



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR JULY 25, 2019 MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft minutes from the June 3, 2019 Meeting	4
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Workload Formula at 100% (Action Required)	6
Attachment 1A: June 17, 2019 Report to the FMS re: Recommendations of 100% Funding Working Group	7
Item 2 – Annual FMS Work Plan Update (Action Required)	10
Attachment 2A: FMS Work Plan Items Completed Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19	11
Attachment 2B: FMS Work Plan	12
Item 3 – 2018-19 Preliminary One-Time Reduction for Fund Balances Above the 1% Cap (Action Required)	14
Attachment 3A: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	16
Attachment 3B: 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form	18
Item 4 – Allocation of Cannabis Convictions Resentencing Funding (Action Required)	19
Attachment 4A: Allocation Table for Cannabis Conviction Resentencing Funding	21
Item 5 – Trial Court Executive Summary Display (Action Required)	22
Attachment 5A: 2019-20 Allocation Summary	23
Information Only Items (No Action Required)	
Info 2 – 2019-20 Self-Help	24
Info 3 – Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf Expenditure Reporting	27
Attachment 3A1: Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts	29
Attachment 3B2: Funds Held on Behalf of the Court Project Completion Reporting	33



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 IN-PERSON MEETING

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: July 25, 2019
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Location: 2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA, 95833, Tower Room A & B
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 June 3, 2019 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1)-(2))

In-Person 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 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 10:00 a.m. on July 24, 2019 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–5)

Item 1

Workload Formula Funding at 100% (Action Required)

Consideration of a Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommendation on policy parameters regarding an allocation or trial courts that exceed 100% of their Workload Formula.

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

Item 2

Annual FMS Work Plan Update (Action Required)

Consideration of a FMS recommendation to update and prioritize the items on the annual work plan.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Director, Budget Services

Item 3

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

Review of the 2018-19 preliminary one-time allocation reductions for fund balances in excess of the 1 percent cap.

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

Item 4

Allocation of Cannabis Convictions Resentencing Funding (Action Required)

Consideration of the FMS recommendation on the allocation methodology for the \$13.9 million in 2019-20 and the \$2.929 million in 2020-21 to support increased workload for the trial courts as a result of the enactment of Chapter 993, Statutes 2018 (AB 1793).

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

Item 5

Trial Court Executive Summary Display (Action Required)

Review of the 2019-20 allocation summary for distribution to all 58 trial courts.

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

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

2019 Budget Act

Discussion of the funding provided for trial courts in the Budget Act of 2019.

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

Info 2

2019-20 Self-Help Annual Update

Annual update of the three-year average census data from the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, and Population Estimates for Cities and Counties and the State.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Supervising Research Analyst,
Business Management Services

Info 3

Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf Expenditure Reporting

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, Budget Services

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

June 3, 2019
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Andrew S. Blum, Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Hon. Mark A. Cope, Hon. Jill C. Fannin, Hon. Kimberly Gaab, Hon. Teri L. Jackson, Hon. Charles Margines, Hon. Brian McCabe, and Hon. B. Scott Thomsen.

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice Chair), Ms. Kim Bartleson, Ms. Sherri Carter, Mr. Chad Finke, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Michael D. Planet, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Mr. Brian Taylor, Ms. Kim Turner, Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

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

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton and Hon. Gary Nadler

Others Present: Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, and Ms. Melissa Ng.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the then called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the May 2, 2019 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 - 2)

Item 1 – Additional 2019-20 Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and General Fund (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations of the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee regarding allocations from the TCTF proposed in the Governor's Budget including cannabis convictions, and in the May Revise including 25 additional judgeships.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Melissa Ng, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve six recommendations below for consideration by the Judicial Council at its July 18-19, 2019 business meeting:

1. Approve \$24.486 million from the TCTF for general trial court operations allocated based on the Judicial Council-approved Workload Formula Allocation policy (Attachment 1A, line 23);
2. Approve \$10.852 million from the TCTF for the Court Interpreters Program (Attachment 1A, lines 28 and 29);
3. Approve \$13.9 million from the TCTF for Cannabis Convictions Resentencing (Attachment 1A, line 24);
4. Approve \$2.139 million reduction from the TCTF related to revised benefit cost change for non-interpreter employees, subordinate judicial officer (SJO) conversions, and replenishment of the \$10 million reserve (Attachment 1A, lines 19, 22 and 32);
5. Approve \$33.955 million in available reimbursement from the TCTF for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (Attachment 1A, line 55); and
6. Approve \$75 million from the General Fund for the Pretrial Pilot Program.

Item 2 - Allocation Methodology for Additional Judgeships (Action Required)

Consideration of the Workload Formula methodology for allocation of the trial court operations portion of new judgeship funding.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Judicial Council Court Research

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve a recommendation for consideration by the Judicial Council at its July 18-19, 2019 business meeting to give 50 percent of funds to those courts under the average formula line, and give the remaining 50 percent to courts through a weighted approach that considers court size and distance from the average.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:55pm.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

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

(Action Item)

Title: Policy Change to Workload Formula for Courts at or Above 100% of Funding Need

Date: 7/25/2019

Contact: Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Business Management Services
415-865-7708 | leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Pursuant to its work plan, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) convened a working group to review and develop a policy for courts that exceed 100% of their Workload Formula. A proposal was reviewed and approved at FMS' June 17, 2019 meeting for transmission to the full Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC).

Background

The background and analysis of this issue is contained in Attachment 1A. At FMS' June 17, 2019 meeting, a further refinement was made to the original recommendation to specify that courts above 105% of funding need would be subject to a 2% reduction *without going below 104%* (emphasis added).

Recommendation

FMS recommends that TCBAC:

1. Approve a change to the Workload Formula policy concerning reallocations in years with no new money so that any court above 105% of funding be subject to a 2% reduction of funding without going below 104%.
2. Allocate any funding received for cost increase adjustments to trial courts based upon their pro-rata share of the Workload Formula.

If approved by TCBAC, this policy recommendation would be forwarded to the Judicial Council for its approval at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 1A: June 17, 2019 Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee re: Recommendations of 100% Funding Working Group

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Attachment 1A

(Action Item)

Title: Recommendations of 100% Funding Working Group
Date: 6/17/2019
Contact: Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager
415-865-7708 | leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Item 4 on the Funding Methodology Subcommittee’s Workplan for 2018-19 calls for the development of policy parameters regarding an allocation methodology for trial courts that exceed 100% of their Workload Formula. The new discretionary funding received by courts in the 2018 Budget Act brought many trial courts closer to 100% of funding based on workload, which prompted a closer look at the policies concerning funding allocation. A working group of FMS was convened following the February 28, 2019 meeting to address this issue and propose recommendations concerning this issue to FMS.

Background

In January 2018, the council adopted new policy parameters for workload funding. The following sections specifically address how allocations of discretionary funding are to be allocated in the workload formula:

Allocations in fiscal years for which no new money is provided. To continue to make progress toward equity of trial court funding based on workload, while being mindful of the many years of budget reductions some courts have faced, the following parameters were recommended by FMS and approved by all TCBAC members save for one “no” vote:

- A band will be established that is 2 percent above and below the statewide average funding level, eliminating annual allocation fluctuations from minor changes in workload. Courts more than 2 percent above or below the statewide average funding ratio would be subject to an allocation change, whereas courts within the band would not be. The size of the band identified may be subject to reevaluation in the future.
- No allocation adjustment will occur for those courts within the band or for Cluster 1 courts. The goal is to fully fund the Cluster 1 courts, and an allocation adjustment would be contrary to that outcome.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

- Funds will be reallocated from courts above the band to courts below the band every other fiscal year for which no new money is provided regardless of years of increase or decrease in between. The first year of no new money will provide time to adjust for a second year of no new money in which an allocation change will occur.
- Up to 1 percent of allocations for courts above the band will be reallocated to courts below the band to provide an increased allocation of up to 1 percent. The allocation reductions are capped at 1 percent, regardless of the need of the courts below the band. Conversely, the allocation increases are capped at 1 percent, regardless of the available funding of the courts above the band. If adequate funds are available, some courts under the band may be able to penetrate into the band.

Allocations in fiscal years for which new money is provided. New money, for the purposes of this process, is defined above. FMS recommended, and TCBAC approved unanimously, that allocations of new money are to be made in the fiscal year for which the funding is intended in the following sequenced manner:

1. Bring all Cluster 1 courts up to at least 100 percent of funding need.
2. Allocate up to 50 percent of remaining funding to courts under the statewide average funding ratio. Allocated funds will bring courts up to but not over the statewide average funding ratio.
3. Allocate remaining funding to all courts based on the workload formula.
4. Allow no court's allocation to exceed 100 percent of its need unless it is the result of a funding floor calculation.

Ongoing and one-time funds designated for nondiscretionary purposes will be addressed as needed.

Analysis

The Ad Hoc group convened in May and June to discuss the issue. At its May meeting, the group affirmed that the basic principles of the allocation policies should be upheld. The group also recognized that in years with no new money, the pace of achieving equity in funding could be very slow. For that reason, the group proposed changing the policy concerning reallocation of funding in years with no new money. Whereas the current policy caps reallocation of funding at 1% for those courts above the 2% band, the group proposed that any court above 105% of funding need be subject to a 2% reduction of funding. Courts up to 105% of funding would continue to be subject to a 1% reallocation.

The group discussed the impact of the Budget Change Proposal for a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment on these calculations and recommends to FMS that if approved, that FMS

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

consider allocating the CPI funding separately from the workload-based allocations so that one allocation does not undo the other. Also, as a result of this potential funding, the group refrained from proposing additional changes to the workload formula policies, proposing that any further review or action be incorporated into other discussion that FMS might have concerning the workload formula.

Recommendation

It is recommended that FMS:

1. Approve a change to the workload formula policy concerning reallocations in years with no new money so that any court above 105% of funding be subject to a 2% reduction of funding.
2. Allocate any funding received for cost increase adjustments to trial courts separately from the workload formula allocation.

The recommendations of the FMS will be presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee for consideration.

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

(Action Item)

Title: Funding Methodology Subcommittee Work Plan
Date: 7/25/2019
Contact: Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Director, Budget Services
415-865-7587 | lucy.fogarty@jud.ca.gov

Issue

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee's (FMS's) proposed work plan as updated on June 17, 2019 requires review and approval of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC).

Background

The FMS prepares an annual work plan to direct its efforts in the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload Formula, develop a methodology for allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund Court Interpreter Program in the event of a funding shortfall, and consider funding allocation methodologies for other non-discretionary dollars as necessary.

The FMS has resolved many work plan items over the last two years, including developing a recommendation for implementation of the Workload Formula. This set new policy parameters, beginning in 2018-19, for an allocation methodology to continue after the first five years of the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology. The work plan items completed by the FMS in 2017-18 and 2018-19 are provided as Attachment 2A.

The proposed work plan for 2019-20 is provided as Attachment 2B. This takes into account any items already considered complete by the FMS, even if pending review and approval by the Judicial Council.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the TCBAC review and approve the 2019-20 work plan. In addition, the TCBAC may consider adding additional items to the work plan they deem a priority.

Attachments

Attachment 2A: FMS Work Plan Items Completed Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19
Attachment 2B: FMS Work Plan

**FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE
WORK PLAN ITEMS COMPLETED
FISCAL YEARS 2017-18 AND 2018-19**

1. Plans for FY 2018–2019 and year 6 and beyond.
 - a. Review and evaluate funding methodology.
 - b. Simplify display of worksheets for after year five.
2. Evaluate the impact of civil assessments as it relates to the Workload Formula.
3. Identify all funding sources and determine allocation models.
4. Develop policy parameters regarding an allocation methodology for trial courts that exceed 100% of their Workload Formula.
5. Evaluate whether and/or how to include unfunded costs for facilities – courthouse construction, maintenance and modifications.
6. Develop a methodology for incorporating inflationary increases for operating expenses and equipment into the Workload Formula.
7. Evaluate how Criminal Justice Realignment (AB 109) funding should be factored into the Workload Formula.
8. Review TCTF and IMF self-help funding allocations and determine allocation methodology for all self-help funding beginning in 2019-20.
9. Review court-appointed dependency allocations and determine allocation methodology for 2019-20.
10. Evaluate special circumstances cases funding.
11. Review funding floor calculation to determine handling of inflation and refresh cycle.

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Updated on June 17, 2019

Charge of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Focus on the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload Formula, develop a methodology for allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund Court Interpreter Program (0150037) in the event of a funding shortfall, and consider funding allocation methodologies for other non-discretionary dollars as necessary.

2019-20

1. Perform a review of all accounts that are used in the computation of the Operating Expenses and Equipment factor.
2. Evaluate the cluster 2 Bureau of Labor Statistics and small court adjustment contributions including a review of the Workload Formula adjustment request from Del Norte Superior Court, submitted on January 8, 2018.
3. Evaluate the Workload Formula Adjustment Request submitted by El Dorado Superior Court in January 2019 including an assessment of what has changed since the request for Mendocino Superior Court was considered in 2013.
4. Develop a methodology for reimbursement of expenditures for the Court Interpreter Program in the event of a funding shortfall.
5. Develop a methodology to allocate:
 - a. 50 percent of funding to courts under the statewide average funding ratio in years of new money per the policy approved by the Judicial Council on January 12, 2018; and
 - b. Funding from courts above the band to courts below the band every other year for which no new money is provided per the policy approved by the Judicial Council on January 12, 2018.
 - c. Reallocation of funding from courts above 105% as proposed by FMS on June 17, 2019.

2020-21

6. Identify and evaluate the impact of Judicial Council-provided services versus those that are funded by local trial court operations funds.

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Updated on June 17, 2019

Ongoing Through 2021-22

7. Track the work of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to ensure implementation of an allocation methodology for the AB 1058 Child Support Family Law Facilitator Program in 2022-23.

Annual Updates

8. Review the base funding floor amounts annually, if requested by the applicable courts, for presentation to the TCBAC in December, to determine whether an inflationary adjustment is needed.

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

(Action Item)

Title: 2018-19 Preliminary One-Time Reduction for Fund Balances Above the 1% Cap
Date: 7/25/2019
Contact: Melissa Ng, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-263-1754 | Melissa.Ng@jud.ca.gov

Issue

The 2018-19 preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$7,376,205 to 15 courts is provided (Attachment 3A) for Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee consideration and recommendation to the Judicial Council at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting.

Background

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation reduction in July of each fiscal year and a final allocation reduction before February of each fiscal year to offset the amount of fund balance (or reserves) in excess of the amount authorized by GC section 77203. GC 77203 limited the amount of funds to be carried over from one year to the next beginning June 30, 2014. The reductions reflect the calculated preliminary allocation reduction amounts provided by the courts on the 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form (Attachment 3B).

At its July 29, 2014 business meeting, 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 section 68502.5(c)(2)(A):

- Each year, courts will be required to submit the 1 percent computation form with preliminary year-end information by July 15. The information provided by courts will be used by the council to make the preliminary allocation of reductions as required by statute. Courts would not be required to provide the details related to encumbrances, prepayments, and restricted revenue when submitting the form for the preliminary allocation.
- Each year, courts will be required to submit the 1 percent computation form with final yearend information by October 15.
- Before February, the Judicial Council’s Chief Financial Officer will report to the council the information provided by courts for the final allocation reduction, if any.

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

The July preliminary submission information was not received in time to present at the July 18-19, 2019 Judicial Council business meeting due to a combination of the earlier council business meeting this year and the time courts required for the soft close of their prior year finances.

The calculated 2018-19 preliminary one-time allocation reduction totals \$7,376,205 to 15 courts with fund balance in excess of the 1 percent cap. Of this amount, \$2,330,000 in approved requests for funds to be held on behalf of courts will be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund balance for expenditure in future years.

Further, amounts presented in this report are subject to change as requests for Funds Held on Behalf are approved and additional information is received from the courts.

Recommendation

Approve the 2018-19 preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$7,376,205 to 15 courts that are projecting the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent balance cap to exceed the cap by \$7,376,205 as required by statute, for consideration by the council at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting.

Attachments

- Attachment 3A: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap
- Attachment 3B: 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form

Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap
(as of July 15, 2019)

Court	Fund Balance Cap	2018-19 Ending Fund Balance	Encumbrance Reserves at June 30	Excluded Funds	Prepayments	Balance of Approved Funds Held on Behalf	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	Current Year Reduction	Prior Year Disencumbrance	Total Preliminary Reduction	Approved Funds to be Held on Behalf of Courts in 2019-20 ²
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G (B - C - D - E - F)	Col. H (A - G - I)	Col. I	Col. J (H + I)	Col. K
ALAMEDA	1,000,169	7,606,206	2,928,273	1,675,561	0	0	3,002,372	(1,978,877)	(23,326)	(2,002,203)	
ALPINE	7,947	28,703	0	14,974	0	0	13,729	(5,782)	0	(5,782)	
AMADOR	37,545	176,800	130,000	16,688	0	0	30,112	0	(1,900)	(1,900)	
BUTTE	153,555	1,140,072	292,718	367,075	326,858	0	153,421	0	0	0	
CALAVERAS	32,189	579,098	131,836	170,165	244,908	0	32,189	0	0	0	
COLUSA	19,658	792,358	46,867	261,424	139,409	0	344,658	(325,000)	0	(325,000)	100,000
CONTRA COSTA	592,379	3,129,929	857,338	1,871,886	80,000	0	320,705	0	(35,978)	(35,978)	
DEL NORTE	35,840	603,216	11,703	509,429	0	0	82,084	(46,180)	(64)	(46,244)	
EL DORADO	91,928	60,427	0	0	5,946	0	54,481	0	0	0	
FRESNO	669,416	4,752,038	2,627,425	1,610,100	0	0	514,513	0	0	0	
GLENN	32,443	90,708	0	81,803	0	0	8,905	0	0	0	
HUMBOLDT	96,751	211,924	455	99,903	15,319	0	96,247	0	0	0	
IMPERIAL	121,560	2,003,100	1,243,592	641,589	76,867	0	41,052	0	0	0	
INYO	30,239	408,671	0	399,439	2,015	0	7,217	0	0	0	
KERN	836,756	4,288,018	0	3,443,570	167,760	676,688	0	0	0	0	
KINGS	114,281	1,734,777	1,434,371	264,037	30,000	0	6,369	0	0	0	
LAKE	47,288	497,574	284,463	176,800	0	0	36,311	0	0	0	
LASSEN	32,073	590,663	358,836	123,829	0	75,925	32,073	0	0	0	
LOS ANGELES	7,831,950	32,240,816	7,024,000	23,726,834	57,045	0	1,432,937	0	0	0	
MADERA	108,782	591,085	158,205	409,978	0	0	22,902	0	0	0	
MARIN	149,815	1,742,001	682,605	939,751	5,000	0	114,645	0	0	0	
MARIPOSA	19,333	47,712	0	28,194	2,359	0	17,159	0	0	0	
MENDOCINO	73,827	1,274,361	187,127	236,406	0	0	850,828	(777,001)	0	(777,001)	
MERCED	183,048	3,453,620	543,391	2,659,169	241,886	8,914	260	0	0	0	
MODOC	14,552	111,191	81,788	28,094	0	0	1,309	0	0	0	
MONO	24,057	257,350	32,700	49,054	27,337	0	148,259	(120,874)	(3,328)	(124,202)	20,000
MONTEREY	263,530	2,051,497	903,043	848,424	181,900	9,368	108,762	0	0	0	
NAPA	101,713	694,708	16,687	620,882	0	18,088	39,051	0	0	0	
NEVADA	71,420	337,467	0	301,109	0	0	36,358	0	0	0	
ORANGE	1,986,353	12,614,584	2,490,819	6,802,912	1,000,000	465,234	1,855,619	0	0	0	
PLACER	236,639	1,151,053	121,322	484,000	139,271	45,453	361,007	(120,126)	(4,242)	(124,368)	
PLUMAS	14,481	80,861	23,483	56,272	0	0	1,106	0	0	0	
RIVERSIDE	1,698,282	9,097,498	4,000,000	3,891,835	200,000	0	1,005,663	0	0	0	
SACRAMENTO	962,013	6,501,256	200,000	2,116,386	24,039	1,412,664	2,748,167	(1,700,000)	(86,154)	(1,786,154)	
SAN BENITO ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SAN BERNARDINO	1,408,161	10,017,270	3,850,980	2,366,763	3,799,527	0	0	0	0	0	
SAN DIEGO	1,853,396	17,757,984	3,355,104	11,822,991	1,434,877	0	1,145,012	0	0	0	
SAN FRANCISCO	747,008	807,172	0	421,479	0	385,693	0	0	0	0	
SAN JOAQUIN	464,081	2,846,604	40,539	2,251,204	223,047	0	331,814	0	0	0	
SAN LUIS OBISPO	179,565	2,663,399	550,921	1,958,768	0	0	153,710	0	(4,633)	(4,633)	
SAN MATEO	483,115	5,241,417	2,285,770	508,000	150,000	0	2,297,647	(1,781,658)	(32,874)	(1,814,532)	2,160,000
SANTA BARBARA	315,020	4,871,275	1,580,234	2,827,103	360,885	0	103,053	0	0	0	
SANTA CLARA	1,043,028	742,464	0	474,989	0	0	267,475	0	0	0	
SANTA CRUZ	163,199	848,267	100,000	603,691	0	0	144,576	0	0	0	
SHASTA	201,404	464,672	19,219	315,538	0	0	129,915	0	0	0	
SIERRA	8,834	22,295	4,515	2,164	9,960	0	5,656	0	0	0	
SISKIYOU	42,416	378,724	108,078	228,498	0	0	42,148	0	0	0	
SOLANO	292,951	2,267,904	799,796	1,170,104	33,701	0	264,303	0	0	0	
SONOMA	285,054	2,601,710	0	1,857,372	474,426	0	269,912	0	0	0	

Court	Fund Balance Cap	2018-19 Ending Fund Balance	Encumbrance Reserves at June 30	Excluded Funds	Prepayments	Balance of Approved Funds Held on Behalf	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	Current Year Reduction	Prior Year Disencumbrance	Total Preliminary Reduction	Approved Funds to be Held on Behalf of Courts in 2019-20 ²
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G (B - C - D - E - F)	Col. H (A - G - I)	Col. I	Col. J (H + I)	Col. K
STANISLAUS	311,462	1,887,741	695,314	265,614	622,304	0	304,509	0	0	0	
SUTTER	73,862	1,249,075	618,397	339,115	0	2,889	288,674	(214,812)	0	(214,812)	50,000
TEHAMA	56,569	573,292	127,527	200,817	0	75,000	169,948	(112,209)	(1,170)	(113,379)	
TRINITY	23,849	63,555	5,400	50,581	4,763	0	2,811	0	0	0	
TULARE	337,968	1,289,407	719,000	377,970	191,490	0	947	0	0	0	
TUOLUNME	46,749	179,600	0	132,834	0	0	46,766	(17)	0	(17)	
VENTURA	560,903	4,008,713	3,656,883	98,892	0	0	252,938	0	0	0	
YOLO	160,993	1,628,053	1,040,994	569,626	0	0	17,433	0	0	0	
YUBA	67,528	371,210	262,887	104,113	0	0	4,210	0	0	0	
TOTAL	26,818,927	163,723,145	46,634,605	83,875,798	10,272,899	3,175,916	19,763,927	(7,182,536)	(193,669)	(7,376,205)	2,330,000

¹Information not yet received for preliminary one-time allocation reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap.

²Approved requests for funds to be held on behalf of courts in the Trial Court Trust Fund balance for expenditure in future years.

1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form
SUMMARY TOTALS
2018-19
PRELIMINARY

Line #		FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Instructions
Part A - Computation of Cap					
1	Expenditures	2,446,371,209	2,485,496,927	2,627,903,853	Court enters expenditures for ending fiscal year.
2	Accruals	61,675,218	67,704,404	65,304,086	Court enters expense accruals for ending fiscal year.
3	Less: Expenses related to Encumbrance Reserves for FY14/15	(20,756,614)			Current year expenditures relating to prior year encumbrance reserves.
4	Less: Expenses related to Encumbrance Reserves for FY15/16	(51,780,567)	(26,010,628)		Current year expenditures relating to prior year encumbrance reserves.
5	Less: Expenses related to Encumbrance Reserves for FY16/17		(54,226,473)	(16,362,504)	Court enters current year expenditures relating to prior year encumbrance reserves. Enter a negative number.
6	Less: Expenses related to Encumbrance Reserves for FY17/18			(31,524,485)	Court enters current year expenditures relating to prior year encumbrance reserves. Enter a negative number.
7	Encumbrance Reserves as of June 30	100,195,328	59,529,125	46,634,604	Court enters total year ending fund balance reserved for encumbrances (Do not include TCTF Funds Held Purchase Order)
8	Less: remaining Encumbrance Reserves from FY15/16	(27,196,648)			The amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrances (line 7) that is related to prior fiscal years.
9	Less: remaining Encumbrance Reserves from FY16/17	-			The amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrances (line 7) that is related to prior fiscal years.
10	Less: remaining Encumbrance Reserves from FY17/18		-		The amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrances (line 7) that is related to prior fiscal years.
11	Operating Budget	2,508,507,926	2,532,493,355	2,681,892,571	Cell is formula driven. This row calculates Operating Budget.
12	Fund Balance Cap (1% of Operating Budget)	25,085,079	25,324,934	26,818,927	Cell is formula driven. This row calculates Fund Balance Cap.
Part B - Computation of Fund Balance Subject to Cap					
13	Ending fund balance	210,018,578	167,151,324	163,723,145	Court enters actual year end fund balance.
14	Less: Encumbrance Reserves as of June 30	100,195,328	59,529,125	46,634,604	Cell is formula driven. This line is the encumbrance reserves amount entered above from line 7.
15	Less: Excluded Funds Per GC 77203	73,877,890	76,432,785	83,875,798	Cell is formula driven. Court enters details on the Excluded Detail tab.
16	Less: Prepayments	12,376,288	9,550,877	10,272,899	Court enters any Prepayment amounts.
17	Less: TCTF Funds Held (approved and returned to court)	5,066,406	5,380,398	3,175,916	Cell is formula driven. Court enters details on the TCTF Funds Held tab.
18	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	18,502,666	16,258,137	19,763,929	Cell is formula driven. This row calculates Fund Balance Subject to Cap and is what will be compared to the Fund Balance Cap (line 12).
Part C - Potential Additional Allocation Reduction					
19	Amount above cap if no Encumbrance Reserves	94,081,999	54,425,778	42,275,168	Cell is formula driven.
20	Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that, if not expensed in the next two years, is subject to the cap	91,764,857	41,457,368	36,050,137	These amounts will be liquidated if not spent (year of encumbrance, plus 2 additional). These are the encumbrance amounts for the fiscal year listed above.
21	Maximum amount of non-excluded encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction	6,914,831	4,907,501	6,833,936	Cell is formula driven. This total is the threshold the court can disencumber without having to reduce their allocations.
Part D - Liquidations					
22	FY14/15 Liquidation in third year	8,272,497			This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in third year following original encumbrance.
23	FY15/16 Liquidation in second year	1,442,548			This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance.
24	FY15/16 Liquidation in third year		1,182,715		This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in third year following original encumbrance.
25	FY16/17 Liquidation in second year		1,069,250		This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance.
26	FY16/17 Liquidation in third year			1,340,453	Cell is formula driven. This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in third year following original encumbrance.
27	FY17/18 Liquidation in second year			238,699	Cell is formula driven. This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance.
Part E - Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction					
29	Current Year Subject to Cap	1,356,206	1,177,443	7,182,536	Cell is formula driven. This is the amount of fund balance over the cap.
30	TCTF Funds Held to be returned to the Trial Court Trust Fund	-	8,311	-	Cell is formula driven. Court enters details on the TCTF Funds Held tab.
31	FY14/15 Encumbered Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction	5,954,147			FY14/15 total liquidation less maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction .
32	FY15/16 Encumbered Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction	82,217	73,324		Cell is formula driven. FY15/16 total liquidation less maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction .
33	FY16/17 Encumbered Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction		433,029	156,924	Cell is formula driven. FY16/17 total liquidation less maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction .
34	FY17/18 Encumbered Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction			36,745	Cell is formula driven. FY17/18 total liquidation less maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction .
35	Total Allocation Reduction	7,392,571	1,692,107	7,376,205	Cell is formula driven. This is the amount that will revert to the Trial Court Trust Fund.

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

(Action Item)

Title: Allocation Methodology for Cannabis Convictions Resentencing Funding
Date: 7/25/2019
Contact: Melissa Ng, Senior Budget Analyst, Budget Services
916-263-1754 | melissa.ng@jud.ca.gov

Issue

The 2019 Budget Act includes \$13.901 million in 2019-20 and \$2.929 million in 2020-21 to support increased workload for the trial courts as a result of the enactment of Chapter 993, Statutes of 2018 (AB 1793), which requires sentence modification of past cannabis conviction cases pursuant to the Control, Regulate, and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act of 2016 (AUMA). A methodology is needed to allocate funding included in the 2019 Budget Act for approval by the Judicial Council.

Background

The AUMA, or Proposition 64, was enacted by voters through a statewide general election on November 9, 2016. The AUMA allows for regulation of the cultivation, distribution, and use of cannabis for nonmedical purposes by individuals 21 years of age and older. Further, the AUMA permits individuals convicted of designated marijuana offenses to obtain a reduced conviction or sentence if the crime was for conduct now legal under the AUMA.

Current law requires the Department of Justice (DOJ) to notify the prosecution of all cases in their jurisdiction that are eligible for recall or dismissal of sentence, dismissal and sealing, or redesignation pursuant to AUMA. Current law also authorizes the prosecution to challenge the resentencing, dismissal and sealing, or redesignation if the person does not meet the eligibility requirements or presents an unreasonable risk to public safety. The prosecution is allowed to have until July 1, 2020 to review all cases and determine whether to challenge the recall or dismissal of sentence, dismissal and sealing, or redesignation. If the prosecution does not challenge the recall or dismissal of sentence, dismissal and sealing, or redesignation by July 1, 2020, the court is required to reduce or dismiss the conviction.

Courts are also required to notify the DOJ of the recall or dismissal of sentence, dismissal and sealing, or redesignation, and the DOJ is required to modify the state summary criminal history information database accordingly.

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

Recommendation

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommends that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee approve the following allocation methodology recommendations for consideration by the council at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting:

1. A proportional allocation methodology based on the percentage of potentially eligible cases by county (Attachment 4A), as provided by the DOJ.
2. Initial distribution of 50 percent of 2019-20 funding, with a mid-year assessment of funding need based on data collected by Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services office on actual cases received.

Alternatives Considered

Two alternatives were considered and presented to the FMS at its June 17, 2019 meeting including:

Alternative 1: Allocate \$13.9 million in 2019-20 and \$2.929 million in 2020-21 using a pro rata allocation based on the Workload Formula allocation.

This alternative was not recommended for consideration since the funding is intended for specific workload relating to cases that are identified to be eligible for recall or dismissal of sentence, dismissal and sealing, or redesignation pursuant to AUMA.

Alternative 2: Allocate \$13.9 million in 2019-20 and \$2.929 million in 2020-21 using a pro rata allocation based on reported collection filings for Proposition 64 relief.

This alternative was not recommended for consideration since the information, collected by Criminal Justice Services through biannual and quarterly surveys, only reflects activities that courts have taken prior to receipt of funding related to this workload. This may not be a good indicator of outstanding workload or representative of all pending work that needs to be done at the courts.

Attachment

Attachment 4A: Allocation Table for Cannabis Conviction Resentencing Funding

**Recommended Allocation for
Cannabis Conviction Resentencing Funding**

County	Total Eligible Convictions ¹	% of Total	2019-20 Allocation ²	2020-21 Allocation	Total Allocation
Alameda	8,493	3.90%	\$ 541,530	\$ 114,103	\$ 655,633
Alpine	38	0.02%	2,423	511	2,934
Amador	267	0.12%	17,024	3,587	20,611
Butte	1,397	0.64%	89,075	18,769	107,844
Calaveras	294	0.13%	18,746	3,950	22,696
Colusa	283	0.13%	18,045	3,802	21,847
Contra Costa	3,311	1.52%	211,116	44,483	255,599
Del Norte	333	0.15%	21,233	4,474	25,707
El Dorado	979	0.45%	62,423	13,153	75,576
Fresno	3,382	1.55%	215,643	45,437	261,080
Glenn	338	0.16%	21,552	4,541	26,093
Humboldt	1,299	0.60%	82,827	17,452	100,279
Imperial	1,686	0.77%	107,503	22,651	130,154
Inyo	200	0.09%	12,752	2,687	15,439
Kern	3,383	1.55%	215,707	45,450	261,157
Kings	687	0.32%	43,804	9,230	53,034
Lake	569	0.26%	36,281	7,644	43,925
Lassen	252	0.12%	16,068	3,386	19,454
Los Angeles	68,418	31.38%	4,362,465	919,190	5,281,655
Madera	962	0.44%	61,339	12,924	74,263
Marin	579	0.27%	36,918	7,779	44,697
Mariposa	275	0.13%	17,535	3,695	21,230
Mendocino	1,175	0.54%	74,920	15,786	90,706
Merced	921	0.42%	58,725	12,374	71,099
Modoc	127	0.06%	8,098	1,706	9,804
Mono	81	0.04%	5,165	1,088	6,253
Monterey	1,624	0.74%	103,549	21,818	125,367
Napa	761	0.35%	48,523	10,224	58,747
Nevada	667	0.31%	42,529	8,961	51,490
Orange	16,130	7.40%	1,028,479	216,705	1,245,184
Placer	1,269	0.58%	80,914	17,049	97,963
Plumas	174	0.08%	11,095	2,338	13,433
Riverside	8,270	3.79%	527,311	111,107	638,418
Sacramento	6,421	2.95%	409,416	86,266	495,682
San Benito	303	0.14%	19,320	4,071	23,391
San Bernardino	10,892	5.00%	694,495	146,333	840,828
San Diego	28,446	13.05%	1,813,772	382,170	2,195,942
San Francisco	6,211	2.85%	396,026	83,444	479,470
San Joaquin	3,266	1.50%	208,247	43,878	252,125
San Luis Obispo	1,156	0.53%	73,709	15,531	89,240
San Mateo	2,419	1.11%	154,240	32,499	186,739
Santa Barbara	1,736	0.80%	110,691	23,323	134,014
Santa Clara	10,003	4.59%	637,811	134,389	772,200
Santa Cruz	1,354	0.62%	86,334	18,191	104,525
Shasta	1,877	0.86%	119,681	25,217	144,898
Sierra	77	0.04%	4,910	1,034	5,944
Siskiyou	556	0.26%	35,452	7,470	42,922
Solano	1,923	0.88%	122,614	25,835	148,449
Sonoma	2,781	1.28%	177,322	37,363	214,685
Stanislaus	2,178	1.00%	138,874	29,261	168,135
Sutter	258	0.12%	16,451	3,466	19,917
Tehama	927	0.43%	59,107	12,454	71,561
Trinity	604	0.28%	38,512	8,115	46,627
Tulare	2,731	1.25%	174,134	36,691	210,825
Tuolumne	515	0.24%	32,837	6,919	39,756
Ventura	1,692	0.78%	107,885	22,732	130,617
Yolo	697	0.32%	44,442	9,364	53,806
Yuba	367	0.17%	23,401	4,930	28,331
218,014	100.00%		\$ 13,901,000	\$ 2,929,000	\$ 16,830,000

¹ Based on data provided by the Department of Justice in May 2019.

² 50% of funds will be distributed following Judicial Council approval, with the remaining 50% to be distributed in either 2019-20 or 2020-21 depending on actual workload.

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

(Action Item)

Title: Trial Court Executive Summary Display
Date: 7/25/2019
Contact: Brandy Sanborn, Manager, Budget Services
415-865-7195 | brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Adopt the updated single-court executive summary for trial court allocations, including the Workload Formula, beginning in 2019-20.

Background

At its May 31, 2018 meeting, the TCBAC approved a single-court executive summary that was compiled to provide a representation per court that reflects current funding, comparisons to prior year, and relevant statewide perspectives for reference. This document, which accompanied other simplified displays, was presented to the Judicial Council at its July 20, 2018 business meeting.¹

Last year the template included details highlighting self-help funding and civil assessments, and this year those references have been replaced with court interpreter and court-appointed dependency counsel funding. These designated detail areas are intended to showcase relevant areas of focus or changes that occur and could change year to year. In addition, the glossary of terms on the bottom of the executive summary may change year to year depending on how the information in this document changes.

For additional details above what is reflected in the executive summary, the viewer can refer to the high-level display presented to the Judicial Council at its July 19, 2019 business meeting.²

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee approve the updates to the executive summary to be provided to all courts for the 2019-20 fiscal year.

Attachments

Attachment 5A: 2019-20 Allocation Summary

¹ [Report to the Judicial Council: Trial Court Budget: 2018-19 Trial Court Base Allocations \(Attachment A\)](#)

² [Report to the Judicial Council: Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for Fiscal Year 2019-20 \(Attachment B\)](#)



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
2019-20 ALLOCATION SUMMARY*
 AUGUST 2019

	Court Perspective		Statewide Perspective	
	Prior Year 2018-19	Current Year 2019-20	Prior Year 2018-19	Current Year 2019-20
Workload Formula	81,002,945	86,474,695	2,214,738,616	2,498,649,159
Workload Allocation	72,936,208	80,298,614	1,898,780,971	2,056,062,357
<i>Share of Cluster 1 to 100%</i>		0		1,083,819
<i>Share of First 50% of Funding</i>		0		11,473,418
<i>Share of Remaining 50% to All</i>		470,350		11,473,418
<i>Workload Formula Local Revenues</i>		4,109,810		107,999,677
Percent of Workload Formula Funded	90%	93%*	86%	82%*
Other Allocations	8,985,595	9,360,019	242,460,046	265,397,895
Total Estimated Allocation	81,921,803	89,658,633	2,141,241,017	2,321,460,252

Additional Court Information

2019-20 Workload Allocation Highlights

TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	0
Auto. Recordkeeping/Micrographics (2017-18)	101,727
Full-Year Benefits Funding (2018-19)	2,392,027
Current-Year Benefits Funding (2019-20)	TBD
Replacement 2% Automation	424,794
Funding Floor Adjustment	(2,287)

Other 2019-20 Allocation Highlights

\$13.9m Estimated Cannabis Convictions Resentencing Funding	655,633
Non-Sheriff Security Base	3,275,206
\$75m Pretrial Reform Funding	TBD
\$10m Reserve Replenishment	(4,546)

Reserve Cap 1% → 3%

Language Access Funding

Statewide (Estimated)

	<u>2018-19</u>	<u>2019-20</u>
Existing Funds	103,632,000	108,960,000
Add'l One-Time	4,000,000	(4,000,000)
Add'l Ongoing	1,328,000	15,725,485
Total	108,960,000	120,685,485

Court Estimated Schedule 7A Reimbursement

	<u>2018-19</u>	<u>2019-20</u>
	3,876,288	TBD

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel

Federal Title IV-E Reimbursement

	<u>2019-20</u>	
	33,955,000	
	State	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Reserve</u>
	156,600,000	100,000
	156,700,000	
	Court	
	<u>2018-19</u>	<u>2019-20</u>
	3,399,620	3,752,930

FTE
FULL-TIME
EQUIVALENT

IMF
STATE TRIAL COURT
IMPROVEMENT AND
MODERNIZATION FUND

MOE
MAINTENANCE
OF EFFORT

RAS
RESOURCE
ASSESSMENT
STUDY

SJO
SUBORDINATE
JUDICIAL
OFFICER

TCTF
TRIAL COURT
TRUST FUND

*Not inclusive of all allocations such as restricted funding, reimbursements, and local revenues.

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

(Information Only)

Title: 2019-20 Self-Help Annual Update
Date: 7/12/2019
Contact: Nicholas Armstrong, Senior Research Analyst, Business Management Services
415-865-7829 | nicholas.armstrong@jud.ca.gov

Background

At its June 12, 2018 meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the following policy recommendations for self-help funding to be allocated to trial courts effective for fiscal year 2019–20 allocations and ongoing:

- (1) Adopt a three-year population update schedule using rolling three-year average census data;
- (2) Provide annual population updates to trial courts using rolling three-year average data for informational purposes only; and
- (3) Maintain the current self-help allocation baseline of \$34,000 per court and revisit in 2021 after the November 30, 2020 report to the Legislature.

This report responds to #2 of the approved recommendations: to provide a yearly—informational only—population update to keep courts abreast of population fluctuations and prepare for any potential funding changes that could occur from recalculations commenced every third year.

Population Update

The current allocation methodology for self-help funding has two major components: a baseline level of funding and then a proportionate share of funding that is based on the percentage of each court’s population relative to the state population. The allocation of self-help funds through 2020-21 will remain unchanged and are based on three-year average population data using 2016-18 data¹. However, for purposes of informing the courts of population changes that may impact future allocations beyond 2020-21, an information only update of the most current three-year average population data (2017-19) is being provided.

The table below (Table 1) shows the previous three-year population average (2016-18) with its corresponding proportion of the state total and the updated three-year population average (2017-19) with the new corresponding proportion of the state population. The population averages are

¹ *E-1: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, Population Estimates for Cities and Counties and the State.*

shown in columns A and C, while the proportions to the state total are shown in columns B and D. Column E reflects the percent change in population, while column F reflects the change in the proportion of the state total. The most current population update is from January 2019.

Table 1: Population Average, Proportion of State Total, Percent Change in Population Average, and Percent Change in Proportion

County	Previous Population (3-Year Avg. 2016-18)	% of State Population	Updated Population (3-Year Avg. 2017-19)	% of State Population	Change in Population Avg.	Change in % of State Population
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alameda	1,645,359	4.163%	1,658,636	4.173%	0.81%	0.010%
Alpine	1,151	0.003%	1,157	0.003%	0.55%	0.000%
Amador	38,382	0.097%	38,257	0.096%	-0.33%	-0.001%
Butte	226,404	0.573%	226,830	0.571%	0.19%	-0.002%
Calaveras	45,168	0.114%	45,150	0.114%	-0.04%	-0.001%
Colusa	22,043	0.056%	22,088	0.056%	0.21%	0.000%
Contra Costa	1,139,513	2.883%	1,148,185	2.889%	0.76%	0.006%
Del Norte	27,124	0.069%	27,227	0.069%	0.38%	0.000%
El Dorado	185,062	0.468%	188,823	0.475%	2.03%	0.007%
Fresno	995,975	2.520%	1,006,901	2.533%	1.10%	0.013%
Glenn	28,731	0.073%	28,886	0.073%	0.54%	0.000%
Humboldt	136,953	0.347%	135,922	0.342%	-0.75%	-0.005%
Imperial	188,334	0.477%	189,604	0.477%	0.67%	0.001%
Inyo	18,619	0.047%	18,589	0.047%	-0.16%	0.000%
Kern	895,112	2.265%	906,122	2.280%	1.23%	0.015%
Kings	149,537	0.378%	151,644	0.382%	1.41%	0.003%
Lake	64,945	0.164%	64,964	0.163%	0.03%	-0.001%
Lassen	30,918	0.078%	30,574	0.077%	-1.11%	-0.001%
Los Angeles	10,241,278	25.912%	10,256,239	25.804%	0.15%	-0.107%
Madera	156,492	0.396%	158,464	0.399%	1.26%	0.003%
Marin	263,604	0.667%	263,342	0.663%	-0.10%	-0.004%
Mariposa	18,148	0.046%	18,111	0.046%	-0.20%	0.000%
Mendocino	89,134	0.226%	89,133	0.224%	0.00%	-0.001%
Merced	274,665	0.695%	279,336	0.703%	1.70%	0.008%
Modoc	9,580	0.024%	9,592	0.024%	0.13%	0.000%
Mono	13,713	0.035%	13,732	0.035%	0.14%	0.000%
Monterey	442,365	1.119%	443,615	1.116%	0.28%	-0.003%
Napa	142,408	0.360%	141,286	0.355%	-0.79%	-0.005%
Nevada	98,828	0.250%	98,891	0.249%	0.06%	-0.001%
Orange	3,194,024	8.081%	3,214,190	8.087%	0.63%	0.006%
Placer	382,837	0.969%	389,799	0.981%	1.82%	0.012%
Plumas	19,819	0.050%	19,790	0.050%	-0.15%	0.000%

County	Previous Population (3-Year Avg. 2016-18)	% of State Population	Updated Population (3-Year Avg. 2017-19)	% of State Population	Change in Population Avg.	Change in % of State Population
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Riverside	2,384,783	6.034%	2,412,906	6.071%	1.18%	0.037%
Sacramento	1,514,770	3.833%	1,529,697	3.849%	0.99%	0.016%
San Benito	56,854	0.144%	58,754	0.148%	3.34%	0.004%
San Bernardino	2,160,256	5.466%	2,174,244	5.470%	0.65%	0.005%
San Diego	3,316,192	8.390%	3,332,917	8.386%	0.50%	-0.005%
San Francisco	874,228	2.212%	880,613	2.216%	0.73%	0.004%
San Joaquin	746,868	1.890%	758,797	1.909%	1.60%	0.019%
San Luis Obispo	280,101	0.709%	279,901	0.704%	-0.07%	-0.004%
San Mateo	770,203	1.949%	772,965	1.945%	0.36%	-0.004%
Santa Barbara	450,663	1.140%	452,692	1.139%	0.45%	-0.001%
Santa Clara	1,938,180	4.904%	1,949,452	4.905%	0.58%	0.001%
Santa Cruz	276,603	0.700%	276,080	0.695%	-0.19%	-0.005%
Shasta	178,605	0.452%	178,397	0.449%	-0.12%	-0.003%
Sierra	3,207	0.008%	3,208	0.008%	0.02%	0.000%
Siskiyou	44,688	0.113%	44,617	0.112%	-0.16%	-0.001%
Solano	436,023	1.103%	439,247	1.105%	0.74%	0.002%
Sonoma	505,120	1.278%	502,873	1.265%	-0.44%	-0.013%
Stanislaus	548,057	1.387%	554,857	1.396%	1.24%	0.009%
Sutter	96,956	0.245%	97,216	0.245%	0.27%	-0.001%
Tehama	63,995	0.162%	64,125	0.161%	0.20%	-0.001%
Trinity	13,628	0.034%	13,652	0.034%	0.18%	0.000%
Tulare	471,842	1.194%	475,221	1.196%	0.72%	0.002%
Tuolumne	54,707	0.138%	54,685	0.138%	-0.04%	-0.001%
Ventura	857,386	2.169%	857,194	2.157%	-0.02%	-0.013%
Yolo	218,896	0.554%	220,841	0.556%	0.89%	0.002%
Yuba	74,577	0.189%	75,763	0.191%	1.59%	0.002%
Total	39,523,613	100%	39,745,994	100%	0.56%	0.000%

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

(Information Only)

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

Date: 7/25/2019

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

Issue

Upon completion of the 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 to make a preliminary allocation reduction in July of each fiscal year and a final allocation reduction before February of each fiscal year to offset the amount of fund balance in excess of the amount authorized by GC 77203. GC 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 GC 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 (see Attachment 3A1). 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.

Report of Status

In May 2019, Judicial Council Budget Services staff requested a status on projects or planned expenditures from those courts that indicated completion through 2017-18. Reports on completion of each project or planned expenditure can be found in Attachment 3B2. A summary of each follows:

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

Court	Council Approval Date	Project or Planned Expenditure	Amount	Completion Date
Kern	06/24/17	Two new courthouse projects	\$806,503	06/30/17
Lake	06/24/16	Contracted for development and installation of a new minute order generation application/interface	50,431	06/05/17
Los Angeles	05/19/17	Contracted for implementation of a new civil case management (CMS) system	2,253,419	06/30/18
Mendocino	10/28/16	Implementation of a new CMS	23,699	12/01/16
Merced	06/24/16	Tyler CMS project	298,878	02/26/19
	09/15/17	Critical information technology upgrades	107,734	04/20/18
Santa Barbara	12/16/16	Contracted with Tyler Inc. for implementation of the Odyssey CMS	732,981	04/04/19
Shasta	01/12/18	Purchase of a vehicle for the marshal's office	10,895	04/16/18
Siskiyou	11/17/17	Replaced servers used to maintain CMS and operating system	39,716	12/15/17
Sonoma	07/29/16	Implementation of the Tyler CMS	824,106	06/30/18

\$5,148,362

Next Steps

Budget Services will continue surveying courts on project or planned expenditure status and will report back to the TCBAC quarterly.

Attachments

Attachment 3A1: *Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts*

Attachment 3B2: Funds Held on Behalf of the Court Project Completion Reporting

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

Recommended 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 TCBCAC 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.

Recommended 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.

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

Below is the proposed 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*)

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 15-17-01-00	
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
SUPERIOR COURT: Kern	
JC APPROVED DATE: 6/24/2016	JC APPROVED AMOUNT: \$806,503
REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:	
<p>The Superior Court, County of Kern, had two new courthouse projects that were indefinitely suspended due to state budget problems. One of these projects was to replace the Delano Regional Court facility. As such, when the Delano Police Department, which is adjacent to the Delano Regional Court facility, was vacated it presented an opportunity to address problems related to this court location. Delano serves, in addition to the second fastest growing community in the County of Kern, two large prisons – Kern Valley and North Kern. These two facilities generate a significant amount of case work for the courts which have overtaxed current facilities and necessitated transfer of many of the CDCR related matters to the already overcrowded Metro Bakersfield Court location. The remodeling of the leased facility would enable the court to manage this caseload in a secure and efficient court environment. Further it would save significant tax payer resources as CDCR would no longer have to transport their inmates to Bakersfield, some 45 minutes away from Delano. The remodel project was delayed by approximately eight months due to the requirements of the Office of State Fire Marshall plan review. Thus the Court is requesting authorization to carryover encumbered local funding to complete the remodel project completed June 2017.</p>	
SECTION II: 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>THE FUNDS WERE USED TO PAY THE RETENTION AMOUNT ON THE \$806,503 TCTF FUNDS HELD FOR LEASED FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS, WHICH WAS REQUEST #2 APPROVED ON 10/4/2016.</p>	
TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE:	
\$835,734.00 (\$758,409 FY 2016-17 PROJECT O-159302; \$77,325 FY 2017-18 O-159302)	
COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 6/30/2017	
<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:	
PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (<i>Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer</i>):	

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 17-16-01-A1

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Lake

JC APPROVED DATE:

6/24/2016

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$50,431

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

The Court contracted with StreamWrite LLC in December 2013 to develop and install a new minute order generation application/interface called Proceedings. The project cost was contracted at \$157,339.00. The Court encumbered the funds at the end of Fiscal Year 2013 which means the funds need to be expended by the end of Fiscal Year 2015/16. The court has paid StreamWrite \$67,670.00 to date. The Court is requesting that the remaining funds totaling \$89,669.00 be held on behalf of the Court. The project was originally scheduled to be complete well before the end of Fiscal Year 2015/16. However, the project has faced delays for several reasons. As a result of the funding reductions made to programs funded out of the Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF), including the Sustain Justice Edition program, this project was delayed. The application has been developed and tested successfully in StreamWrite's Development environment and has been deployed to the Court's UAT environment in the CCTC. Upon deployment in the UAT environment, it was determined that certain necessary functionality was not working properly and therefore further deployment into the Staging and Production environments has not been able to move forward.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED WHEN THE FINAL MILESTONE WAS COMPLETED PER THE CONTRACT. THE CRIMINAL AND CIVIL MODULES WENT LIVE ON JUNE 5, 2017. THE FINAL PAYMENTS WERE MADE ON 6/7/17.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: TOTAL PROJECT COST WAS \$157,339.00

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 6/5/2017

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Michaela Noland, michaela.noland@lake.courts.ca.gov, 707-263-2374 x2263

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

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 19-17-02-00

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Los Angeles

JC APPROVED DATE:

5/19/2017

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$2,253,419

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

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.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

FUNDS WERE USED TO PAY FOR DELAYED DELIVERABLES FOR CONFIGURATION, DEVELOPMENT, CUSTOM PROGRAMMING AND TRAINING FOR PROBATE, FAMILY LAW, TRAFFIC, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, MENTAL HEALTH AND CRIMINAL.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: \$2,253,419.00

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 6/30/2018

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Christine Padilla 213-633-8511

PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer)

Sherri R. Carter, Court Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 23-16-01-00

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Mendocino

JC APPROVED DATE:

10/28/2016

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$23,699

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

While originally scheduled to be the second of the five courts to go live, due to a variety of project delays – ranging from application development to staffing resources, the application process for access to DMV’s system, and coordination of the implementation date with other ONESolution courts – Mendocino was the last of the five courts to go live with the new system on May 31, 2016. Vendor resources that should have been devoted to contracted development work were focused on meeting the Go-Live dates of the other courts, thereby leaving the vendor with inadequate time to test and train staff with new programs and features. The delayed Go-Live date in turn delayed implementation of integration with our county justice partners, giving the Court inadequate time to identify shortcomings and inadequacies in data exchanges with those county justice partners. Despite assurances to the contrary by the CMS vendor (SunGard) over the several months preceding 6/30/16, as FY 15-16 year-end approached the vendor was not able to submit invoices totaling the full amount of the encumbered contract, leaving a contract balance of \$23,699.15 as of the end of FY 15-16. In order to effectively implement the system and pay for needed modifications over FY 16-17, the Court requests utilization of these funds to create a Contingency Fund to pay the cost of those needed modifications.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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.”

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

THE FUNDS WERE USED FOR CUSTOM PROGRAMMING MODIFICATIONS ON THE COURT’S NEW CMS, ONE SOLUTION.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE:

\$23,699.00

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 12/1/2016

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

KIM TURNER 707-467-2511

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

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 24-16-01-A1

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:
Merced

JC APPROVED DATE:
6/24/2016

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:
\$298,878

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

Merced Superior Court is requesting that our funds be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted fund balance due to work that has not been completed on an active purchase order with a signed contract. The contract is for our Tyler Case Management system project. This project will extend beyond the original planned three-year encumbrance period. The remaining funds on this purchase order are for the completion of - Clerks Edition, Customized ECR Report – CourTools and the Travel Reimbursement for Tyler Support staff assigned to the Clerks Edition project.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:
THE FUNDS WERE USED TO FINALIZE THE COURTS TYLER CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPGRADE, WHICH INCLUDES THE CUSTOM ECR REPORTS, CPD DOCUMENTS CONFIGURATION, SUPPORT STAFF, AND THE PROJECT CLOSEOUT REPORT WITH TYLER TECHNOLOGIES.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: THE TOTAL COST OF THE PROJECT \$1,220,660 OF WHICH THE \$298,878 WAS ENCUMBERED AND REQUESTED TO BE HELD ON EBHALF TO ALLOW THE COURT TO FINALIZE THEIR PROJECT WITH TYLER TECHNOLOGIES.

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 2/26/2019

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: Click here to enter a date.

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

Keri Brasil 209-725-4156

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

Amanda Foster, Interim CED

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 24-17-01-00

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Merced

JC APPROVED DATE:

9/15/2017

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$107,734

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

Using liquidated funds from two prior fiscal years to fund critical IT upgrade and replacement project.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

THESE FUNDS WERE USED TO UPGRADE OUR IT INFRASTRUCTURE. THE COURT REPLACED OUTDATED AND END-OF-LIFE SERVERS WHICH WERE NO LONGER SUPPORTED. THE COURT HAD SEVERAL SERVERS FROM 2008 AND 2012. ALSO WITH THE CASE MANAGEMENT REPLACEMENT FROM SUSTAIN TO TYLER ODYSSEY THE COURT WAS REQUIRED TO HAVE ADDITIONAL SERVERS TO SUPPORT THE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: THE TOTAL COST OF THE BLADE SERVER UPGRADE WAS \$248,106.56 OF WHICH THE COURT USED THE \$107,734 TO HELP FUND THIS PROJECT.

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 4/20/2018

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

Keri Brasil 209-725-4156

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

Amanda Foster, Interim CEO

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 28-16-01-A1

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Napa

JC APPROVED DATE:

6/24/2016

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$126,164

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

In fiscal year 2013/14, the court entered into a collaborative agreement with Tyler Technologies to provide new Case Management Systems (CMS) for Napa, Monterey, and Santa Clara courts in the same project. The collaborative agreement was designed to share expertise among the courts, create a greater uniformity, and for all three courts to be able to share in some of the vendor costs, therefore reducing the overall costs to all three courts. During the project planning phases early in the project, Tyler determined that it did not have sufficient resources to meet the original timeline set out in the initially agreed upon project plan. Specifically, the implementation resources that Tyler needed to support all three courts were needed in one location at a time, and therefore we had to stagger the implementation of the first phase further out to give each of the courts more attention in the months both before and after our implementation dates. The same strategy will need to be used for Phase II of each our courts implementation, staggering out the three implementation dates through the end of fiscal year 2016/17.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

OUR CMS IMPLEMENTATION WAS COMPLETED IN FISCAL YEAR 17/18. THE SERVICES WERE PROVIDED BY AND PAID TO OUR CMS VENDOR, TYLER TECHNOLOGIES DURING FISCAL YEAR 17/18.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: OVER THE LIFE OF THE CMS IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT, WE HAVE PAID TYLER TECHNOLOGIES \$1,320,112.59 AS OF JUNE 2019. THIS IS FOR SOFTWARE LICENSES, IMPLEMENTATION AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE, AND HARDWARE. WE HAVE SPENT ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO OTHER VENDORS FOR THIS PROJECT. THE COMPLETION DATA BELOW IS THE IMPLEMENTATION DATE FOR OUR CRIMINAL CASES. WE HAVE AN ONGOING RELATIONSHIP WITH TYLER TECHNOLOGIES USING CURRENT YEAR FUNDING.

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 12/11/2017

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Lisa Skinner lisa.skinner@napa.courts.ca.gov 707-299-1248

PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (*Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer*): *Authorized by former Court Executive Officer, Richard Feldstein. Current Court Executive Officer is Robert Fleshman*

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 42-16-01-00

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Santa Barbara

JC APPROVED DATE:

12/16/2016

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$732,981

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System. While working with the vendor it has become evident that the product is not functioning at a level acceptable to our Court. This revelation has led to an unanticipated delay. Therefore, the Court must carry funds forward to meet the anticipated expenses which have been pushed farther out than originally scheduled. In summary, we would like to use these carried over funds towards the completion of our case management project towards the following: final vendor deliverables \$193,670, continuation of old case management maintenance expense for partial year of \$145,833, technology equipment \$200,000, and extra-help and overtime \$329,932. These delayed expenses exceed the use of the requested amount so we will use operations funds to cover the difference. This application is being submitted to seek authorization to carry those monies into the next fiscal year.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

Implementation was completed in January 2017, however there were post go-live issues, specifically related to collections job reporting, that required further development work by the vendor, along with configuration and testing by the court, prior to final retainage payment invoice being approved and signed.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: \$732,981

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 4/4/2019

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

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

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 45-17-01-00

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Shasta

JC APPROVED DATE:

1/12/2018

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$10,895

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

The purpose of this request is to purchase a vehicle for the Marshal's Office, a division of the Superior Court. Currently, the initial cost of the vehicle is \$30,000 and another \$5,000 in equipment will need to be added as set forth below for a total cost of \$35,000.

On July 21, 2017, the department's 2008 Ford Crown Victoria was totaled after the engine caught fire. The insurance payout is expected to be \$2,960 from Office of Risk and Insurance Management. The purchase of a 2018 Dodge Charger from the factory will include many items the court would otherwise need to purchase separately to equip the vehicle for law enforcement purposes. The only other items needing to be purchased are a cage barrier, light bar and radio components. The anticipated cost for these items is an additional \$5,000, for a total expected expense of \$35,000.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED: THE COURT SOUGHT OUT A REQUEST FOR QUOTE (RFQ 2017-05A) FOR 2018 FORD INTERCEPTOR SEDAN POLICE SEDAN. THE COURT ACCEPTED CROWN MOTORS LLC FLEET PROPOSAL ON 12/08/2017 TO ORDER/PURCHASE 2018 FORD POLICE INTERCEPTOR SEDAN. THE COURT ACCEPTED DELIVERY OF THE SEDAN ON 04/16/2018.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE:

THE TOTAL COST OF THE VEHICLE WAS \$27,398.30 WHICH INCLUDED THE FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,895 AND TCTF FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,503.30.

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 4/16/2018

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Natelie Hiser, CFO; nhiser@shasta.courts.ca.gov; (530) 229-8220

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

Melissa Fowler-Bradley, Court Executive Officer

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 47-17-01-00

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Siskiyou

JC APPROVED DATE:

11/17/2017

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$39,716

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

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 5th 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: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

FUNDS WERE USED TO PURCHASE TWO SERVERS FOR OUR CASE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING SYSTEMS.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE:

TOTAL COST OF SERVERS WERE \$24,170.34 + \$19,924.28 = \$44,094.62

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 12/15/2017

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Lorena Barnes, Court Fiscal Manager; 530-8428368;

lbarnes@siskiyou.courts.ca.gov

PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer): Reneé McCanna Crane, CEO

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 49-16-01-A1

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Sonoma

JC APPROVED DATE:

5/19/2017

JC APPROVED AMOUNT:

\$824,106

REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:

Conversion to Odyssey , Tyler Case Management System- The Court contracted with Tyler Technologies in FY 13/14 off of Master Agreement MA 132003, The contract was for the Odyssey Case Management System with a big-bang implementation for all case types set to be carried out in five phases, including pre-implementation planning and business process review; design and development of the overall solution; completion of the deployment of the CMS; deployment of e-filing; and close out of the project. The contract includes software licensing, maintenance and support services, and electronic filing. The Court was originally planned to go live in Sept. 2015, but has since been delayed 3 times. Our next deployment was supposed to be Dec. 2016, however, it was clear that the big-bang proposal required too much court resources and given our current integration with the county justice partners, would not be feasible in this timeline. So our court then broke the project into two phases, to allow an adequate allocation of resources. Phase I included Civil, Family, Probate and Non-Criminal Mental Health and went live August 2016. This phase had minimal interfaces with justice partners thereby allowing for less delays in completing this segment. Other delays are a result of the availability of limited Tyler resources, given multiple conversions in California. Further, our integrated Criminal System and fully automated Traffic System have proved challenging for Tyler with their limited resources. The Court currently uses a County built, fully integrated system and cannot convert to Odyssey until all interfaces have been completed and all data conversion errors have been resolved. As indicated, our current Traffic System, which operates from a web-based program (eCourt by Daily Journal Technologies) contains a multitude of automated workflow that exceeds the current Tyler offering and if implemented as currently configured, that would result in going backwards in technology and efficiency. This has created increased work for Tyler to make the court whole with the Traffic System. As a result, we will now break the project into three phases, with the second phase now scheduled for some time in early FY 17/18, pending completion of the integrated interfaces with our county justice partners. The final phase will be Traffic and no current date has been set, pending the successful launch of Traffic in LA court by Tyler Technologies. The Court and Tyler Technologies continue to mutually work toward a successful implementation and developing a comprehensive mitigation plan to phase-in the remaining implementations. The amount requested reflects the remaining body of work for the Phase II and Phase III go-lives, which will include Criminal, Juvenile and Traffic.

SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)

PROJECT COMPLETE

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."

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:

1. Converted data issues resolved via scripts that caused impediments to report the cases from the CCMS to DOJ
2. DOJ Certification
3. ECR for 8716 reporting
4. New Integration built after go live to send Mental Health to the Justice partners
5. Reconfiguration of the charges in odyssey
6. Implementation of CATS package and testing DMV
7. JBSIS certification
8. REVQ extraction files
9. Out Sourced letters Interface to the vendor
10. Financial reports, outCard Report for Criminal
11. Family law case Number Search

- 12. Creation of Executive Node to store Administrative documents filings etc.
- 13. Warrant integration to the justice partners
- 14. Calendar Integration issues to the justice partners
- 15. Creation of DMV Reports
- 16. Script to add jurisdiction to charges
- 17. Script to clean up inactive Petitioners and respondents

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE:
\$2,631,342

COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: June 2018

PROJECT NOT COMPLETED

PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:

ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

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