for courtroom clerks and assist in reducing backlog.

The Ricoh project will allow us to complete the purchase of the court's copiers, an important piece of our infrastructure.

**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.**

If the request is not approved it will impact the court's budget in fiscal year 17-18 as the amount requested would be liquidated and reduce the court's allocation for fiscal year 17-18. Further, it puts the court in a position of defaulting on the previously entered into contracts that we were unable to fully implement.

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

Not approving the request would affect the ability to serve the public as court resources, specifically staffing would be affected.

**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 court could not identify alternatives should the request not be approved. Holding funding in the TCTF is the only 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**

Work to be completed in fiscal year 17-18.

**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**

Work to be completed in fiscal year 17-18.

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

Work to be completed in fiscal year 17-18.

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

Work to be completed in fiscal year 17-18.



**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 May 19, 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	80,837								80,837
Contribution									-
Expenditures			80,837						80,837
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>80,837</b>	<b>80,837</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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	60,840								60,840
Contribution									-
Expenditures			60,840						60,840
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>60,840</b>	<b>60,840</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

## ***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*)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Report to the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee**

(Agenda Item 2)

**Title:** Consideration of Children’s Waiting Room Fund Balance Cap Adjustment Requests

**Date:** 10/4/2017

**Contact:** Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-263-1754 | [suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov](mailto:suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of whether to recommend that the Judicial Council approve Children’s Waiting Room fund balance cap adjustments in response to requests from three trial courts.

**Background**

The Judicial Council revised its Children’s Waiting Room (CWR) Distribution and Fund Balance Policy on June 26, 2015, placing a cap on the amount of CWR fund balance that courts can accumulate. Courts with fund balances that exceed the cap are required to return the amount above the cap to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) by the end of the fiscal year, unless the council approves a court’s request for a cap adjustment. The Judicial Council approved additional revisions to the policy on March 24, 2017 to extend the review and adjustment of CWR fund balances from an annual to a biennial schedule, beginning with the 2016–17 fund balances (Attachment 2E).

**2016–17 CWR Cap Adjustment Requests**

On August 25, 2017, Judicial Council Budget Services staff sent out the Estimated 2016-2017 CWR Fund Balance Cap Reductions (Attachment 2A) to all trial courts. Attachment 2A identified seven courts that had CWR fund balances above their cap. Three courts have submitted requests for CWR fund balance cap adjustments that total to \$862,289. These courts’ rationale for the adjustments are listed below.

1. Contra Costa: CWR fund balance cap adjustment of \$66,981 (Attachment 2B). This request is based on the continuation of multi-year contracts and projected annual expenditures exceeding annual revenues.
2. Orange: CWR fund balance cap adjustment of \$352,922 (Attachment 2C). This request is based on the continuation of multi-year contracts and projected annual expenditures exceeding annual revenues.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Report to the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee**

3. Santa Barbara: CWR fund balance cap adjustment of \$443,386 (Attachment 2D). This request is based on the continuation of multi-year contracts and projected annual expenditures exceeding annual revenues.

Of the remaining four courts with CWR fund balances above the cap, two courts (San Luis Obispo and Stanislaus) agreed to the fund balance reductions. One court (Monterey) did not qualify for the reduction as this court has not yet begun operating a CWR and has a Judicial Council approved request from May 2017 to continue to collect CWR revenues to generate sufficient funds to begin CWR operations. And the final court, San Mateo, had transferred \$200,000 in General Fund monies into the CWR account to cover multi-year contract expenses. This has been the court's practice so that it could cover expenses beyond what their restricted CWR revenue allows. The CWR fund balance policy is in place to prevent and discourage courts from accumulating fund balances in a restricted revenue stream that could otherwise be used for other purposes in the TCTF. As San Mateo's fund balance is due to unrestricted funds being put into the CWR account to cover a multi-year contract, no fund balance cap adjustment request was deemed necessary for the Judicial Council to approve. San Mateo has asked that the CWR policy be clarified to specifically allow exemptions to submitting fund balance cap adjustments due to the transfer of unrestricted funds into the CWR account.

2016-2017 Biennial Review of Children's Waiting Room Fund Balances

Court	A 2014-15	B 2015-16	C 2016-17	D Highest Dist.
Alameda	165,434	162,487	161,044	165,434
Alpine	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-
Butte	21,312	19,372	23,243	23,243
Calaveras	-	-	-	-
Colusa	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa	106,292	104,333	110,553	110,553
Del Norte	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	-	-	-	-
Fresno	98,711	98,469	102,249	102,249
Glenn	-	-	-	-
Humboldt	-	-	-	-
Imperial	-	-	-	-
Inyo	-	-	-	-
Kern	-	-	-	-
Kings	-	-	-	-
Lake	-	-	-	-
Lassen	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	829,265	830,421	1,135,306	1,135,306
Madera	-	-	-	-
Marin	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	-	-	-	-
Mendocino	-	-	-	-
Merced	20,851	(95,781)	-	20,851
Modoc	-	-	-	-
Mono	-	-	-	-
Monterey	35,124	32,856	34,348	35,124
Napa	-	-	-	-
Nevada	-	-	-	-
Orange	376,107	369,617	395,976	395,976
Placer	-	-	-	-
Plumas	-	-	-	-
Riverside	254,609	253,815	267,712	267,712
Sacramento	241,942	504,807	331,970	504,807
San Benito	-	-	-	-
San Bernardino	-	-	254,178	254,178
San Diego	350,800	336,581	363,973	363,973
San Francisco	106,721	115,160	119,097	119,097
San Joaquin	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	24,872	23,484	25,058	25,058
San Mateo	66,316	64,791	68,540	68,540
Santa Barbara	39,718	39,686	41,033	41,033
Santa Clara	154,615	147,497	148,907	154,615
Santa Cruz	-	-	-	-
Shasta	-	-	-	-
Sierra	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-
Solano	47,757	46,724	48,472	48,472
Sonoma	48,527	45,987	46,841	48,527
Stanislaus	21,299	19,924	20,812	21,299
Sutter	-	-	-	-
Tehama	-	-	-	-
Trinity	-	-	-	-
Tulare	-	-	-	-
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-
Ventura	83,721	84,342	87,949	87,949
Yolo	-	-	-	-
Yuba	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,093,995</b>	<b>3,204,572</b>	<b>3,787,262</b>	<b>3,993,999</b>

E CWR 16-17 Fund Balance	F CWR Reduction
69,270	-
-	-
-	-
10,011	-
-	-
-	-
177,534	(66,981)
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
428,506	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
103,177	(68,053)
-	-
-	-
747,898	(351,922)
-	-
-	-
141,514	-
368,698	-
-	-
126,416	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
55,670	(30,612)
200,875	(132,335)
484,419	(443,386)
125,995	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
46,860	-
7,382	-
82,229	(60,929)
-	-
-	-
-	-
-	-
45,345	-
-	-
-	-
3,221,799	(1,154,218)

Info Only		
CWR 14-15 Fund Balance	CWR 15-16 Fund Balance	CWR 15-16 Fund Balance Reduction <sup>1</sup>
417,014	269,323	(77,305)
-	-	-
-	-	-
13,736	6,148	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
1,092,262	1,044,995	(845,962)
-	-	-
244,892	245,806	(245,806)
34,043	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
853,148	539,503	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
92,638	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
35,157	68,223	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
1,287,568	1,009,393	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
138,470	123,107	-
190,408	451,860	(155,661)
-	-	-
-	-	-
0	-	-
(0)	-	-
-	-	-
290,713	315,631	(285,783)
971	9,886	-
516,950	503,272	-
649,828	558,715	(369,755)
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
248,473	234,248	(176,197)
15,119	10,578	-
1,044,233	1,055,373	(993,567)
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
50,556	50,026	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
7,216,178	6,496,087	(3,150,036)

1. Updated from information provided in August 28, 2017 email to include CWR reductions taken in November 2016 distribution.



**CHILDREN'S WAITING ROOM (CWR)  
ANNUAL REPORTING FOR COURTS WITH CWR CAP ADJUSTMENTS /  
BIENNIAL FUND BALANCE CAP ADJUSTMENT REQUEST**

Please check all that apply:

**ANNUAL REPORTING FOR COURTS WITH CWR CAP ADJUSTMENTS**

*(Complete Sections I and II) To be submitted in fiscal years ending in an even number (i.e., 2017-2018)*

**BIENNIAL FUND BALANCE CAP ADJUSTMENT REQUEST** *(Complete Sections I, II, and III)*

*To be submitted in fiscal years ending in an odd number (i.e., 2016-2017)*



**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

**SUPERIOR COURT:**

Contra Costa

**PERSON AUTHORIZING REPORT** *(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):*

Stephen H Nash, CEO

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO** *(Please include mailing address, email, and phone number):* **Jeff Jones, Financial Services Manager**

**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

9/19/2017

**RECEIVED AT LEAST 12 MONTHS OF DISTRIBUTIONS IN THE LAST FISCAL YEAR:**  
**YES**  **NO**  *(No biennial reporting is required if less than 12 months of distributions received)*

**DO YOU HAVE MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS?** **YES**  **NO**  *(If yes, provide an explanation of the contracts in the CWR Program Update below)*

**CWR PROGRAM UPDATE** *(Please briefly summarize the status of your current program):*

The court is still operating a Children's waiting room, and has a contract with a vendor to run the CWR. The contract with the vendor currently runs through 6/30/2018

## SECTION II: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

- A. THREE-YEAR HISTORY AND THREE-YEAR PROJECTION OF YEAR END FUND BALANCES, REVENUES, AND EXPENDITURES** (Double click below for Excel spreadsheet. Please populate rows 1 and 2, and the beginning fund balance in cell A3. The rest of the sheet is formula driven and will automatically populate. If requesting an adjustment to the calculated CAP and return of funds to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), enter the amount (row 7) being requested and complete Section III):

Row	Fiscal Year	Actual			Estimated			
		Beginning Fund Balance	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
1	Revenue Distributed to the Court		106,292	104,333	110,553	92,222	84,264	76,993
1a	Interest/Other Adj.		2,445	2,890	-842,413			
2	Expenditures		130,867	154,489	135,601	120,000	120,000	120,000
3	Fund Balance	1,114,391	1,092,262	1,044,995	177,534	149,756	114,020	71,013
<b>CWR Fund Balance above CAP Calculation:</b>								
4	Highest Year of Revenue Distributed to the Court	110,553						
5	Fund Balance at the End of the Current Fiscal Year	177,534						
6	Amount to Return to the TCTF	66,981						
7	Requested Adjustment to Fund Balance CAP <sup>1</sup>	66,981						
<sup>1</sup> Due to the Director of Budget Services within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year								


- B. CURRENT DETAILED EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS/PLAN FOR NEXT THREE FISCAL YEARS** (Please provide an explanation of the expenditure plan that ties to row 2, columns E, F, and G):

The court plans to continue running the CWR in the foreseeable future, and is projecting expenditures to remain consistent. The court will negotiate another contract after FY 17/18, and until then, the court will not know if there will be any variation on future expenditures, so we are projecting the same level of expenditures in the next 3 years.

**SECTION III: RETURNING FUNDS ABOVE THE CAP TO THE TCTF****A. IF REQUESTING AN ADJUSTMENT TO THE FUND BALANCE CAP, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR JUSTIFICATION BELOW** *(Include a summary of your ongoing CWR expenditure plan):*

As revenue projections continue to decline, and expenditures are projected to stay the same, the CWR fund balance will continue to decline. In order be able to continue to operate the CWR at the same level of service (which represents a limited, though important, program), the court requests no decrease/returns on the CWR fund.

**CHILDREN'S WAITING ROOM (CWR)  
ANNUAL REPORTING FOR COURTS WITH CWR CAP ADJUSTMENTS /  
BIENNIAL FUND BALANCE CAP ADJUSTMENT REQUEST**

Please check all that apply:  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>ANNUAL REPORTING FOR COURTS WITH CWR CAP ADJUSTMENTS</b> <i>(Complete Sections I and II) To be submitted in fiscal years ending in an even number (i.e., 2017-2018)</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>BIENNIAL FUND BALANCE CAP ADJUSTMENT REQUEST</b> <i>(Complete Sections I, II, and III)</i> <i>To be submitted in fiscal years ending in an odd number (i.e., 2016-2017)</i>	
<b>SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> Orange	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REPORT</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> David H. Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer  <b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO</b> <i>(Please include mailing address, email, and phone number):</i> Kristine Swensson, 657-622-7736, <a href="mailto:kswensson@occourts.org">kswensson@occourts.org</a> 700 Civic Center Drive West, Santa Ana, CA 92701
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 9/8/2017	<b>RECEIVED AT LEAST 12 MONTHS OF DISTRIBUTIONS IN THE LAST FISCAL YEAR:</b> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(No biennial reporting is required if less than 12 months of distributions received)</i>  <b>DO YOU HAVE MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></b> <i>(If yes, provide an explanation of the contracts in the CWR Program Update below)</i>
<b>CWR PROGRAM UPDATE</b> <i>(Please briefly summarize the status of your current program):</i>  <p>The Superior Court of California, County of Orange (Court) operates the Children's Waiting Room (CWR) at six justice centers located throughout the county. The CWRs are open five days a week, from 8am to 5 pm (excluding a lunch hour). During Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17, a total of 2,826 families utilized the CWR. In total, 4,188 children were provided with a safe place to stay while their parents participated in court proceedings and/or resolved their legal issues. Services were provided in multiple languages including English, Spanish, Arabic as well as various others.</p> <p>In October 2016, the Judicial Council of California (JCC) approved an adjustment to the Court's cap on the CWR fund balance. Since the approval, the Court has been able to continue operating the six waiting rooms at the same service level without interruption. As proposed in the cap adjustment request, Court staff began work on a thorough assessment of the operations and costs of the CWRs in Orange County. Relevant data (e.g. utilization rate, language needs, and filing trends) were gathered and analyzed with the goal of determining how to best use limited funds. As a result, a list of items that require immediate action such as needed supplies and furniture and recommendations for long-term changes (e.g. reduced operating hours and the elimination of CWR locations) were presented to the Court executives in June 2017.</p> <p>The Court has entered into the fourth year of a five-year contract with the current CWR provider. The current contract ends on June 30, 2019. Court executives are examining various options to decrease operating expenditures now without compromising contractual obligations. The next step for the Court is to convene a working group to begin a formal bidding process to secure a new service contract. This type of large bid—one that equates to millions of dollars over a period of five years—requires at least nine months to a year of lead time. Within the next few months, the Court should have identified key factors that will be incorporated into the formal bid. By the end of FY 2017-18, the bidding process should be well underway.</p>	

**SECTION II: FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

- THREE-YEAR HISTORY AND THREE-YEAR PROJECTION OF YEAR END FUND BALANCES, REVENUES, AND EXPENDITURES** (Double click below for Excel spreadsheet. Please populate rows 1 and 2, and the beginning fund balance in cell A3. The rest of the sheet is formula driven and will automatically populate. If requesting an adjustment to the calculated CAP and return of funds to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), enter the amount (row 7) being requested and complete Section III):

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Row	Fiscal Year	Actual				Estimated		
		Beginning Fund Balance	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
1	Revenue Distributed to the Court		376,113	369,617	395,976	396,000	396,000	397,600
1a	Interest/Other adj.		3,486	4,658	6,321	4,685	2,500	1,600
2	Expenditures		643,459	652,449	663,793	750,000	550,000	400,000
3	Fund Balance	1,551,428	1,287,568	1,009,393	747,897	398,582	247,082	246,282
<b>CWR Fund Balance above CAP Calculation:</b>								
4	Highest Year of Revenue Distributed to the Court	395,976						
5	Fund Balance at the End of the Current Fiscal Year	747,897						
6	Amount to Return to the TCTF	351,922						
7	Requested Adjustment to Fund Balance CAP <sup>1</sup>	351,922						

- CURRENT DETAILED EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS/PLAN FOR NEXT THREE FISCAL YEARS** (Please provide an explanation of the expenditure plan that ties to row 2, columns E, F, and G):

The Court has a multi-year contract with its current CWR services provider, Children's Creative Learning Centers (CCLC)—Agreement no. SC5310. The contract ends on June 30, 2019. Services currently provided by CCLC at the six CWR locations include:

- Childcare services on a drop-in basis for all ages up to 16 years
- Age-appropriate activities for each child
- Age-appropriate supplies, materials, and manipulatives (such as educational games, building blocks)
- Child sleeping/resting area
- Light snacks and bottled water

Expenditure Projection/Plan

In FY 2017-18, the Court expects to spend more than previous years to account for: 1) the expected increase in yearly contractual services costs, and 2) the investment in one-time, immediate need items. These items were identified during the assessment, and they are related to the health and safety needs of the CWR users. Specifically:

- \$675,000 for contractual services (CWR provider)
- \$29,400 for architectural design, space reconfiguration, material cost (including secure gate areas), and installation of secured check-in/check-out areas (3 locations)
- \$9,600 for purchase and installation of storage cabinets and furniture as well as new carpet and paint
- \$36,000 for purchase/upgrade and installation of closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras and data video recorders (DVR) to enable and improve monitoring by Sheriff personnel (3 locations)

In FY 2018-19 (the last year of the multi-year contract), the Court expects to begin realizing savings as adjustments are made to the operations of CWRs. Details on the adjustments are being reviewed and discussed, but they will likely involve changes in service locations and service levels. This is a logical step for the Court to take in order to gradually adjust to the current and projected financial constraints.

By FY 2019-20, the Court expects to have a new service contract that operates at a cost close to the projected available annual funding.

There are no significant changes to revenues and expenditures since the Court's fund balance cap adjustment was approved last year. Since October 2016, the Court has received slight increases in CWR distribution (as compared to the prior year) and in the interest earned from the fund balance. However, the contractual services costs have also increased. The variance from the projected ending CWR balance as of June 30, 2017 contained in the original fund balance cap exception request (submitted in August 2016) varied less than 4% from the actual ending fund balance. The Court fully expects to be below the cap by the end of the current fiscal year.

### **SECTION III: RETURNING FUNDS ABOVE THE CAP TO THE TCTF**

#### **A. IF REQUESTING AN ADJUSTMENT TO THE FUND BALANCE CAP, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR JUSTIFICATION BELOW** *(Include a summary of your ongoing CWR expenditure plan):*

**CHILDREN'S WAITING ROOM (CWR)  
ANNUAL REPORTING FOR COURTS WITH CWR CAP ADJUSTMENTS /  
BIENNIAL FUND BALANCE CAP ADJUSTMENT REQUEST**

Please check all that apply:

**ANNUAL REPORTING FOR COURTS WITH CWR CAP ADJUSTMENTS**

*(Complete Sections I and II) To be submitted in fiscal years ending in an even number (i.e., 2017-2018)*

**BIENNIAL FUND BALANCE CAP ADJUSTMENT REQUEST** *(Complete Sections I, II, and III)*

*To be submitted in fiscal years ending in an odd number (i.e., 2016-2017)*



**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

**SUPERIOR COURT:**

Santa Barbara

**PERSON AUTHORIZING REPORT** *(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):*

Darrel Parker, CEO

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO** *(Please include mailing address, email, and phone number):*

Patrick Ballard, CFO  
pballard@sbcourts.org  
phone: 805-882-4682

**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

9/21/2017

**RECEIVED AT LEAST 12 MONTHS OF DISTRIBUTIONS IN THE LAST FISCAL YEAR:**

**YES**  **NO**  *(No biennial reporting is required if less than 12 months of distributions received)*

**DO YOU HAVE MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS? YES**  **NO**  *(If yes, provide an explanation of the contracts in the CWR Program Update below)*

**CWR PROGRAM UPDATE** *(Please briefly summarize the status of your current program):*

The Superior Court of Santa Barbara County requests a cap adjustment to the funds accumulated by Santa Barbara County's Children's Waiting Room fund\*. The court currently operates two children's waiting rooms in the major population centers within the county. The first is operated in downtown Santa Barbara, in the Figueroa Division, a criminal court building adjacent to the civil and family courts operated in the historic courthouse. The second children's waiting room is operated in the Juvenile Court building in Santa Maria. Both rooms were previously open a limited number of hours under the supervision of a contracted non-profit agency.

In order to better serve the needs of the public, a new contract was negotiated with the non-profit agency to operate both rooms on a full-time basis. The new contract and expanded hours became effective on June 1, 2017. The children's waiting room in Santa Barbara, previously opened for just 24 hours per week and is now currently open 40 hours per week. The children's waiting room in Santa Maria at the Juvenile Court, was previously opened a mere 8 hours per week, is now serving the public 35 hours per week.

The Court seeks to preserve the entire balance of the fund for the increase in services available to the public since June, and also in anticipation of furnishing a waiting room for a new facility in FY2019-2020. Additionally, the court aspires to add technologically advanced learning equipment to the existing room in Santa Maria.

**\*PLEASE NOTE**

*The Judicial Council, effective October 28, 2016, increased the amount of the fiscal year 2016-2017 cap on the children's waiting room fund balance the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next by \$455,732. (See: Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (October, 2016), p. 45; <https://jcc.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>)*

## Section II: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

**A. THREE-YEAR HISTORY AND THREE-YEAR PROJECTION OF YEAR END FUND BALANCES, REVENUES, AND EXPENDITURES** (Double click below for Excel spreadsheet. Please populate rows 1 and 2, and the beginning fund balance in cell A3. The rest of the sheet is formula driven and will automatically populate. If requesting an adjustment to the calculated CAP and return of funds to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), enter the amount (row 7) being requested and complete Section III):

Row	Fiscal Year	Actual				Estimated		
		Beginning Fund Balance	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20*
1	Revenue Distributed to the Court		39,718	39,686	41,033	40,146	40,146	40,146
2	Expenditures		53,177	55,397	63,205	157,745	157,745	217,745
3	Fund Balance	535,762	522,303	506,591	484,419	366,820	249,221	71,622
<b>CWR Fund Balance above CAP Calculation:</b>								
4	Highest Year of Revenue Distributed to the Court	41,033						
5	Fund Balance at the End of the Current Fiscal Year	484,419						
6	Amount to Return to the TCTF	443,386						
7	Requested Adjustment to Fund Balance CAP <sup>1</sup>	443,386						
<sup>1</sup> Due to the Director of Budget Services within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year								

\*(Furniture, fixtures and equipment in the amount of \$60,000 in planned new court facility)

**B. CURRENT DETAILED EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS/PLAN FOR NEXT THREE FISCAL YEARS** (Please provide an explanation of the expenditure plan that ties to row 2, columns E, F, and G):

The court has a Multi-year contact: agreement for Children's Waiting Room with Community Action Commission. Please see below for the expenditure plan of the agreement. Within the next three fiscal years the court will be incurring a total of \$533,235 to run the children's waiting rooms in both the north and south locations. However, only \$120,438 is estimated (based on average of prior 3-years of revenues) to be received in revenues during the same period leaving a large deficit. Without an ability to use existing reserves the court would have to cease operating the children's waiting rooms in both locations.

Ongoing Expenses	Annual Max Amount
Contractor Staff Salaries	126,433
Classroom Expenses	17,424
Total Costs	12,227
Indirect Costs @8.5%	12,227
Other Allowable Expenses	2,448
<b>Annual Total</b>	<b>\$157,745</b>

<b>One-time FF&amp;E costs*</b>	<b>\$60,000</b>
---------------------------------	-----------------

\*(Furniture, fixtures and equipment in the amount of \$60,000 for the planned new court facility.)



**SECTION III: RETURNING FUNDS ABOVE THE CAP TO THE TCTF****A. IF REQUESTING AN ADJUSTMENT TO THE FUND BALANCE CAP, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR JUSTIFICATION BELOW** *(Include a summary of your ongoing CWR expenditure plan):*

The children's waiting room in Santa Barbara, at 118 East Figueroa Street, is open 24 hours per week. The children's waiting room in Santa Maria, at the Juvenile Court, was only open 8 hours per week. Using the balance in the children's waiting room fund allows the court to expand those services now full-time in Santa Barbara and 3.5 days per week in Santa Maria. The total cost of operating the two centers under the old contracts was \$55,400 annually. This is more than the fund has been collecting. Expanding the availability in both ends of the County costs \$157,745 annually. Assuming annual revenue of \$40,000, the court would need an additional \$117,745 in ongoing costs each year. After reducing the current balance for the acquisition of new equipment and furnishings, the Court could operate both children's waiting rooms, to better serve the community, for approximately 3.5 years. At the end of that time the court would have exhausted the balance of the fund and would either find an alternate source of funding or reduce the schedule accordingly.

<b>Ongoing Expenses</b>	<b>Santa Maria</b>	<b>Santa Barbara</b>	<b>Annual Max Amount</b>
Contractor Staff Salaries	55,610	66,823	126,433
Classroom Expenses	8,712	8712	17,424
Total Costs	68,322	75,535	12,227
Indirect Costs @8.5%	5,807	6,420	12,227
Other Allowable Expenses	264	2,184	2,448
<b>Annual Total</b>	<b>\$74,386</b>	<b>\$83,359</b>	<b>\$157,745</b>

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

### A. Applying for a New CWR Distribution

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

### B. Requesting a Decreased CWR Distribution Amount

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

### C. Temporarily or Permanently Ceasing CWR Operations

- Courts that cease operating all CWRs must notify the director of the JC Finance Office within 60 days of the cessation date. Unless a court provides notification and submits an application to continue receiving distributions while not operating a CWR within 60 days of the cessation date, the court's CWR distributions will be stopped either January 1 or July 1, whichever is earlier, and the court will be required to return any CWR fund balance to the TCTF.
- For courts that are required to return all of their remaining CWR fund balance to the TCTF, the return of the CWR fund balance will occur on the February trial court distribution for those courts that the CWR distribution stopped on January 1, and on the August distribution for those courts that the CWR distributions stopped on July 1.
- If there is a dispute between a court and JC staff over the amount of CWR fund balance that should be returned to the TCTF, the dispute will be brought before the TCBAC and the Judicial Council if the two parties cannot come to a resolution within 90 days of the cessation date.

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

- An application for a continued distribution must include all the information required of courts applying for a new distribution (see section A above) as well as the amount of any CWR fund balance.
- The TCBAC will make a recommendation to the Judicial Council on each court's application.
- For courts that apply and whose application is denied by the Judicial Council, any CWR fund balance shall be returned to the TCTF.

## D. Cap on CWR Fund Balance

- Courts shall monitor the CWR distribution amount per filing to ensure it is adequate to meet the CWR needs of the court without accumulating an amount in excess of the cap described below.
- Effective July 1, 2015, there shall be a cap on the amount of CWR fund balance that courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next. The cap shall be the amount of the highest annual distribution within the three most recent fiscal years.
- Courts that have a CWR fund balance greater than the cap (as described above) at the end of the every other fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2016–2017) will be required to return to the TCTF the amount above the cap in the subsequent fiscal year.
- For courts that are required to return the portion of their CWR fund balance above the cap to the TCTF, the return of the CWR fund balance will occur on the August trial court distribution.
- If there is a dispute between a court and JC staff over the amount of CWR fund balance that should be returned to the TCTF, the dispute will be brought before the TCBAC and the Judicial Council if the two parties cannot come to a resolution within 90 days of the cessation date.
- The cap applies only to courts that have received at least 12 months of distributions in a fiscal year while operating a CWR.
- If a court wants a cap adjustment, it must submit a request explaining the extenuating circumstance and including its CWR expenditure plan to the director of the JC Finance Office for consideration by the TCBAC and the Judicial Council. The request must be received by the Finance Director within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year for which the adjustment is being requested.
- JC staff will report any return of CWR fund balance through the trial court distribution process to the TCBAC and the Judicial Council.
- For courts that have Judicial Council–approved adjustments to their CWR caps, annual reporting will be required 60 days after the end of each fiscal year for courts that have an adjustment to their CWR cap approved by the Judicial Council, using a template provided by Judicial Council staff.

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

- Courts that received distributions between January 1, 2006 and June 30, 2014 but did not operate a CWR during that time period must either apply for a continued distribution by

Revised: March 24, 2017

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

September 26, 2015 or have their distributions stopped on January 1, 2016 and return to the TCTF any CWR fund balance.

- For courts that are required to return all of their remaining CWR fund balance to the TCTF, the return will occur on the October 2015 trial court distribution.
- If there is a dispute between a court and JC staff over the amount of CWR fund balance that should be returned to the TCTF, the dispute will be brought before the TCBAC and the Judicial Council if the two parties cannot come to a resolution within 90 days of the cessation date.

Revised: March 24, 2017

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Report to the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee**

(Agenda Item 3)

**Title:** Discussion on the Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf Policy  
**Date:** 10/4/2017  
**Contact:** Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-263-1754 | [suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov](mailto:suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of whether to recommend that the Judicial Council approve revisions to the *Judicial–Council Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts* (Attachment 3A).

**Background**

At the Judicial Council’s April 15, 2016 business meeting, the council approved the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommended process, criteria, and required information for trial courts to request TCTF reduced allocations (see Attachment 3A), related to the 1% fund balance cap, be retained in the TCTF as restricted fund balance for the benefit of those courts.

Categories or activities for which funds can be requested to be held include, but are not limited to: projects that extend beyond the original planned three-year process such as delayed deployment of information systems; technology improvements or infrastructure such as a new case management system; facilities maintenance or repair allowed under rule 10.810 of the California Rule of Court; court efficiencies such as online and smart forms for court users; and other court infrastructure projects such as vehicle replacement or copy machine replacement.

At its meeting on March 30, 2017, the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee (FPS) discussed possible changes to the process, including streamlining the approval process for amended requests and making a technical change for submitting the report. The FPS directed Budget Services staff to prepare a proposed revision to the procedure. Those proposed revisions are outlined below and provided in Attachment 3B. In addition, the FPS was briefed on the impact of amendments needed for funds to cross fiscal years due to contractor delays.

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

1. Process for submitting and reviewing amended requests: Additional language has been proposed in section 5, which allows the FPS to approve amended requests, or refer the amended to the Judicial Council for its approval. Language has also been proposed for

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Report to the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee**

the FPS to provide an informational report to the Judicial Council on the amended requests the subcommittee approves.

2. Proposed technical changes: The proposed technical changes include changing that request be submitted to the Director of Budget Services, rather than the Administrative Director of the Judicial Council of California. References to Fiscal staff have been replaced with Budget Services staff to reflect the current Judicial Council of California reporting unit. The proposed language also replaces references to the TCBAC working group with the FPS.

***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)*

## ***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 *new* requests will be submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration.
  - b. Requests will be submitted to the ~~Administrative Director~~ *Director of Budget Services* by the court’s presiding judge or court executive officer.
  - c. The ~~Administrative Director~~ *Director of Budget Services* will forward ~~the~~ *a summary of all request received to the Administrative Director. to the Judicial Council director of Finance.*
  - d. ~~Finance~~ *Budget Services* 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 Fiscal Planning Subcommittee (FPS) of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC); the TCBAC subgroup~~ *FPS* 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;
  - e. ~~and Finance office~~ *Budget Services* staff will issue a final report on behalf of the ~~TCBAC subgroup~~ *the FPS* for the council.
  - f. The final report to the ~~TCBAC review subgroup~~ *FPS* and the Judicial Council will be

provided to the requesting court before the report is made publicly available on the California Courts website.

g. The court may send a representative to the ~~TCBAC review subgroup~~ FPS 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~~ *Director of Budget Services* 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) changes 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~~ *2b-2d* 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.
  - b. *The FPS may choose to refer any amended request to the Judicial Council for its approval. If the FPS chooses to approve the amended request at its level, the FPS will provide the Judicial Council with an informational report on approved amended requests at the next business meeting.*
  - c. *Amended requests that make changes in the amounts by year to be distributed to the court for the planned annual expenditures and/or encumbrances will need to provide an annual report to the FPS on the use of the held funds.*
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 *separate* 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*)