



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**FISCAL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE**

**MATERIALS APRIL 5, 2018**

**Meeting Contents**

<b>Agenda</b> .....	2
<b>Minutes</b>	
Draft Minutes from the December 4, 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



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 RECORDED

---

**Date:** April 5, 2018  
**Time:** 2:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Veranda Room, Judicial Council of California  
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive Sacramento CA, 95833  
**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 December 4, 2017, Fiscal Planning Subcommittee meeting.

---

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

---

**Public Comment**

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least one hour prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

**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 2:00 p.m. on April 4, 2018, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)**

---

**Item 1**

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

Consideration of whether to recommend that the Judicial Council approve TCTF funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts in response to six amended requests from six 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**

December 4, 2017

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

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

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair)  
Executive Officers: Mr. 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. Nancy Eberhardt and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde.

**OPEN MEETING**

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll was called.

**Approval of Minutes**

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 4, 2017 Fiscal Planning Subcommittee meeting.

**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 one new request from one trial court and one amended request from one trial court.

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 one new Funds Held on Behalf request and the one amended Funds Held on Behalf request.*

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 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**

**(Item 1)**

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

**Date:** 4/5/2018

**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 six amended requests from six 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. Six courts have submitted requests within this time frame to be considered for the Judicial Council's May 25, 2018 business meeting. Attachment A summarizes the amended TCTF funds held on behalf request totaling \$2,842,019, a reduction of \$1,012,729 from the previously approved total for these six courts of \$3,854,748. 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 (Amended Requests)

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

**Attachment B:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Butte County (Amended Request)

**Attachment C:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Amended Request)

**Attachment D:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of San Francisco County (Amended Request)

**Attachment E:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Siskiyou County (Amended Request)

**Attachment F:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Sutter County (Amended Request)

**Attachment G:** Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Tulare County (Amended Request)

**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 Trial Court Trust Fund Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court (Amended Requests)

Table 1: Amended Requests for May 24-25, 2018 Judicial Council Meeting

Court	Request Number	Last Approved Amount	Does Request Change \$\$ Amount?	If Yes - \$\$ Change +/-	Last Approved Expenditures by Fiscal Year		Amended Expenditures by Fiscal Year		Category	High-Level Summary
					2017-18	2018-19 +	2017-18	2018-19 +		
Butte	04-17-02-A1	53,561	Yes	(410)	53,561		53,151		Major Equipment	Purchase of a new electronic calendar system - Oroville Courthouse
Los Angeles	19-17-02-A1	3,200,000	Yes	(946,581)	3,200,000		2,253,419		Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System (CMS)
San Francisco	38-17-01-A1	447,147	Yes	(61,454)	295,000	152,147	100,000	285,693	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of CMS
Siskiyou	47-17-01-A1	44,000	Yes	(4,284)	44,000		39,716		Technology Improvement	Replace CMS servers
Sutter	51-17-01-A2	60,840	No	-	60,840		13,958	46,882	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of CMS
Tulare	54-18-01-A1	49,200	No	-	45,020	4,180	-	49,200	Equipment replacement (CCTV system)	Amending to include in Fund Balances ending 2017-18 process
		<b>3,854,748</b>		<b>(1,012,729)</b>	<b>3,698,421</b>	<b>156,327</b>	<b>2,460,244</b>	<b>381,775</b>		
					<b>3,854,748</b>		<b>2,842,019</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> 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> 1/11/2018	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:</b> \$53,151 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> \$53,151
<p><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> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>		
<b>SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES</b>		
<p><b>A. Identify sections and answers amended.</b></p> <p>Changed the amount requested in Section I from \$53,561 to \$53,151. Changed the estimated cost of the project reflected in Section III.A from \$53,561 to \$53,151. Changed the amounts referenced in Section IV.C and IV.D from \$53,561 to \$53,151.</p>		
<p><b>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</b></p> <p>See A above. Because the \$53,561 amount exceeded the final 1% fund balance cap reduction amount by \$410, the Court is resubmitting a revised application with a requested amount of \$53,151.</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>The cost of the project is estimated to be \$53,151 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</p>		

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.

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


Original Request:

Description	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	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>53,561</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

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	53,151								53,151
Expenditures		53,151							53,151
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>53,151</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> Los Angeles	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Sherri R. Carter, Court Executive Officer	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> Jeremy Cortez, Chief Deputy, Finance & Administration	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 1/18/2018	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:</b> JULY 1, 2017 TO JUNE 30, 2018	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> <del>\$3,200,000.00</del> \$2,253,419.00
<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>In 2014/15, the Court entered into a multi-year contract with Tyler Inc. for the implementation of the Odyssey Case Management System in every litigation area but Civil. Projected implementation dates were specified and milestone payments were to be made based on the deliverables schedule pursuant to the contract. Following the implementation of the Probate module, the Court was made aware of significant configuration issues and recognized a need to slow down to ensure successful implementation. The litigation areas scheduled to be implemented after Probate are much larger, more complicated, and have a greater impact on the community the court serves. As a result, the Court made a decision to delay implementation to subsequently scheduled litigation areas. Due to these unforeseen circumstances, the vendor will not meet the contractually obligated deliverables on schedule; consequently, the balance of the encumbrance established in 2014/15 cannot be liquidated as planned by the end of 2016/17. Therefore, the Court is requesting funds be held on its behalf to meet the delayed deliverables that were not billable within the three-year encumbrance term. To summarize, there is a need to carry over funds towards the completion of our case management project. This application is being submitted to seek authorization to have the balance of the encumbrance held on its behalf until the end of 2017/18.</p>		
<b>SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES</b>		
<b>A. Identify sections and answers amended.</b>		
Section 1: Requested Amount: changed from \$3,200,000 to \$2,253,419		
<b>B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.</b>		
Due to FY 2016-17 final closing and the recalculation of the 1% fund balance cap adjustment the original request needs to be reduced by \$946,581.		
<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>		
Due to circumstances related to the scope of the project and programming issues, deliverables and production dates have been delayed, resulting in changes to the deliverables schedule pursuant to the contract. This request is to have the unliquidated funds encumbered in the 2014/15 encumbrance held on the Court's behalf to ensure sufficient funds are available in 2017/18 when projected milestones / deliverables have been achieved.		

**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 new case management system will enable the Court to move off of the antiquated (DOS-based) legacy systems to a newer web-based system that will offer more flexibility in interacting with newer technology. This will enable the Court to provide more efficient and effective access to justice through enhanced automated systems, improving accessibility to Court documents/records for the public, law enforcement, lawyers and justice partners. More specifically, the introduction of e-filing capabilities will allow all parties to file and access documents in a more effective and efficient manner as documents will be uploaded directly into the Court's database. In its efforts to work toward a paperless environment, implementation of the system will also reduce staffing needs for scanning documents as well as the need for the public to appear in person to retrieve documents, thereby reducing long public lines, and further promoting the goal of providing equal access to justice through the fair, timely and efficient resolution of all cases.

**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 new case management system will enable the Court to move off of the antiquated (DOS-based) legacy systems to a newer web-based system that will offer more flexibility in interacting with newer technology. This will enable the Court to provide more efficient and effective access to justice through enhanced automated systems, improving accessibility to Court documents/records for the public, law enforcement, lawyers and justice partners. More specifically, the introduction of e-filing capabilities will allow all parties to file and access documents in a more effective and efficient manner as documents will be uploaded directly into the Court's database. In its efforts to work toward a paperless environment, implementation of the system will also reduce staffing needs for scanning documents as well as the need for the public to appear in person to retrieve documents, thereby reducing long public lines, and further promoting the goal of providing equal access to justice through the fair, timely and efficient resolution of all cases.

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

Electronic accessibility will be severely delayed, resulting in the public having to drive to local courthouses to obtain copies, file documents and obtain other case information. This will further delay e-filing and digital document storage projects as the old CMS systems do not provide for these types of modules.

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

Alternatives:

- Seek additional funding through a Budget Change Proposal.
- Reduce services to the public to recover funding need.

Holding funds in TCTF is the preferred alternative because it will eliminate the need to locate and maneuver funding from a balanced budget, resulting in reduced access to Court services. These funds were already allocated and dedicated for the effective implementation of the new case management system. Use of these funds will assure that deadlines are met without further delays.

**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**

The Fund Balances reflected include funds excluded from the 1% calculation, the Payroll Revolving fund, and commitments related to encumbrances in process.

**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**

Budget projections assume a budget with no growth, resulting in diminished purchasing power because of the lack of funding to cover Consumer Price index (CPI) increases.

**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**

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

Original Request:

Description	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	3,200,000									3,200,000
Expenditures	3,200,000									3,200,000
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	2,253,419									2,253,419
Expenditures	2,253,419									2,253,419
<b>Cumulative Balance</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> San Francisco	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> T. Michael Yuen, Court Executive Officer	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> Sue Wong, Chief Financial Officer, <a href="mailto:suewong@sftc.org">suewong@sftc.org</a>	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 2/27/2018	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:</b> 24 MONTHS	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> \$385,693

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

The Court entered into contract with Thomson Reuters for a new case management system. The goal was to eliminate the Court's reliance on various legacy systems, and replace it with a more efficient and technologically advanced single case management system. Unfortunately, unexpected delays such as additional technical requirements and customizations (e.g. complex fines and fee revenue distributions) have prolonged development and implementation. With the unanticipated delays, we have not been able to spend down funds allocated for this fiscal year (16-17). The overall CMS timeline has been re-adjusted to accommodate the initial delay and has pushed the implementation of the other case types to 2017-18. However, at it stands now, we will not be able to spend applicable encumbered funds by June 30, 2017. Therefore, the Court is requesting to carry over these funds to be used in 2017-18 and 2018-19. It is critical to maintain access to these funds for project continuity and completion. Denial of access to these funds would have negative impacts to court services and the public's access to justice.

### SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES

**A. Identify sections and answers amended.**

Changed the amount requested from \$447,147 to \$385,693 in Section I. Added the tab Sec. IV D for amended requests which reflects the change in total amount requested, as well as a revised expenditure plan for the funds between 2017-18 and 2018-19.

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

See A above. Because the original request exceeded the final 1% fund balance cap reduction by \$61,454, the Court is submitting a revised application with a requested amount of \$385,693.

### 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.**

Savings over years were accumulated to fund this project. To be able to acquire comparable amounts in such a short amount of time would require significant reductions in other critical operational areas. The only way that such funds may be obtained is to reduce staffing levels, or delay other critical projects.

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

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

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

This project will enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of court operations because there will be a fully integrated system in which all case related data will be available across departments. We currently have four case management systems that we are attempting to consolidate into one system that is also web-based. Significant staff efficiencies will be achieved since the case management system will be standardized across criminal, civil and family law. Moreover, standard operating procedures will be more streamlined and become automated including reports that will replace manual recording and data entry processes. Lastly, with the new system, we would be able to electronically exchange data with related justice partners, integrate with other existing non-case management systems, expand electronic case filing and files, and meet Judicial Council and other California state reporting requirements.

**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 this request is not approved, the court will have to maintain both the old case management systems and the new system. Maintaining both systems would create an undue burden on the court, as it would require support for several platforms. In addition to the dual support for several platforms, staff time and resources will be impacted negatively as they navigate through both. The current systems are also obsolete, and at risk of failure. If the court lost funding for this project, we would be operating at a less than efficient level for several years as we struggled to find funds to continue implementation. Therefore, this project must continue to be funded to increase efficiencies in the court, as well as for the public.

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

If this request is not approved, the public would experience increased wait times as staff attempt to assist them navigating through two systems. The expansion of e-filing would be delayed resulting in continued old-fashioned use of court runners. Additionally, the public would be adversely affected as there would be delayed information provided to our justice partners. Lastly, since the systems are so antiquated, access to justice is at risk of being affected at any time if the systems fail.

**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 alternative if this request is not approved is to maintain several systems until funding has been secured to fund this project. Not only is this ineffective and wasteful of resources, it is also irrational. In addition, cutting other operational areas to acquire enough funds to complete this project is not a practical alternative. Holding funding in the TCTF is the preferred alternative because we would be able to seamlessly continue this project.

**SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

See attached.

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

Original Request:

Description	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	447,147								447,147
Expenditures		295,000	152,147						447,147
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>447,147</b>	<b>152,147</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

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	385,693								385,693
Expenditures		100,000	285,693						385,693
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>385,693</b>	<b>285,693</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> Reneé McCanna Crane, CEO	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b>	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 12/20/2017	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FY 2017/2018</b>	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> \$39,716.00 (Amended)

**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.**  
Section I, III & IV (B). Request amended amount of \$39,716 instead of \$44,000 previously requested.
- B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.**  
After the final 1% form was submitted the total of amount of funds remaining from fiscal year 2016/2017 was reduced down by \$4,284 leaving a remaining balance of \$39,716

**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 \$39,716.00(amended amount) 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

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

Original Request:

Description	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	44,000								44,000
Expenditures		44,000							44,000
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>44,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

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	39,716								39,716
Expenditures		39,716							39,716
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>39,716</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> 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> 3/2/2018	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FISCAL YEAR</b> 2018-2019	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> \$60,839.69

**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.):*

**JSI:** Professional services and deliverables on jury management system that is partially implemented (\$13,948.76).

**Tyler:** Professional services and deliverables on new case management system that is partially implemented (\$34,526.20).

**Ricoh:** Final term of purchase agreement for copiers (\$12,364.73).

### SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES

**A. Identify sections and answers amended.**

Section III.A and Section IV.

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

**JSI:** The remaining funds have not been used because programming configuration of the public kiosks has not been completed. The Court expects the configuration to be completed in Fiscal Year 18-19.

**Tyler:** Implementation of the Judge's Edition component delayed implementation of the Clerk's Edition component due to the time and resources used not only to implement but also to train our judicial officers in using Judge's Edition. The Court expects the Clerk's Edition component to be implemented in Fiscal Year 18-19.

**Ricoh:** The amount encumbered extends past the end of Fiscal Year 17-18. The Court has looked into buying out the lease but it would not be cost effective due to the age of the copiers and the maintenance issues the Court has experienced with these copiers. Extending the encumbrance through December 2018 will allow the Court time to use the remaining encumbrance.

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

The 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 18-19.

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 18-19.

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 18-19 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 18-19 as the amount requested would be liquidated and reduce the court's allocation for fiscal year 18-19. 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 18-19.

**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 18-19.

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

Work to be completed in fiscal year 18-19.

**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 18-19.

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


Original Request:

Description	FY 2017-18								Total
Contribution	60,840								60,840
Expenditures	60,840								60,840
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19							Total
Contribution	60,840								60,840
Expenditures	13,958	46,882							60,840
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>46,882</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</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> Tulare	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> <b>Stephanie Cameron, Court Executive Officer</b>	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> <b>Nocona Soboleski, CFO 559-730-5000 x 1370</b>	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 1/16/2018	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 1 YEAR</b>	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> <b>\$ 45,020</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>		
<p>The Superior Court of Tulare County experiences a high volume of defendants who Fail to Appear (FTA) for criminal arraignments. In an effort to reduce the amount of FTA's, the Court sought the services of American Telesource Inc. (ATI) to design and build an e-Court integrated module that would automatically make reminder calls and text messages, in both English and Spanish, to the parties scheduled on the court calendar two (2) days before their scheduled appearance. The requested amount, referenced above, was encumbered to pay for the design and installation of the module in 2015. Prior to the start of the project, the Court learned from another court that had a similar product in place, there may be substantial liability issues if we moved forward with implementation. The Court requested a legal opinion from Judicial Council's (JCC) legal division. In the original and follow up legal opinions, the court was informed that while we may be able to complete this project, governmental (specifically judicial) entities were not automatically excluded from the overriding legal authority of the Federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act (FTCPA). After review of the legal opinion and analysis of the requirements of the FTCPA, it was determined the court would not be in a position to support (for the long term) the amount of resources needed to adhere to the requirements of the act. Such as, a new telephone and case management system integrated software and staff to secure and track individual express consent and identify reassigned phone numbers. Since there are pending legal actions requesting the exclusion of governmental entities from the FTCPA, the Court initially felt we may be in a position to move forward once the legal actions were resolved; however, to date, there has been no ruling on the matter.</p> <p>In the meantime, the court experienced a matrix failure that impacted the entire CCTV system, resulting in no viewing capability in the courtrooms. The matrix is the component that allows security personnel to control movement of the PTZ cameras located throughout the courthouse. It allows the end user to change the position of each camera so that various areas within the courtrooms and building are able to be viewed and recorded. Without the matrix the cameras are only partially functional; they record but cannot be moved or re-positioned. This is a particular concern in the courtrooms where cameras failed while facing a wall so there is no useable view or recording capability. The matrix is very old and outdated and is non-repairable. The JCC has agreed to provide limited repair of the system by manually re-focusing the existing camera and freezing it in a stationary position, resulting in one stationary camera per court room. There are 14 courtroom cameras and 58 other cameras throughout the building; aside from the courtrooms, none of the remaining 58 cameras will be repaired or replaced by the JCC. In addition to the repair of the courtroom cameras, the Court must also</p>		

update the current system software in order to use the remaining 58 PTZ cameras throughout the building. The Court must purchase additional hardware, equipment, and software to allow for the functionality of all cameras, enabling court security to monitor courtrooms and the rest of the courthouse. Courthouse security is compromised with the loss of the camera system.

The Court is currently working with vendors to obtain quotes for the cost of this project. Due to the magnitude of the project, we anticipate it will cost tens of thousands of dollars to complete. Due to limited resources the court is unable to fund this project out of our current budget. Without knowing what we can expect in next fiscal year's budget, the Court feels that monies previously encumbered for the initial project are better used in repairing and upgrading security systems in our court. However, based upon the requirements of the 1% cap we will be forced to return the requested amount of \$45,020 to the state when we liquidate the purchase order for the FTA project. The Court will continue to suffer a negative impact if we are not able to replace the cameras and software system that were impacted by the recent equipment failure. The Court is seeking permission to use the currently encumbered funds of \$45,020 for the camera and software system repair and upgrade so these funds are not lost to the state thru the current purchase order liquidating process and the constraints of the 1% cap.

## **SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES**

**A. Identify sections and answers amended. Section III: A.**

**B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.** The request no longer applies to funds from the FY16/17 1% cap process. FY 17/18 is that last year that we have to liquidate the balance of the PO, which has been done, so the funds will show being reverted to the state on the FY 17/18 1% cap form. We are only requested that the applicable dates for reflection on the 1% cap form be updated from FY 15/16 to FY 17/18.

## **SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

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

Based on the 1% cap worksheet submitted annually, the Court can only liquidate \$13,177 of the funds encumbered in fiscal year 15/16 without the money reverting back to the state. When we liquidate the purchase order for the FTA Project in the amount of \$45,020, \$31,843 will revert to the state in fiscal year 17/18. Since the Court was not able to move forward with the original intended purpose of the 2015 purchase order, due to various legal issues, we are seeking approval to use the previously encumbered funds for the camera and software system repair and upgrade rather than returning the money to the state.

**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 repair and replace the camera system that recently failed. The repair and upgrade is necessary to restore camera viewing capability in the courthouse. It is imperative the system be fully functional to provide adequate security to judges, court staff, and the public.

**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.**

Due to limited resources, the Court is unable to fund this project out of our current budget. Without knowing what to expect in next fiscal year's budget, the Court believes that monies previously encumbered for the initial project are better used in securing our court. If the request to move encumbered funds from one project to another is not approved we will be forced to return \$31,843 to the state and will have insufficient funds for the security system repair and upgrade. The Court would have no option but to fund this project over two fiscal years, resulting in compromised security for an extended period of time in our busiest courthouse.

E. **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 does not have an alternative to TCTF holding the funds. Once we liquidate the purchase order for the FTA project we will be forced to return \$31,843 to the state. If the Court is not allowed to use the encumbered funds for the security project the Court would lose \$31,843 and have to provide the funding for the security project in the amount of \$49,200. That overall cost to our budget would be \$81,043. Due to our limited resources the Court is unable to absorb that with current year funding and limited funding in 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**
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- 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**

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

Original Request:

Description	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	49,200								49,200
Expenditures		45,020	4,180						49,200
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>49,200</b>	<b>4,180</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	49,200								49,200
Expenditures		49,200							49,200
<b>Cumulative Balance</b>	<b>49,200</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*)