



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR JANUARY 23, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft minutes from the November 21, 2019 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Trial Court Budget Change Proposals for 2021-22 (Action Required)	8
Information Only Items (No Action Required)	
Info 2 – 2020 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Annual Agenda	13
Info 3 – Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf (FHOB) Expenditure Reporting ..	23
Attachment 3A: Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for TCTF FHOB of the Courts	25
Attachment 3B: FHOB of the Court Project Completion Reporting	29



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Request for ADA accommodations
should be made at least three business
days before the meeting and directed to:
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: January 23, 2020
Time: 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831; passcode 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.

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov.

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 November 21, 2019 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1))

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA, 94102 attention: Ms. Brandy Sanborn. Only written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on January 22, 2020 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 Budget Change Proposals for 2021-22 (Action Required)

Development and adoption of trial court funding priorities for 2021-22 budget change proposals.

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

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

Governor's Budget Proposal for 2020-21

Update on the Governor's budget proposal for 2020-21.

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

Info 2

2020 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Annual Agenda

Update on the agenda approved by the Executive and Planning Committee for 2020.

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

Info 3

Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf Expenditure Reporting

Quarterly report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on how funds were expended for projects and planned expenditures that are complete.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 21, 2019
11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833, Tower A & B

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton (phone), Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Hon. Mark A. Cope, Hon. Jill C. Fannin, Hon. Kimberly Gaab, Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Hon. Charles Margines, Hon. Deborah H. Ryan, and Hon. B. Scott Thomsen.

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice Chair), Ms. Kim Bartleson, Ms. Sherri Carter, Ms. Nancy Eberhardt (phone), Mr. Shawn Landry, Mr. Chad Finke, Mr. Michael D. Planet, Mr. Chris Ruhl, Mr. Neal Taniguchi, Mr. Brian Taylor, Ms. Kim Turner, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Judicial Council Staff Advisory Members: Mr. John Wordlaw and Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic.

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Others Present: Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Ms. Michele Allan, Mr. Catrayel Wood, and Ms. Rose Livingston.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 11:12 a.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the August 7, 2019 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting, and the September 11, 2019 and October 9, 2019 actions by email between TCBAC meetings.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 - 8)

Item 1 - Methodology for Reallocation of Workload Formula Funds (Action Required)

Consideration of a Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommendation on a methodology for reallocation of Workload Formula funds.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Michele Allan, Supervisor, Budget Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations of FMS for Judicial Council consideration at its business meeting on January 16-17, 2020:

- A. Specify that the methodology for the first 50 percent allocation of new funding to courts below the statewide average be scaled by courts' distance from the statewide average and size based on the courts' Workload Formula need;
- B. Include an exception for consistency purposes to allow the 2020-21 funding provided in the 2019 Budget Act for support of the 25 judgeships apply the same allocation methodology used for 2019-20; and
- C. Specify that the reallocation of funding for every second year in which no new money is provided be based on beginning Workload Formula allocation, distributed to courts via distance from statewide average and size based on Workload Formula need, and in the following sequence:
 - i. Up to 1 percent reduction for courts above the 2 percent band to courts below the 2 percent band.
 - ii. Up to 2 percent reduction for courts above 105 percent of funding need to courts below the 2 percent band.
 - iii. Courts above 105 percent of funding need will not fall below 104 percent of funding need.
 - iv. Courts that penetrate into the band following the up to 1 percent reallocation will not be eligible for additional funding from the 2 percent reallocation from courts above 105 percent of funding need.

Item 2 - Distribution of the Fee for Court Reporter Services in Civil Proceedings Lasting More Than One Hour (Action Required)

Consideration of an FMS recommendation on distribution of the court reporter fee assessed pursuant to Government Code 68086(a)(2).

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Manager, Budget Services

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations of FMS to be considered by the council at its January 16-17, 2020 business meeting:

1. Government Code 68086(a)(2) fees, deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), to be distributed back to trial courts on a dollar-for-dollar basis beginning July 1, 2020; and
2. Exclude court reporter fees in civil proceedings for one hour or more as a funding category in the Workload Formula effective July 1, 2020.

Item 3 - El Dorado Superior Court Workload Formula Adjustment Request (Action Required)

Consideration of an FMS recommendation on the Workload Formula Adjustment Request submitted by El Dorado Superior Court.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Business Management Services

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations from FMS that the request be denied since the portion of the Workload Formula for which it makes policy was determined to not be the appropriate place for such a recommendation. Further, the co-chairs of FMS further recommend that the chair of TCBAC consider referring this item to the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee to determine whether there are any adjustments that could or should be made to the underlying Resource Assessment Study model to account for multiple locations.

Item 4 - Updates to the Funds Held on Behalf (FHOB) of the Trial Courts Policy (Action Required)

Consideration of a Fiscal Planning Subcommittee (FPS) recommendation on revisions to the current FHOB submission process including streamlining the submission schedule and making a change to the recipient of the request as well as a Budget Services recommendation on the timeline.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Budget Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations of FPS for consideration by the council at its business meeting on January 16-17, 2020, the following revisions:

1. To better align with court year-end closing, trial court allocation offsets, and requests to amend previously approved requests, it is recommended that submission due dates be revised beginning January 2020 from five dates to three:
 - August – FHOB requests for preliminary fund balance cap.
 - November – FHOB requests for final fund balance cap.
 - April - Requests to amend previously approved requests.
2. Changing submissions from the Judicial Council Administrative Director to the director of Budget Services in an effort to streamline the current submission, review, and approval process; and
3. Make language corrections as appropriate.

Item 5 - Children’s Waiting Room (CWR) Report (Action Required)

Consideration of an extension on receipt of CWR funds during temporary closure for the San Mateo Superior Court.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Michele Allan, Supervisor, Budget Services

Action: TCBAC voted to approve (with one abstention) the continued distribution of CWR funds to San Mateo Superior Court to allow the court to accumulate funding to support operating the CWRs, scheduled to re-open in September 2020, for consideration by the council at its January 17, 2020 business meeting.

Item 6 - Update to CWR Policy (Action Required)

Consideration of an FPS recommendation to the CWR Distribution and Fund Balance Policy including an update to the timing of the fund balance cap reductions, removal of language that is no longer relevant, and other technical revisions to clarify language in the policy as well as a Budget Services recommendation on the timeline.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Michele Allan, Supervisor, Budget Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the recommendations of FPS and Budget Services staff recommendations on the revisions to the CWR Distribution and Fund Balance Policy for council consideration at its business meeting on January 16-17, 2020.

Item 7 - CWR Fund Balance Cap Biennial Review (Action Required)

Consideration of an FPS recommendation of reductions for 2018-19 fund balances exceeding the cap as well fund balance cap adjustment requests from four courts.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Michele Allan, Supervisor, Budget Services

Action: TCBAC voted to approve (with three abstentions) the following the CWR fund balance cap adjustments for consideration by the council at its business meeting on January 16-17, 2020.

Item 8 - 2018-19 Final One-Time Cap Reduction for Fund Balances Above the 1% Cap (Action Required)

Review of final submissions of 2018-19 one-time reductions for fund balances.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Michele Allan, Supervisor, Budget Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the adjustment to the preliminary 1 percent fund balance cap reduction allocation by a net of \$955,749, for a reduction allocation of \$6,935,081 to match the trial courts' final calculations of the amount above the 1 percent fund balance cap, which nets to \$796,545 after a FHOB reduction, for consideration and recommendation to the council at its business meeting on January 16-17, 2020.

I. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (INFO 1-2)

Info 1 – TCTF FHOB Expenditure Reporting

Quarterly report to the TCBAC on how funds were expended for projects and planned expenditures that are complete.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Budget Services

Action: No action taken.

Info 2 - Lease Review Update

Update from the March 21, 2019 TCBAC request of Budget Services staff to work with Facilities Services and the appropriate advisory body regarding review and consideration of funding for trial court leases.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Michele Allan, Supervisor, Budget Services

Action: No action taken.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on [date].

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

(Action Item)

Title: Prioritization of Trial Court Budget Change Proposals for 2021-22
Date: 1/8/2020
Contact: Brandy Sanborn, Manager, Budget Services
415-865-7195 | brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Identification of the 2021-22 statewide budget change proposal (BCP) priorities for the trial courts is needed for conceptual consideration and approval by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC).

To generate a discussion of potential 2021-22 statewide BCPs, and to ensure full trial court participation as it relates to identifying priorities, each Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) member was assigned one to two courts to contact for ascertaining their priorities for reporting back to the committee at its January 23, 2020 telephonic meeting.

Background

Judicial Branch Budget Committee

The JBBC, established in July 2016, reviews and prioritizes BCPs prior to submission to the Judicial Council for final prioritization and approval. At its December 2016 meeting, the council approved a new process for BCP preparation, approval, and submission to the Department of Finance (DOF) to include the JBBC¹.

At its July 28, 2017 meeting, authority was delegated to the Judicial Council Administrative Director to make technical changes to BCPs as necessary².

¹ Judicial Council meeting report (December 16, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4817140&GUID=6165243B-1678-4074-B1D7-AB5A1467CA6F>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (December 16, 2016),

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=463484&GUID=8E4B8E76-2D88-480D-843A-6576CC996914>

² Judicial Council meeting report (July 28, 2017), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5324681&GUID=0A450F2C-30A0-46F7-975B-B7B0B5ABEC79>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 28, 2017), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=512292&GUID=8C379D3F-1774-4555-AE4D-5B8728283100>

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

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

In addition to prioritizing concepts identified by the TCBAC, the members also review BCP concept submissions developed by other committees in which the TCBAC was identified as having purview and the opportunity to provide input for submission to the JBBC.

2020-21 Budget Change Proposals

TCBAC met on January 17, 2019³, January 24, 2019⁴, February 19, 2019⁵, April 16, 2019⁶, and May 2, 2019⁷ and unanimously developed the following prioritized list of BCP concepts for recommendation to the JBBC:

1. Trial Court Funding Stabilization;
2. Trial Court Civil Assessment Backfill;
3. Trial Court Civil Assessment Maintenance of Effort;
4. Trial Court Reserve Cap; and
5. Funding for the 10 of the 50 Judgeships Authorized by AB 159.

Of the BCP concepts for which TCBAC was identified as having purview and the opportunity to provide input, the committee unanimously approved to prioritize two in the following order:

1. Language Access Expansion in California; and
2. Trial Court Facility Operations and Maintenance Funding.

The remaining BCP concepts were acknowledged and supported by the TCBAC but without prioritization or inclusion with the TCBAC's BCP concept submissions:

³ TCBAC meeting materials (January 17, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190117-fps-materials-1.pdf>; TCBAC meeting minutes (January 17, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190117-minutes.pdf>

⁴ TCBAC meeting materials (January 24, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190124-materials.pdf>; TCBAC meeting minutes (January 24, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190124-minutes.pdf>

⁵ TCBAC meeting materials (February 19, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190219-materials.pdf>; TCBAC additional meeting materials (February 19, 2019), https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190219-additional_material.pdf; TCBAC meeting minutes (February 19, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190219-minutes.pdf>

⁶ TCBAC meeting materials (April 16, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190416-materials.pdf>; TCBAC meeting minutes (April 16, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190416-minutes.pdf>

⁷ TCBAC meeting materials (May 2, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190502-materials.pdf>; Additional TCBAC materials (May 2, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190502-additional-material.pdf>; TCBAC meeting minutes (May 2, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190502-minutes.pdf>

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

- A. Digitizing Documents Phases 2 and 3;
- B. Next Generation Hosting Consulting Services for Data Center and Disaster Recovery;
- C. Productizing California Court Innovation Grants;
- D. Trial and Appellate Court Deferred Maintenance Funding; and
- E. Trial Court Lease Funding.

On July 19, 2019, the JBBC unanimously recommended and the Judicial Council unanimously approved the following branch BCP concepts for submission to the DOF without prioritization as follows⁸:

1. *Trial Court Civil Assessment Backfill*
2. *Trial Court Funding Stabilization*
3. *Trial and Appellate Court Facility Operations and Maintenance, Leased Space, and Deferred Maintenance*
4. *Information Technology Modernization*
5. *Digitizing of Documents, Phases 2 and 3*
6. Court Technology Manager Positions
7. Appellate Courts - Court-Appointed Counsel Projects
8. Electronic Resources and Collection Rightsizing Adjustment for Appellate Court Libraries
9. Appellate Court Security
10. Judicial Branch Data Governance
11. Statutory Statewide Trial Court Audit Program-State Controller's Office
12. *Language Access Expansion in the California Courts*
13. Habeas Corpus Resource Center (HCRC) Case Team Staffing and Establishment of Los Angeles Office
14. Stanislaus-New Modesto Courthouse, Buildout Three Shelled Courtrooms

2019 Budget Act

The Budget Act of 2019 provides for the following:

⁸ Judicial Council meeting report (July 19, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7512332&GUID=B4504462-A6BA-46C1-9A31-8F8A3214C682>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 19, 2019) <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=640299&GUID=79BFCCF3-78C5-45FE-909E-190F0A45083B>

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

- \$75 million to fund the implementation, operation, or evaluation of programs or efforts in at least 10 courts related to pretrial decision making;
- \$30.4 million in 2019-20 and \$36.5 million ongoing to fund 25 new trial court judgeships;
- Trailer bill language to increase the cap on trial court reserves from 1 percent to 3 percent;
- \$41.8 million to address anticipated revenue shortfalls in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF);
- \$33.7 million over five years to replace various outdated legacy case management systems used by 10 trial courts;
- \$22.5 million to support the increase in trial court employee retirement and health benefit costs with an additional \$25 million set aside to address current-year cost increases;
- \$20.2 million for underfunded trial court facility operations and maintenance costs;
- \$6 million to refresh, maintain, and replace security equipment and systems;
- \$5.6 million to conduct phase one of a multiphase program for digitizing mandatory court records for trial and appellate courts;
- \$33.9 million federal funds for court-appointed dependency counsel and an additional \$20 million to decrease the average attorney caseload of clients;
- \$20 million in one-time equal access funding to provide legal aid for renters in landlord-tenant disputes;
- \$2.5 million in one-time equal access funding for expansion of existing programs that represent low-income families (Shriver program);
- \$9.6 million for language access and \$4 million ongoing to replace the prior year one-time funding;
- \$13.9 million in 2019-20 and \$2.9 million in 2020-21 to support costs associated with cannabis convictions resentencing;
- \$38.3 million in new funding for two existing courthouse projects (Imperial and Riverside) and authorization for reappropriation and extension of the liquidation period for the San Diego Courthouse and new Yuba City Courthouse; and
- \$15 million in one-time operational funds for deferred maintenance.

2020 Governor's Budget

The 2020 Governor's Budget proposal includes:

- \$61.7 million, which is equivalent to a three percent increase in funding for general trial court operational costs statewide;
- \$45.9 million to equalize funding among trial courts;
- \$35.2 million to address anticipated revenue shortfalls in the TCTF;
- \$23.1 million in federal funds for court-appointed dependency counsel;

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

- \$11.5 million in 2020-21, increasing to \$56 million beginning in 2023-24 to reduce inequities in the structure of our system of fines and fees;
- \$11.2 million for administration of the Shriver program to support costs with administering an increase in grantees funded by the program and a mandated study;
- \$10.3 million in 2020-21 and then \$2.8 million ongoing to implement three information technology initiatives designed to digitize the court system;
- \$8.9 million in 2020-21 and then \$8.5 million thereafter for increased court reporter costs and to purchase equipment for the Video Remote Interpreting Program;
- \$8.1 million in 2020-21 and then \$15.5 million annually to establish a new Court Navigators program;
- \$6.1 million in 2020-21 and \$10.3 million in 2021-22 to implement the second and third phases of digitizing court records;
- \$35.1 million for trial court employee health benefits and retirement costs;
- Budget bill language to allow unspent cannabis convictions resentencing funds from 2019 be carried over into the 2020-21 fiscal year; and
- A \$2 billion set aside over the next five years to fund construction of additional courthouses.

Recommendation

It is recommended that BCP concept proposals and prioritization by the membership include consideration of the 2020 Governor’s Budget proposal.

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Annual Agenda¹—2020

Approved by Executive and Planning Committee: December 17, 2019

I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Judge, Superior Court of Fresno County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services
Committee's Charge/Membership: Rule 10.64(a) of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, which is to make recommendations to the council on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for trial courts and provides input to the council on policy issues affecting trial court funding. Rule 10.64(b) sets forth additional duties of the committee. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee currently has 24 members, and meets in-person four times a year, in addition to numerous teleconferences, utilizing dedicated funds from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund. The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee meets in-person twice annually, also using dedicated funds from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources.

Subcommittees/Working Groups²:

1. Fiscal Planning Subcommittee – Reviews recommendations regarding trial court requests to set aside funds on their behalf that have reverted to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) pursuant to Government Code section 77203. This group also reviews requests from trial courts that relate to Children’s Waiting Room funding.
2. Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) – Ongoing review and refinement of the Workload Formula, develop a methodology for allocations from the TCTF Court Interpreter Program (CIP) (0150037) in the event of a funding shortfall, and consider funding allocation methodologies for other non-discretionary dollars as necessary.
3. Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee – Ongoing review of TCTF and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) allocations supporting trial court projects and programs as well as any systematic cash flow issues affecting the trial courts.
4. All Funding Sources Ad Hoc Subcommittee (*New*) – To review and confirm all trial court general ledger accounts used in the Workload Formula including operating expenditures and equipment (OE&E).
5. Consumer Price Index (CPI) Ad Hoc Subcommittee (*New*) – To develop a methodology for CPI allocations to the trial courts should funding be granted for this purpose in the 2020 Budget Act.
6. Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee – To develop a methodology for allocations from the TCTF CIP in the event of a funding shortfall and review existing methodologies.

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

II. COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ³	
1.	Project Title: Interpreter Funding Methodology	Priority 2⁴
		Strategic Plan Goal⁵ VII
<p>Project Summary⁶: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated due to the declining fund balance in the TCTF CIP (0150037), and the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee was established to develop a methodology for allocations from the CIP in the event of a funding shortfall and to review existing methodologies. The expected outcome is to appropriately allocate funds in the event of a shortfall, and to update the methodology for reimbursing and/or allocating funds as deemed appropriate.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Targeted completion date for a shortfall methodology and reviewing existing methodologies is fiscal year 2019–20 for a possible 2020–21 implementation.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services and Center for Children, Families & the Courts (CFCC) staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		

³ All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

⁴ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

⁵ Indicate which goal number of The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch the project most closely aligns.

⁶ A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	New or One-Time Projects³	
2.	Project Title: Operating Expenditures and Equipment (OE&E) Review	Priority 2⁴ Strategic Plan Goal⁵ VII
<p>Project Summary⁶: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from a Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS work plan on July 12, 2018, which was carried forward from an initial review performed in 2012–13. An All Funding Sources Ad Hoc Subcommittee was established to identify all funding sources that should be a part of the Workload Formula, which helps identify the gap between a court’s allocation and Workload Formula funding. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS heard a recommendation on February 28, 2019, as it related to the inclusion and exclusion of revenue general ledger accounts, which was recommended by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and adopted by the council at its July 18, 2019 business meeting. A review will continue as it relates to OE&E general ledger accounts and the expected outcome is verification of the correct accounts used in the Workload Formula as well as standardized usage of account codes for use in a uniform and consistent manner.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Targeted completion is fiscal year 2020–21.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services and Business Management Services staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: None.</p>		
3.	Project Title: Consumer Price Index (CPI) Allocation Methodology	Priority 2⁴ Strategic Plan Goal⁵ VII
<p>Project Summary⁶: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from an item on the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS work plan and was discussed at a July 25, 2019. Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting where the CPI Ad Hoc Subcommittee was established to develop a methodology for CPI allocations should funding be granted. The expected outcome is to appropriately allocate funding for trial courts’ inflationary cost increases to allow the courts to maintain service levels.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Targeted completion is 2019–20 for 2020–21 implementation pending outcome of a budget change proposal funding award in the 2020 Budget Act.</p>		

#	New or One-Time Projects ³
	<p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Budget Services staff.</p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> None.</p>

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities	
1.	Project Title: State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Allocations	Priority 1⁴
		Strategic Plan Goal⁵ VII
	<p>Project Summary⁶: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of structural shortfalls identified in the IMF and TCTF. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee R&E Subcommittee will review 2020–21 allocations from the IMF and TCTF to ensure consistency with the Judicial Council goals and objectives and propose solutions to address any structural shortfall in either fund. The expected outcome is to assist the council in ensuring solvency of the IMF and TCTF.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing (allocations for 2020–21 will be approved by July 2020).</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services staff as well as multiple other Judicial Council office staff that have programs funded from the IMF and/or TCTF.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Various Judicial Council offices with programs funded from the IMF and/or TCTF, and external stakeholders include trial courts and service providers.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Various advisory bodies that have programs in these funds and provide recommendations regarding funding and program priorities.</p>	
2.	Project Title: Workload Formula	Priority 2⁴
		Strategic Plan Goal⁵ VII
	<p>Project Summary⁶: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. In April 2013, the Judicial Council approved the Workload Formula for use in allocating the annual state trial court operations funds with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments will continue to be evaluated and submitted to the Judicial Council for approval. Amendments to the annual work plan are presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee annually, and the expected outcome is an improvement to the Workload Formula to more accurately capture relative funding needs of the trial courts.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services and Business Management Services staff.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities	
	<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee oversees the Resources Assessment Study model, which feeds into the Workload Formula.</p>	
3.	Project Title: Joint Facilities Costs	<p>Priority 2⁴</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal⁵ VII</p>
	<p>Project Summary⁶: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS work plan item from an adjustment request submitted on January 16, 2018, and was discussed at the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS meeting on July 12, 2018, where the Joint Facilities Ad Hoc Subcommittee was created. The meeting resulted in a request for Judicial Council staff to identify facilities-related costs already factored into the Workload Formula as well as identifying lease expenditures for trial courts. Court-funded leases and court-funded debt service payments were identified as items to consider including as unfunded facilities costs and was presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS at its February 28, 2019 meeting. A recommendation was made by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and approved by the council at its July 18, 2019 business meeting to adjust each court’s workload allocation to include net civil assessments less maintenance of effort and debt service obligations paid from civil assessments, and the remaining lease issue is pending the outcome of a 2020–21 budget change proposal submission.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Targeted completion is fiscal year 2020–21.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services and Facilities Services staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Court Facilities Advisory Committee and Trial Court Facilities Modification Advisory Committee.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities	
4.	Project Title: Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator (AB 1058) Funding	Priority 2⁴ Strategic Plan Goal⁵ VII
<p>Project Summary⁶: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from a Judicial Council meeting in April 2015 as a recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, with an original targeted completion date of December 2017 for 2018–19 implementation (which has been pushed out to 2021–22 implementation). The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee will work on the development of a workload-based funding methodology for the facilitator portion of the program, which was originally developed in 1997 (the commissioner portion is completed, and a reallocation of funds will be considered every two years beginning with fiscal year 2021–22). The expected outcome is for the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to provide input on appropriately allocating funds based on workload per a Judicial Council December 2016 report.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Targeted completion is fiscal year 2020–21 for 2021–22 implementation.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services and CFCC staff.</p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: Internal stakeholders include CFCC, and external stakeholders include trial courts and the California Department of Child Support Services.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.</p>		

III. LIST OF 2019 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Workload Formula</p> <p>The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS developed new policy parameters for allocation of trial court funding, including methodologies for allocation of new money as well as reallocation of funds to continue the progress towards equity in funding, that was approved by the Judicial Council at its July 2019 business meeting. Highlights include funding for 25 new judgeships received in the 2019 Budget Act and adding net civil assessments and specific general ledger accounts as part of the Workload Formula. Project continues into the 2020 agenda.</p>
2.	<p>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding</p> <p>The Small Court Dependency Workload Working Group made a recommendation to the Judicial Council in May 2017 as it relates to a Bureau of Labor Statistics adjustment for two fiscal years (2017–18 and 2018–19). The working group sunsetted on May 19, 2017. CFCC brought forward various options for recommendation to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee FMS on October 18, 2018. The FMS recommendation was presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on December 13, 2018, for recommendation to the Judicial Council at its January 15, 2019 business meeting. It was decided that the small court changes be made permanent effective July 1, 2019.</p>
3.	<p>Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator (AB 1058) Funding</p> <p>The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee heard a recommendation on a commissioner methodology from the Joint AB 1058 Funding Methodology Subcommittee on October 18, 2018, which was approved by the Judicial Council at its January 15, 2019 business meeting. The family law facilitator part of the project as well as ongoing biennial review of the commissioner allocations continues into the 2020 agenda.</p>
4.	<p>IMF and TCTF Allocations</p> <p>The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee R&E Subcommittee made 2019–20 IMF and TCTF recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Council in May and July of 2019. Project continues into the 2020 agenda.</p>
5.	<p>Interpreter Funding Methodology</p> <p>The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee made a recommendation to the Judicial Council that was approved on May 17, 2019, to use TCTF fund balance to cover an anticipated shortfall in 2019–20. The project continues into the 2020 agenda.</p>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
6.	<p>2018–19 New Funding Outcomes</p> <p>The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee presented a report to the Judicial Council on May 17, 2019, that provided information on outcomes related to new branch funding provided in the 2018 budget, totaling \$108.4 million in discretionary funds, \$19.1 million for self-help services, and \$10 million earmarked to increase the number of court reports in family law. The new funding has increased public access to court services, expanded services, decreased backlog, and enhanced operational stability to serve the public more efficiently and effectively.</p>
7.	<p>Joint Facilities Costs</p> <p>The evaluation of the Joint Facilities Ad Hoc Subcommittee was completed, and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee heard a recommendation from FMS in May 2019, which was approved by the council at its July 2019 business meeting to adopt an adjustment to each court’s workload allocation to include net civil assessments less maintenance of effort and debt service obligations paid from civil assessments. The remaining lease issue is pending the outcome of a 2020–21 budget change proposal submission. The project continues into the 2020 agenda.</p>
8.	<p>Workload Formula Funding at 100 Percent</p> <p>The evaluation of the 100 Percent Ad Hoc Subcommittee was completed, and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee heard a recommendation from FMS in July 2019, which was approved by the council at its September 2019 business meeting to adopt policy parameters regarding an allocation for trial courts that exceed 100 percent of their Workload Formula.</p>

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

(Information Only)

Title: Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf Expenditure Reporting

Date: 1/23/2020

Contact: Catrayel Wood, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-7008 | Catrayel.Wood@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Upon completion of TCTF Funds Held on Behalf (FHOB) projects or planned expenditures, courts are required to report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) within 90 days on the project or planned expenditure and how the funds were expended.

Background

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the Judicial Council, when setting the allocations for trial courts, to set a preliminary allocation in July of each fiscal year. Further, in January of each fiscal year, after review of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year, the Judicial Council shall finalize allocations to trial courts and each court's finalized allocation shall be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 77203. Government Code 77203 provides that a trial court may, beginning June 30, 2014 and concluding June 30, 2019, carryover unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year. Effective June 30, 2020 the carryover amount increases to 3 percent.

At its business meeting on July 29, 2014, the council approved an annual process beginning in 2015-16 for courts to provide preliminary and final computations of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap in compliance with Government Code 68502.5(c)(2)(A).

At its business meeting on April 15, 2016, the Judicial Council adopted a process, criteria, and procedures for trial courts to request that TCTF-reduced allocations related to the 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the TCTF as restricted fund balance for the benefit of those courts that make the request. The process is intended only for expenditures that cannot be funded by a court's annual budget or three-year encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement, and it requires reporting on the use of the funds.

The Judicial Council adopted revisions to the policy, including streamlining the submission schedule, making a change to the recipient of the request, and providing language corrections to better align with court year-end closing, trial court allocation offsets, and requests to amend previously reviewed requests at its business meeting on January 17, 2020 (see Attachment 3A).

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

Judicial Council Budget Services staff submitted its initial expenditure report to the TCBAC at its July 25, 2019 meeting and established quarterly reporting on the status of FHOB projects or planned expenditures from those courts that indicate completion.

Report of Status

In January 2020, Budget Services staff requested a status on projects or planned expenditures for reporting through the second quarter of 2019-20. Reports on completion of each project or planned expenditure provided can be found in Attachment 3B. A summary of each follows:

Court	Council Approval Date	Project or Planned Expenditure	Amount	Completion Date
Alameda	07/29/16	Tyler case management system (CMS)	\$1,204,632	06/29/19
Butte	11/17/17	Court calendaring system	\$50,193	06/05/19*
Monterey	06/24/16	Tyler CMS	\$51,914	08/30/19

\$1,306,739

**Project was completed in June 2019; however, final project costs were not finalized until December 2019. Unspent funds will be returned to the TCTF.*

Attachments

Attachment 3A: *Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts*

Attachment 3B: *Funds Held on Behalf of the Court Project Completion Reporting*

1 **Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for**
 2 **Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts**

3
 4 **Recommended Process for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf**
 5 **of the Courts**

- 6
 7 1. Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance will be held on behalf of trial courts only for
 8 expenditures or projects that cannot be funded by a court's annual budget or three-year
 9 encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement.
- 10 a. Categories or activities include, but are not limited to:
- 11 i) Projects that extend beyond the original planned three-year term process such as
 12 expenses related to the delayed opening of new facilities or delayed deployment of
 13 new information systems;
- 14 ii) Technology improvements or infrastructure such as installing a local data center, data
 15 center equipment replacement, case management system deployment, converting to a
 16 VoIP telephone system, desktop computer replacement, and replacement of backup
 17 emergency power systems;
- 18 iii) Facilities maintenance and repair allowed under rule 10.810 of the California Rules of
 19 Court such as flooring replacement and renovation as well as professional facilities
 20 maintenance equipment;
- 21 iv) Court efficiencies projects such as online and smart forms for court users and RFID
 22 systems for tracking case files; and
- 23 v) Other court infrastructure projects such as vehicle replacement and copymachine
 24 replacement.
- 25
- 26 2. The submission, review, and approval process is as follows:
- 27 a. All requests will be submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration.
- 28 b. Requests will be submitted to the *director of Budget Services* by the court's presiding
 29 judge or court executive officer.
- 30 c. *Budget Services* staff will review the request, ask the court to provide any missing or
 31 incomplete information, draft a preliminary report, share the preliminary report with the
 32 court for its comments, revise as necessary, and issue the report to the *Fiscal Planning*
 33 *Subcommittee* of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC); the
 34 *subcommittee* will meet to review the request, hear any presentation of the court
 35 representative, and ask questions of the representative if one participates on behalf of the
 36 court; and *Budget Services* office staff will issue a final report on behalf of the
 37 *subcommittee* for the council.
- 38 d. The final report to the *subcommittee* and the Judicial Council will be provided to the
 39 requesting court before the report is made publicly available on the California Courts
 40 website.
- 41 e. The court may send a representative to the *subcommittee* and Judicial Council meetings
 42 to present its request and respond to questions.
- 43

- 44 3. To be considered at a scheduled Judicial Council business meeting, requests must be
45 submitted to the *director of Budget Services* at least 40 business days (approximately
46 eight weeks) before that business meeting.
- 47
- 48 4. The Judicial Council may consider including appropriate terms and conditions that courts
49 must accept for the council to approve designating TCTF fund balance on the court's behalf.
50 a. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions would result in the immediate change in
51 the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no
52 longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
- 53
- 54 5. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine need to be revised to reflect a change
55 (1) in the amounts by year to be distributed to the court for the planned annual expenditures
56 and/or encumbrances, (2) in the total amount of the planned expenditures, or (3) of more than
57 10 percent of the total request among the categories of expense will need to be amended and
58 resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process discussed in 1–3 above.
59 a. Denied revised requests will result in the immediate change in the designation of the
60 related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of
61 the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
- 62
- 63 6. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine have a change in purpose will need to
64 be amended and resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process
65 discussed in 1–3 above, along with a request that the TCTF funds held on behalf of the court
66 for the previously approved request continue to be held on behalf of the court for this new
67 purpose.
68 a. Denied new requests tied to previously approved requests will result in the immediate
69 change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted
70 and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative
71 action.
- 72
- 73 7. On completion of the project or planned expenditure, courts are required to report to the Trial
74 Court Budget Advisory Committee within 90 days on the project or planned expenditure and
75 how the funds were expended.
- 76
- 77 8. As part of the courts' audits in the scope of the normal audit cycle, a review of any funds that
78 were held on behalf of the courts will be made to confirm that they were used for their stated
79 approved purpose.

80 **Recommended Criteria for Eligibility for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the**
81 **Courts**

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

85
86 **Recommended Information Required to Be Provided by Trial Courts for TCTF**
87 **Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts**

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

90
91 **SECTION I**

92 **General Information**

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

100
101 **SECTION II**

102 **Amended Request Changes**

- 103 • Sections and answers amended
- 104 • A summary of changes to request

105
106 **SECTION III**

107 **Trial Court Operations and Access to Justice**

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


119 **SECTION IV**120 **Financial Information**

- 121 • Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures (*table template*
122 *provided*)
- 123 • Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years during which the trial court would
124 either be contributing to the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf or receiving
125 distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf (*table template*
126 *provided*)
- 127 • Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project
128 (*table template provided*)
- 129 • A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and
130 expended, by fiscal year (*table template provided*)

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 01-16-01-00	
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
SUPERIOR COURT: Alameda	
JC APPROVED DATE: 7/29/2016	JC APPROVED AMOUNT: \$1,204,632
REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION: The Court entered into a contract with Tyler Technologies, Inc. to provide a new case management system for criminal, juvenile, civil, and family law case types. The original go-live date was December 2015; however project delays required an extension of the go-live date. Thus work will be extending beyond the three-year contract term. The planned work and related expenditures are expected to be completed in FY 2016-17.	
SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROJECT COMPLETE	
<i>Per Judicial Council policy, "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."</i>	
PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED: FUNDING WAS USED TO PAY FOR THE REMAINING DELIVERABLE COSTS AGREED UPON SETTLEMENT WITH THE VENDOR AND THE ANNUAL LICENSING FEES	
TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: \$4,072,527	
COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 6/29/2019	
<input type="checkbox"/> PROJECT NOT COMPLETED	
PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:	
ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: Click here to enter a date.	
CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Melanie Lewis – mlewis@alameda.courts.ca.gov 510.891.6038	
PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (<i>Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer</i>): Chad Finke, CEO	

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 04-17-02-00	
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
SUPERIOR COURT: Butte	
JC APPROVED DATE: 11/17/2017	JC APPROVED AMOUNT: \$53,151
REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:	
<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>	
SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROJECT COMPLETE	
<p><i>Per Judicial Council policy, "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."</i></p>	
PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:	
<p>Funds were used to procure 15 monitors along with the necessary hardware, software, and infrastructure required to display case and calendar related information within the Oroville courthouse.</p>	
TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: \$50,193	
COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 6/5/2019	
<p>Note - Project was completed in June 2019; however, final project costs were not finalized until December 2019.</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> PROJECT NOT COMPLETED	
PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:	
ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: Click here to enter a date.	
CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Jarrod Orr, Deputy Court Executive Officer jorr@buttecourt.ca.gov , (530) 532-7208	
PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (<i>Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer</i>):	
	Kimberly Flener, Court Executive Officer

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 27-16-01-00	
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
SUPERIOR COURT: Monterey	
JC APPROVED DATE: 6/24/2016	JC APPROVED AMOUNT: \$51,914
REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION: <p>Monterey Superior Court is in the process of implementing Tyler's Odyssey Case Management system, a project which was originally scheduled for completion by June 30th 2016. However, though our court has achieved steady progress of its implementation, due to circumstances beyond the control of the court, the expected completion date of this project will extend into FY 2016/17. As a result, the court anticipates \$51,914 of FY 2013/14 fund balance encumbered to fund the project will not be liquidated by the deadline of 6/30/16 and will be reverted to TCTF due to the 1% cap on fund balance calculated for FY 2013/14. It is necessary for the court to retain access to this funding to ensure project completion and avoid negative impact to services that would occur if not completed. This request is based on estimates of project deliverables completed by the current liquidation deadline of June 30, 2016 and may require revision after close of FY 2015/16.</p>	
SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROJECT COMPLETE <p><i>Per Judicial Council policy, "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."</i></p> <p>PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED: The remaining \$9,368 of the unpaid contract with Tyler was paid in August 2019 as Tyler met all of its contractual obligations, specifically compliance with DOJ reporting requirements. This completed the court's contract with Tyler for the deployment of the Odyssey case management system.</p> <p>TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: \$51,914</p> <p>COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 8/30/2019</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> PROJECT NOT COMPLETED <p>PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:</p> <p>ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: Click here to enter a date.</p>	
CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Colin Simpson, colin.simpson@monterey.courts.ca.gov , (831) 775-5630	
PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (<i>Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer</i>): Chris Ruhl, CEO	