



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR AUGUST 7, 2019 TELECONFERENCE

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	3
Draft minutes from the July 25, 2019 Meeting	
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – 2019-20 IMF for V3 Case Management System (Action Required)	6
Attachment 1A: 2019-20 IMF Allocations	8
Attachment 1B: IMF Fund Condition Statement	9
Item 2 – Children’s Waiting Room (CWR) Report (Action Required)	10
Attachment 2A: Government Code Section 70640	12
Attachment 2B: CWR Distribution and Fund Balance Policy	13
Attachment 2C: Contra Costa Superior Court’s Request to Extend Receipt of Funds	16
Attachment 2D: CWR – Distribution Amount and Total Distribution	17
Attachment 2E: Distribution from First Paper General Civil Unlimited Uniform Filing Fee ...	18
Item 3 – Reporting Requirement for TCTF and IMF Encumbrances (Action Required)	19
Information Only Items (No Action Required)	
Info 1 – 2019-20 Language Access Signage and Technology	21



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: August 7, 2019
Time: 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831; passcode 1884843 (Listen Only)

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

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

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the July 25, 2019 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

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

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Ms. Brandy Sanborn. Only written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on August 6, 2019 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

Item 1

2019-20 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for V3 Case Management System (CMS) (Action Required)

Consideration of a recommendation to reallocate unspent funds provided in a 2016-17 budget change proposal for Sacramento Superior Court as it relates to the V3 CMS transition.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Jason Haas, Senior Analyst, Budget Services

Item 2

Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Report (Action Required)

Consideration of a Fiscal Planning Subcommittee recommendation to provide Contra Costa Superior Court with a three-month extension on receipt of CWR funds during temporary closure.

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

Item 3

Reporting Requirement for Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and IMF Encumbrances (Action Required)

Consideration of a recommendation to forego the reporting requirement for outstanding encumbrances for all programs funded from the TCTF and/or IMF unless requested.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Jason Haas

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

2019-20 Language Access Signage and Technology (Action Required)

Information on a grant program to disburse \$2.55 million for language access signage, technology infrastructure support, and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council for 2019-20 and ongoing.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Don Will, Assistant Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Mr. Douglas Denton, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

July 25, 2019

10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

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

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Andrew S. Blum, Hon. Mark A. Cope, Hon. Jill C. Fannin, Hon. Kimberly Gaab (phone), Hon. Teri L. Jackson (phone), Hon. Charles Margines, Hon. Gary Nadler (phone), and Hon. B. Scott Thomsen.

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice Chair), Ms. Kim Bartleson (phone), 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. Daniel J. Buckley and Hon. Brian McCabe

Others Present: Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Ms. Michele Allan, Ms. Shima Mirzaei, Mr. Catrayel Wood, Mr. Joseph Glavin, Ms. Suzanne Schleder, and Ms. Rose Livingston.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the June 3, 2019 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND 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

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Council at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting:

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

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

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the recommendation to adopt the 2019-20 work plan, adding a sixth item for 2019-20 to develop a methodology for Consumer Price Index (CPI) allocations should it be granted. An ad hoc CPI subcommittee has been established to assist in this effort and includes Mr. David Yamasaki, Ms. Sherri Carter, Mr. Michael Roddy, and Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco.

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

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the recommendation of a 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.

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

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve recommendation 1, a proportional allocation methodology based on the percentage of potentially eligible cases by county (Attachment 4A), as provided by the Department of Justice, and to provide all of the funding to the courts up front for consideration by the council at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting.

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

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the updates to the executive summary to be provided to all courts for the 2019-20 fiscal year, replacing the Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel information with Self-Help funding.

I. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (INFO 1-3)

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

Action: No action taken

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

Action: No action taken

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

Action: No action taken

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:46am.

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: Reallocation of Unspent Funds Provided in a 2016-17 Budget Change Proposal for Sacramento Superior Court V3 Case Management System (CMS) Replacement

Date: 8/7/2019

Contact: Jason Haas, Senior Budget Analyst, Budget Services
916-643-7061 | Jason.Haas@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of a recommendation to reallocate unspent funds provided in a 2016-17 budget change proposal (BCP) for Sacramento Superior Court as it relates to the V3 CMS transition. The allocation will increase the 2019-20 adopted allocation from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for the Judicial Council Information Technology (IT) office.

Background

IT - \$1,255,900 for the V3 CMS Transition

The funds are being requested as a reallocation to unspent funds from IT's 2016-17 approved allocations. This request would be an increase to the existing 2019-20 Judicial Council-approved IT allocation of \$68,105,984 (see Attachment 1A, Column D, Row 62). Approval of this request would give the IT office a total allocation of \$69,361,884 in 2019-20.

The V3 CMS transition program received \$21.6 million as a General Fund transfer to the IMF from a 2016-17 BCP. This BCP funded the replacement of V3 CMS for four Superior Courts (Sacramento, Orange, San Diego, and Ventura). Funds were allocated by the council in 2016-17 (\$12.4 million), and 2017-18 (\$9.2 million). The funding from this request would be used for the assessment, analysis, procurement, and deployment of a CMS to replace the Sacramento Superior Court's V3 CMS.

The unspent funds have been held in reserve in the IMF fund condition statement (see Attachment 2B), as they were specifically appropriated to be used for the sole purpose of replacing the V3 CMS in the Sacramento Superior Court. The resulting balance from this reallocation does not represent a change to the expected long-term balance as these funds have always been projected to be spent for this purpose. The table below represents the original cost of the project (column B), the total amount expended (column F), and the amount held in reserve (column G).

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

Court	IBA Amount	Exp/Enc 2016-17	Exp/Enc 2017-18	Exp/Enc 2018-19	Total Expended	Held In Reserve
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Orange	\$3,400,000	\$411,111	\$2,488,889	\$500,000	\$3,400,000	\$0
Sacramento*	3,165,622	524,345	1,385,377		524,345	1,255,900
San Diego	7,997,167	4,571,117	3,426,050		7,997,167	0
Ventura	3,093,640	1,894,784	1,198,856		3,093,640	0
TOTAL	\$17,656,429	\$7,401,357	\$7,113,795	\$500,000	\$15,015,152	\$1,255,900

In 2016-17, a total of \$1,780,000 was encumbered and expected to be transferred from the council to the Sacramento Superior Court by the end of the 2018-19 fiscal year via an Intra Branch Agreement (IBA). The IBA stipulated specific transfer amounts for reaching certain milestones. A total of \$524,345 was transferred prior to the deadline of June 30, 2019 for reaching the first two milestones. However, there was a delay in entering in to an agreement with the contractor on the third and final milestone as their requested price was greater than the remaining amount appropriated.

This delay prevented the final transfer of funds by the end of the 2018-19 fiscal year. An agreement was subsequently reached in July 2019 that does not require any additional funding from the Judicial Council. Approval of this request will allow the IT office to make the final transfer for the Sacramento Superior Court IBA.

Recommendation

The following recommendation is presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee for approval and for consideration by the council at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting:

Approve the recommendation to the Judicial Council of a reallocation of \$1,255,900 in 2019-20 of unspent funds to the Information Technology office for the Sacramento Superior Court V3 Case Management System Replacement.

Attachments

- Attachment 1A: 2019-20 IMF Allocations
- Attachment 1B: IMF Fund Condition Statement

**Judicial Council Approved 2019-20 Allocations
from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF)
State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations**

#	Program Name	Office	2019-20 Allocations		
			Judicial Council Approved Allocations	Proposed Adjustments	Pending Total Allocations
A	B	C	D	E	F
	Program Adjustments				
1	Superior Court Audit Program	AS	\$ 409,804		\$ 409,804
2	Phoenix Program	BAP	\$ 1,531,000		\$ 1,531,000
3	Trial Court Procurement/TCAS-MSA-IMF	BAP	\$ 138,625		\$ 138,625
4	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	CFCC	\$ 17,000		\$ 17,000
5	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000
6	Self-Help Center	CFCC	\$ 5,000,000		\$ 5,000,000
7	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	CFCC	\$ 67,000		\$ 67,000
8	Shriver Civil Counsel- Cy Pres Funding	CFCC	\$ 520,692		\$ 520,692
9	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	CFCC	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
10	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	CFCC	\$ 143,000		\$ 143,000
	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	COSSO	\$ -		\$ -
11	CJER Faculty	CJER	\$ 36,000		\$ 36,000
12	Distance Education	CJER	\$ -		\$ -
13	Essential Court Management Education	CJER	\$ 35,000		\$ 35,000
14	Essential Court Personnel Education	CJER	\$ 215,000		\$ 215,000
15	Judicial Education	CJER	\$ 916,000		\$ 916,000
16	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	BS	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000
17	Treasury Services - Cash Management (Support)	BS	\$ 298,216		\$ 298,216
18	Revenue Distribution Training	BS	\$ 9,500		\$ 9,500
19	Workload Assessment Advisory Committee	BS	\$ 8,500		\$ 8,500
20	Trial Court Labor Relations Academics and Forums	HR	\$ 22,700		\$ 22,700
21	CCTC Operations	IT	\$ 1,718,714		\$ 1,718,714
22	ISB Support	IT	\$ 946,153		\$ 946,153
23	Uniform Civil Filing System Unit	IT	\$ 423,779		\$ 423,779
24	CCPOR Development	IT	\$ 524,200		\$ 524,200
25	V3 - ICMS/CMS Release Management Support	IT	\$ 619,669		\$ 619,669
26	Telecommunications Support	IT	\$ 11,749,425		\$ 11,749,425
27	Phoenix Program	IT	\$ 1,685,208		\$ 1,685,208
28	Enterprise Policy & Planning (Statewide Planning and Dev Support)	IT	\$ 4,342,185		\$ 4,342,185
29	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	\$ 1,441,032		\$ 1,441,032
30	Data Integration	IT	\$ 1,841,149		\$ 1,841,149
31	California Courts Technology Center (CCTC)	IT	\$ 7,995,247		\$ 7,995,247
32	Jury Management System	IT	\$ 665,000		\$ 665,000
33	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	\$ 364,848		\$ 364,848
34	Sustain Justice Edition CMS	IT	\$ -		\$ -
35	V3 Case Management System	IT	\$ 1,481,970		\$ 1,481,970
36	Telecom	IT	\$ 5,509,354		\$ 5,509,354
37	V3 CMS Transition	IT	\$ -	\$ 1,255,900	\$ 1,255,900
38	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LS	\$ 1,200,000		\$ 1,200,000
39	Jury System Improvement Projects	LS	\$ 19,000		\$ 19,000
40	Litigation Management Program	LS	\$ 6,618,647		\$ 6,618,647
41	Regional Office Assistance Group	LS	\$ 589,192		\$ 589,192
42	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	LS	\$ 651,000		\$ 651,000
43	Subtotal Program Adjustments		\$ 59,963,809	\$ 1,255,900	\$ 61,219,709
44	BCP Adjustments				
45	CMS Replacement - Phase IV	IT	\$ 22,777,259		\$ 22,777,259
46	Futures Commission	IT	\$ 853,000		\$ 853,000
47	Digitizing Court Records	IT	\$ 4,853,000		\$ 4,853,000
48	Phoenix Program ^{1/}	IT	\$ (1,685,208)		\$ (1,685,208)
49	Phoenix Program ^{1/}	BAP	\$ (1,531,000)		\$ (1,531,000)
50	Litigation Management Program ^{1/}	LS	\$ (4,500,000)		\$ (4,500,000)
51	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program ^{1/}	LS	\$ (651,000)		\$ (651,000)
52	Subtotal BCP Adjustments		\$ 20,116,051		\$ 20,116,051
53	Total		\$ 80,079,860	\$ 1,255,900	\$ 81,335,760

^{1/} The approval of this Budget Change Proposal shifted these IMF expenditures to the General Fund.

	Office	Judicial Council Approved Allocations	Proposed Adjustments	Pending Total Allocations
54	Totals by Office			
55	AS	\$ 409,804	\$ -	\$ 409,804
56	BAP	\$ 138,625	\$ -	\$ 138,625
57	CFCC	\$ 5,907,692	\$ -	\$ 5,907,692
	COSSO	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
58	CJER	\$ 1,202,000	\$ -	\$ 1,202,000
60	BS	\$ 366,216	\$ -	\$ 366,216
61	HR	\$ 22,700	\$ -	\$ 22,700
62	IT	\$ 68,105,984	\$ 1,255,900	\$ 69,361,884
63	LS	\$ 3,926,839	\$ -	\$ 3,926,839
64	Total Allocations	\$ 80,079,860	\$ 1,255,900	\$ 81,335,760

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
Fund Condition Statement
2019-20 Budget Act (UPDATED REVENUES - April 2019 Actuals)

#	Description	Estimated					
		2016-17 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2017-18 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-22
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Beginning Balance	6,956,187	9,300,938	14,795,000	12,401,983	8,178,222	8,715,182
2	Prior-Year Adjustments ¹	4,187,917	-5,979,333		0	0	0
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	11,144,104	3,321,605	14,795,000	12,401,983	8,178,222	8,715,182
4	REVENUES:						
5	Jury Instructions Royalties	607,672	604,495	649,000	689,000	747,000	747,000
6	Interest from SMIF	415,663	863,725	1,047,000	1,047,000	1,047,000	1,047,000
7	Escheat-Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds	7,615	2,158	0	0	0	1,000
8	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	13,160,903	22,077,608 ^{1/}	9,393,000	9,034,000	8,543,000	8,543,000
9	2% Automation Fund Revenue	12,792,097	12,367,362	12,316,000	10,936,000	10,350,000	10,350,000
10	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	0	146	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Class Action Residue		205,615	315,077	0	0	0
12	Subtotal Revenues	26,983,950	36,121,109	23,722,077	21,708,000	20,689,000	20,689,000
13	Transfers and Other Adjustments						
14	To TCTF (GC 77209(k))	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000
15	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000
16	From State General Fund	0					
16	Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	12,992,950	22,130,109	9,731,077	7,717,000	6,698,000	6,698,000
17	Total Resources	24,137,054	25,451,714	24,526,077	20,118,983	14,876,222	15,413,182
18							
19	EXPENDITURES:						
20	Judicial Branch Total State Operations	6,002,342	4,405,086	4,793,364	5,668,352	4,470,687	4,396,223
22	Judicial Branch Total Local Assistance	65,451,774	63,464,276	52,138,730	75,667,408	48,666,316	45,030,716
21	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	659,579	305,352	306,000	106,000	400,000	400,000
25	Less funding provided by General Fund (Local Assistance)	-56,618,000	-57,518,000	-45,114,000	-69,501,000	-47,375,962	-43,740,362
25	Total Expenditures and Adjustments	14,836,116	10,656,714	12,124,094	11,940,760	6,161,041	6,086,577
26	Fund Balance	9,300,938	14,795,000	12,401,983	8,178,222	8,715,182	9,326,605
27	Reserve Funds (June 24, 2016 JCC)		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
28	Restricted Funds - Jury Management	1,104,525	799,682	712,682	717,682	775,682	780,682
29	Restricted Funds - Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel		205,615	520,692	0	0	0
30	Restricted Funds - Case Management Systems (CMS)			2,641,277	1,385,377	0	0
31	Fund Balance - less restricted funds	9,300,938	11,789,703	6,527,332	4,075,164	5,939,500	6,545,923
32	Structural Balance	-1,843,166	11,473,395	-2,393,017	-4,223,760	536,959	611,423

¹ State Controllers Office (SCO) recorded 50/50 revenues incorrectly in 2016-17. Actual 50/50 revenue for 2016-17 is \$12,109,826 and 2017-18 is \$12,120,300

² 2018-19 expenditures reflect anticipated savings as recognized by programs in relation to the 2018-19 JCC approved allocations.

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

(Action Item)

Title: Consideration of a Three-Month Extension on Receipt of Children’s Waiting Room (CWR) Funds During Temporary Closure for the Contra Costa Superior Court

Date: 7/30/2019

Contact: Melissa Ng, Senior Budget Analyst, Budget Services
916-263-1754 | melissa.ng@jud.ca.gov

Issue

The Contra Costa Superior Court closed its CWR in Pittsburg on October 1, 2018 in order to relocate the CWR to Martinez. The court received approval from the Judicial Council on May 17, 2019 to continue receiving CWR funds to accumulate sufficient funding to reopen the CWR and resume ongoing operations by July 2019. However, due to project delays, the court was unable to reopen in July 2019 and requests a three-month extension to continue receiving CWR funds in anticipation of reopening the CWR in Martinez by October 1, 2019.

Background

According to Government Code section 70640, after January 1, 2006, a court may apply to the Judicial Council for a CWR distribution between \$2 and \$5 from applicable filing fees (see Attachment 2A). The Judicial Council’s policy requires the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) adopt a recommendation related to a court’s request for the council’s consideration (see Attachment 2B). The court’s request for an extension to the previous Judicial Council-approved continued CWR distribution is provided in Attachment 2C.

The following attachments provide information on CWR distributions:

- Attachment 2D provides the current distribution amount and total distributions for 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 (for the period of July 2018–April 2019) for the 18 courts that currently have a CWR distribution; and
- Attachment 2E provides the distribution from the First Paper General Civil Unlimited Uniform Filing Fee (GC 70611) for Contra Costa Superior Court. There is no change in the distribution for this request because the court is already receiving a CWR distribution.

This extension request was received from Contra Costa Superior Court on June 27, 2019. In order to allow for review and recommendation by the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee and TCBAC, this request will be considered by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on September 23-24, 2019.

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

Recommendation

The Funding Planning Subcommittee (FPS) recommends that the TCBAC approve the recommendation for a three-month extension of the previous Judicial Council-approved request for the continued receipt of CWR funds for Contra Costa Superior Court for consideration by the council at its business meeting on September 23-24, 2019.

Attachments

- Attachment 2A: Government Code Section 70640
- Attachment 2B: CWR Distribution and Fund Balance Policy
- Attachment 2C: Contra Costa Superior Court's Request to Extend Receipt of Waiting Room Funds During Temporary Closure for Relocation
- Attachment 2D: CWR – Distribution Amount and Total Distribution
- Attachment 2E: Distribution from First Paper General Civil Unlimited Uniform Filing Fee (GC 70611)

Government Code Section 70640

(a) It is the policy of the state that each court shall endeavor to provide a children's waiting room in each courthouse for children whose parents or guardians are attending a court hearing as a litigant, witness, or for other court purposes as determined by the court. To defray that expense, monthly allocations for children's waiting rooms shall be added to the monthly apportionment under subdivision (a) of Section 68085 for each court where a children's waiting room has been established or where the court has elected to establish that service.

(b) The amount allocated to each court under this section shall be equal to the following: for each first paper filing fee as provided under Section 70611, 70612, 70613, 70614, or 70670, and each first paper or petition filing fee in a probate matter as provided under Section 70650, 70651, 70652, 70653, 70654, 70655, 70656, or 70658, the same amount as was required to be collected as of December 31, 2005, to the Children's Waiting Room Fund under former Section 26826.3 in the county in which the court is located when a fee was collected for the filing of a first paper in a civil action under former Section 26820.4.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court may make expenditures from these allocations in payment of any cost, excluding capital outlay, related to the establishment and maintenance of the children's waiting room, including personnel, heat, light, telephone, security, rental of space, furnishings, toys, books, or any other item in connection with the operation of a children's waiting room.

(d) If, as of January 1, 2006, there is a Children's Waiting Room Fund in the county treasury established under former Section 26826.3, the county immediately shall transfer the moneys in that fund to the court's operations fund as a restricted fund. By February 15, 2006, the county shall provide an accounting of the fund to the Administrative Office of the Courts.

(e) After January 1, 2006, the court may apply to the Judicial Council for an adjustment of the amount distributed to the fund for each uniform filing fee. A court that wishes to establish a children's waiting room, and does not yet have a distribution under this section, may apply to the Judicial Council for a distribution. Applications under this subdivision shall be made according to trial court financial policies and procedures authorized by the Judicial Council under subdivision (a) of Section 77206. Adjustments and new distributions shall be effective January 1 or July 1 of any year beginning January 1, 2006.

(f) The distribution to a court under this section per each filing fee shall be not less than two dollars (\$2) and not more than five dollars (\$5).

(Amended by Stats. 2007, Ch. 130, Sec. 135. Effective January 1, 2008.)

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

A. Applying for a New CWR Distribution

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

B. Requesting a Decreased CWR Distribution Amount

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

C. Temporarily or Permanently Ceasing CWR Operations

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

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

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

D. Cap on CWR Fund Balance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kate Bieker
Court Executive Officer

Superior Court of California

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
725 COURT STREET
P.O. BOX 911
MARTINEZ, CA 94553-0091



June 27, 2019

Sent via electronic mail

Zlatko Theodorovic
Director of Budget Services
Judicial Council of California
2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95833-4353

Re: Request to Extend Receiving CWR Distribution During Temporary CWR Closure

Dear Mr. Theodorovic:

The Contra Costa Superior Court (Court) received approval to continue receiving its Children's Waiting Room (CWR) distribution during a temporary closure of its CWR. The Court closed the CWR in its Pittsburg Courthouse on October 1, 2018 and has been working on relocating its CWR to the Martinez Family Law Center where there is significant public demand and need for a CWR. The Court originally anticipated opening the new Martinez CWR in July 2019, but the process has been delayed.

The Court received approval to use self-help funding to build the Martinez CWR, submitted a court-funded request to build the CWR, and entered into an inter-branch agreement with the Judicial Council in February 2019 for the Judicial Council to oversee the construction of the CWR. It is anticipated that the project will be completed by July 19, 2019. The Court also conducted an open competitive solicitation for a vendor to operate the Martinez CWR and received one bid. The Court is in contract negotiations with the vendor and expects to execute the agreement within the next few weeks. Once the contract is executed, the vendor anticipates taking 45 to 60 days to start operations. Therefore, the Court anticipates opening the new Martinez CWR by October 1, 2019.

The Court requests the Judicial Council to approve an extension of the continued CWR distribution to the Court at the next council meeting. The Court currently receives a CWR distribution at the \$5 level and projects having a fund balance of \$255,595 by the end of Fiscal Year 2018-2019. The prospective vendor's cost proposal to operate a CWR for 9 hours per day, 5 days per week is approximately \$220,000 per year, which is 57 percent higher than the annual operating cost of the Court's previous CWR vendor. Although the Court is attempting to negotiate a lower cost level with the vendor, it is anticipated that the annual cost to operate the CWR will exceed the Court's CWR distribution of approximately \$125,000 annually. The ability for the Court to continue receiving its CWR distribution will allow it to continue building its reserve to fund these anticipated annual shortfalls. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kate Bieker
Court Executive Officer

KB/FL

cc: Hon. Barry Baskin, Presiding Judge
Fae Li, Director of Finance

Children's Waiting Room
Distribution Amount and Total Distribution

	Court	Distribution Amount	2015-16 Total Distribution	2016-17 Total Distribution	2017-18 Total Distribution	2018-19 July 2018-April 2019
	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Alameda	\$5	\$ 162,487	\$ 188,819	\$ 169,579	\$ 145,442
2	Butte	\$5	\$ 19,372	\$ 27,096	\$ 11,227	\$ -
3	Contra Costa	\$5	\$ 104,333	\$ 129,349	\$ 116,444	\$ 105,683
4	Fresno	\$5	\$ 98,469	\$ 121,401	\$ 110,504	\$ 97,516
5	Los Angeles	\$5	\$ 830,421	\$ 1,295,100	\$ 1,480,168	\$ 1,328,993
6	Monterey	\$5	\$ 32,856	\$ 40,826	\$ 20,230	\$ -
7	Orange	\$5	\$ 369,617	\$ 466,843	\$ 421,645	\$ 368,905
8	Riverside	\$5	\$ 253,815	\$ 317,869	\$ 287,070	\$ 274,541
9	Sacramento	\$5	\$ 504,807	\$ 373,901	\$ 348,234	\$ 274,685
10	San Bernardino	\$5	\$ -	\$ 297,239	\$ 288,108	\$ 248,556
11	San Diego	\$5	\$ 336,581	\$ 430,649	\$ 380,780	\$ 337,696
12	San Francisco	\$5	\$ 115,160	\$ 140,230	\$ 124,923	\$ 109,487
13	San Joaquin	\$5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 91,233	\$ 78,199
14	San Luis Obispo	\$5	\$ 23,484	\$ 29,250	\$ 25,681	\$ 23,263
15	San Mateo	\$5	\$ 64,791	\$ 81,204	\$ 71,715	\$ 62,556
16	Santa Barbara	\$5	\$ 39,686	\$ 48,354	\$ 43,675	\$ 37,337
17	Santa Clara	\$5	\$ 147,497	\$ 174,867	\$ 162,279	\$ 144,060
18	Solano	\$5	\$ 46,724	\$ 56,083	\$ 54,379	\$ 49,574
19	Sonoma	\$5	\$ 45,987	\$ 55,979	\$ 49,926	\$ 44,864
20	Stanislaus	\$2	\$ 19,924	\$ 24,371	\$ -	\$ -
21	Ventura	\$5	\$ 84,342	\$ 103,657	\$ 92,008	\$ 82,189
	Total		\$ 3,302,071	\$ 4,403,087	\$ 4,349,806	\$ 3,813,546

**Distribution from First Paper General Civil Unlimited Uniform
Filing Fee (GC 70611) in Contra Costa County**

Distribution	State vs. Local	Current
Trial Court Trust Fund Base Allocation	State	\$311.70
Children's Waiting Room	State	\$5.00
Automated Recored-Keeping and Micrographics	State	\$3.00
Judges' Retirement Fund	State	\$2.50
State Court Facilities Construction Fund	State	\$35.00
Immediate & Critical Needs Account	State	\$30.00
Local Courthouse Construction Surcharges		\$0.00
Equal Access Fund	Local	\$4.80
Dispute Resolution	Local	\$8.00
Law Library	Local	\$35.00
Fee Amount		\$435.00

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

(Action Item)

Title: Reporting Requirement for Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) Encumbrances

Date: 8/7/2019

Contact: Jason Haas, Senior Budget Analyst, Budget Services
916-643-7061 | Jason.Haas@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of a recommendation to the Judicial Council to forego the reporting requirement for outstanding encumbrances for all programs funded from the TCTF and/or IMF unless requested.

Background

At the August 20, 2015 Judicial Council meeting, a recommendation was adopted from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to require Judicial Council staff to report biannually on outstanding encumbrances for all programs funded from the TCTF and IMF that support the trial courts.

The impetus of that action was in part related to the financial landscape facing the TCTF and IMF at that time. Specifically, both funds were facing anticipated funding shortfalls. The reporting requirement was developed to help aid the TCBAC in implementing recommendations for possible reductions to already approved allocations as well as requested future allocations.

At the May 24, 2018 council meeting, the biannual reporting requirement was reduced to an annual report as conditions with both funds had significantly improved. Furthermore, with the approval of recent budget change proposals in the 2019-20 enacted budget, and an ongoing agreement with the Department of Finance to backfill the TCTF for shortfalls in certain key revenue streams, both funds now appear healthy for the foreseeable future. Neither fund is experiencing uncertainty of funding shortfalls, fund balance, or insolvency.

The original circumstances that triggered the reporting requirement are no longer present. Removing the reporting requirement would help reduce workload, and Judicial Council staff will retain the ability to produce an ad hoc report on either fund upon request.

Recommendation

The following recommendation is presented to the TCBAC for consideration:

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

Approve a recommendation for consideration by the Judicial Council at its September 23-24, 2019 business meeting to forego the annual reporting requirement for outstanding encumbrances from the TCTF and IMF unless requested by the TCBAC.

Language Access Signage and Technology Grants
Process Overview
August 1, 2019

Below is a high-level overview of the proposed process for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grants. This process includes potential priorities for grants, and solicitation of projects from trial courts for consideration of awarding grants, to the ultimate distribution of funding to the courts upon successful completion of court signage and technology project(s).

Background

The 2018 Budget includes ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.55 million per year for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs. The relevant language from the 2018 May Revise Budget Change Proposal (BCP)¹ is included below:

Signage (Electronic and Static) - \$1,000,000

Recommendations #39 and #42 of the Language Access Plan direct the council to "assist courts by providing plain-language translations of the most common and relevant signs likely to be used in a courthouse and provide guidance on the use of internationally recognized icons, symbols, and displays to limit the need for text and, therefore, translation" and to "provide information to courts [for] better wayfinding strategies, multilingual (static and dynamic) signage." With over 475 court buildings dispersed across 58 counties statewide, easy-to-understand signage is essential to help LEP court users navigate the courthouse and ensure they receive appropriate services. Meaningful access to these 475 buildings starts with wayfinding, which requires the use of clear and intuitive visual cues to minimize confusion and assist all persons who enter a building. Wayfinding is accomplished through strategic and immediate visual information indicating the location of common, important public spaces: information desks, elevators, stairs, and restrooms. Wayfinding is then supplemented by appropriate signage. These important navigational tools can help to remove confusion and language access barriers and reduce the apprehension that many court users may have about going to an unfamiliar courthouse.

Court Language Access Infrastructure and Equipment - \$1,550,000

Courts are not currently funded for language access expansion or maintenance costs outside of direct interpreter services provided in the courtrooms. Various items vital to the day-to-day operations of a court should be funded to assist in the expansion of services to LEP court users:

- 1) Technology
- 2) Interpreter Equipment
- 3) Multi-Language Communication
- 4) Telephonic or other remote interpreting technologies

This funding would be allocated to various courts on an ongoing basis based on equipment and infrastructure refresh and update schedules that will be established to ensure that all courts receive the necessary funding to maintain adequate infrastructure for language access needs.

¹ See https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/1819/FY1819_ORG0250_BCP2379.pdf.

Note: \$200,000 of the \$1,550,000 amount is dedicated to the Judicial Council for upgrades to the Language Access Toolkit and other council language access infrastructure support (such as translation costs for statewide forms, web content, and other multilingual resources for LEP court users). The amount available to trial courts for technology is therefore \$1,350,000 each year.

The Language Access Services Unit (Center for Families, Children & the Courts) is planning to disburse this funding for courts each year, beginning in FY 2019-20, as a grant program.

Objectives of Grant Program

The goals of the Signage and Technology Grant Program include:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help LEP court users to navigate the courthouse.
- Assist courts that may need equipment or software that will facilitate communication with LEP court users and the courts.
- Allocate funds to as many trial courts as possible within the given budget to support language access signage and technology initiatives.
- Fund enhancements that provide LEP court users with greater access to the courts and to information in their language.
- Encourage courts to establish an ongoing plan for grant funding that coordinates with other facilities and/or technology initiatives planned or underway that support language access as a core service of the court.

Note: Courts may apply for both signage and technology needs.

Application Timing and Process

- Applications are due on November 15, 2019.
- Recommendations will be developed by staff for review by the Language Access Subcommittee and the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, and the Information Technology Advisory Committee.
- The decision on which projects to fund will be made by the Judicial Council by March 2020.
- All courts that submit Signage and Technology Grant requests will be notified as to whether they receive funding.
- Intra-Branch Agreements for the signage and technology grant requests which are funded are expected to be delivered to the Court Executive Officers (CEOs) for signatory approval and returned to the Judicial Council prior to April 30, 2020.
- Due to limited funding, and depending upon the number of requests received, it may not be possible to fund all requests, and/or some requests may be approved only for partial funding.
- Courts requesting funding for more than one project in each category are asked to identify the top priority project for their court.
- No more than 10% of the annual grant budget for each program will be allocated to any one court (i.e., no more than \$100,000 for signage, no more than \$135,000 for technology).
- If total funding requests fall below the total annual allocation, courts may be awarded larger amounts to ensure that available funding under the program is disbursed as needed.

- Applicants should check with their Facilities and/or Information Technology departments to ensure that grant funding requests conform with court-wide planning efforts.

Grant Award and Reimbursement Process

- Funding must be encumbered each fiscal year and ongoing costs such as software maintenance and support should not be included in the request (if a request covers multiple years, courts must undertake the project and then reapply each year).
- The Signage and Technology grant is a reimbursement grant which means that the funds will be distributed after the conclusion of a successful project.
- Courts who participate in the grant program and request funding for video remote interpreting equipment will be asked to agree to follow the council’s *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events*.²
- Note: Courts that apply for VRI equipment in the courtroom must abide with local Memoranda of Understanding and agreements that allow for the appropriate use of VRI in the courtroom.
- Funds must be encumbered by the court in the current fiscal year and the court must inform the Judicial Council that funding for the project has been encumbered by June 30, 2020.
- If the reimbursement request and the invoices to support the requested reimbursement amount are not received by December 31, 2020, funding for the grant will be unavailable for reimbursement to the court for the cost of the project.

Potential Priorities for Grants

In 2019, Judicial Council staff developed the following potential priorities for the grant program, and reviewed these priorities with the Language Access Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Signage Grants

Priority	Project
1.	Plain language editing and professional translation of signage language that is not available in the Glossary of Signage Terms and Icons (available here: http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lap-toolkit-Glossary_of_Signage_Terms_and_Icons.xlsx).
2.	Development of multilingual wayfinding strategies, including electronic displays with automated maps and orientation guides with multilingual interface and/or other types of multilingual electronic signage.
3.	Investment in multilingual non-electronic signage (paper, plaques, etc.).
4.	Equipment and start-up costs for an automated queue management system that will contain multilingual information.

Technology Grants

Priority	Project
1.	Interpreter equipment, including upgraded headsets and other communication equipment for interpreters (for example, wireless transmitters and receivers, charging stations and carrying cases).

² See <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf>.

2.	Telephonic/video remote solutions equipment for LEP assistance both inside and outside the courtroom (for example, speakerphones, and equipment for video remote appearances, video remote interpreting, counter assistance, or other self-help remote assistance, including tablets, computer equipment and monitors).
3.	Scheduling software for language access services, multilingual avatars for LEP court users, or other software that allows for accurate multilingual communication between the LEP court user and the court.
4.	Multilingual videos for LEP court users, including translation costs.
5.	Audio-visual (AV) systems upgraded, broadband service and/or other infrastructure enhancements (must directly relate to services provided to LEP court users).
6.	Multilingual kiosks.

Project Solicitation

An invitation will be sent to the Language Access Representatives for all 58 trial courts from the Language Access Services Unit inviting the courts to submit a request for funding if they have a language access signage and/or technology system project which they would like to have considered for grant funding. A solicitation email will come from the Language Access Subcommittee Chair that will also be shared with the Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers. The email will include a memo from staff that provides an overview of the goals of the grant program, criteria that is considered when deciding which grants are recommended for funding, and a deadline to submit the grant project request form for consideration.

Evaluation of Project Funding Requests

Courts that request funding for signage and/or technology will need to submit a completed project request form to Judicial Council staff. As noted above, courts can submit funding requests for both signage and technology for consideration. In cases where courts submit more than one signage project (or more than one technology project), they will be asked to complete a separate project request form for each project and to indicate the priority for each of their projects (e.g. top priority, 2nd priority, etc.). Judicial Council staff will review each submission and follow up with the courts on any missing information and questions. Staff will prepare an initial allocation in a spreadsheet by court of the proposed grant funding based upon the amount of available funding, the number of project requests received, the overall goals of the program, and other criteria as specified in the solicitation memo. Part of the evaluation process includes ensuring the project falls within the scope and criteria of the grant program. Additionally, staff will review the scope of funding included in the project request to ensure that the funding being requested is for one-time costs. Any ongoing system maintenance costs will be removed from the requested funding amount. Staff will then categorize the projects into the various program priorities and will make an initial proposed allocation for each court limiting the grant awarded to no more than 10% for an individual court, unless total funding requests are lower than the annual allocation. The results of this analysis will be recorded in an Excel spreadsheet. There will be multiple review cycles of the proposed allocations internally with management in CFCC, JCIT, and the Executive Office throughout this process.

Advisory Body Review and Approval

After management approval of the proposed grant requests, a memo will be prepared and sent from Judicial Council staff to the Language Access Subcommittee, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF), and Information Technology Advisory (ITAC) Committee Chairs for review. If the

Chairs have no questions about the memo or proposed allocations, the memo will be placed on the PAF and ITAC agenda for a presentation to the full bodies of the committees for consideration. During the meetings, the recommendation memo along with the proposed allocations will be reviewed and any questions will be addressed.

Following approval by the advisory bodies, the proposed allocations will be submitted and potentially approved by the Judicial Council at its March 2020 meeting.

Write and Issue IBA's

If the proposed allocations are approved by the council, a Contract Detail Sheet and Intra-Branch Agreement (IBA) will be drafted for each court and sent to Budget Accounting and Procurement (BAP) for processing and eventually signed by the court's CEO, per the schedule above.

Funds Disbursement

To be reimbursed, courts must expend grant funding by December 31, 2020. Upon successful completion of their project, the court submits an invoice with a brief report on what was completed, along with a disbursement request along with supporting invoices to the Language Access Services Unit for processing. A memo from Judicial Council staff along with the supporting documents from the court will be sent to Judicial Council Branch Accounting for disbursement of the funding to the courts.

DRAFT