



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR APRIL 9, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft minutes from the May 22, 2019 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for 2020-21 (Action Required)	5
Attachment 1A – Judicial Council Approved 2019-20 Allocations and 2020-21 Proposed Allocations from the IMF State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations	9
Attachment 1B – Summary of Programs	11
Attachment 1C – IMF Fund Condition Statement	13
Item 2 – Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for 2020-21 (Action Required)	14
Attachment 2A – TCTF Judicial Council Staff and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Allocations	19
Attachment 2B – TCTF Judicial Council Staff (0140010); Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Narrative (0150095)	20
Attachment 2C – TCTF Support for Operations of the Trial Courts (0150010) Allocations ...	29
Attachment 2D – Support for Operations of the Trial Courts (0150010) Narrative	30
Attachment 2E – TCTF Fund Condition Statement	35



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 REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE SUBCOMMITTEE

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: April 9, 2020
Time: 12:00 p.m. - 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 May 22, 2019 Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee 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. Only written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on April 8, 2020 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for 2020-21 (Action Required)

Deliberation regarding allocations from the IMF for 2020-21.

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

Item 2

Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for 2020-21 (Action Required)

Deliberation regarding allocations from the TCTF for 2020-21.

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

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 22, 2019
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Conference Call

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Hon. Jill C. Fannin, and Hon. Gary Nadler.
Executive Officers: Ms. Sherri R. Carter (Cochair), Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Mr. Michael D. Planet, and Mr. David H. Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judges: Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton (Cochair), Hon. Andrew S. Blum, and Hon. Brian L. McCabe.
Executive Officers: Mr. Brian Taylor and Ms. Kim Turner

Others Present: Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Michele Allan, Ms. Donna Newman, Mr. Jason Haas, and Ms. Melissa Ng.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m. and roll was called.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the April 8, 2019 Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee meeting, and the April 24, 2019 action by email between meetings.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

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

Deliberation regarding allocations from the TCTF proposed in the Governor's Budget Proposal including cannabis convictions, and in the Governor's May Revise including unfunded judgeships.

Presenter: Ms. Melissa Ng, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: The Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee voted unanimously to approve the following allocation recommendations:

1. \$33.955 million in available reimbursement from the TCTF for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel;
2. \$24.486 million from the TCTF for general trial court operations; and
3. \$13.9 million from the TCTF for Cannabis Convictions Resentencing.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

(Action Item)

Title: Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for 2020-21

Date: 4/9/2020

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

Issue

Consider adopting recommendations for the 2020-21 preliminary allocations from the IMF for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee at its May 21, 2020 meeting and for Judicial Council consideration at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting.

Total requested allocations for 2020-21 are \$65,332,499 (Attachment 1A, Column I, Row 50), which is a decrease of \$14,747,361 from the prior year. This amount represents updated costs for current service levels and budget change proposals (BCPs) currently included in the 2020-21 Governor's Budget. Should the 2020-21 BCPs not be approved in the final budget, the request would be reduced by \$11,297,000 for a total allocation request of \$54,035,499.

The COVID-19 crisis has created uncertainties related to the state budget process, and it is anticipated that modifications to the allocations may be necessary based on available state revenues and final budget decisions.

Proposed 2020-21 Preliminary Allocations

The proposed Governor's Budget released on January 10, 2020 includes BCPs that impact the 2020-21 allocations for the IMF. The allocation requests below assume the BCPs will be approved in the enacted budget.

The following are the proposed 2020-21 allocation requests by Judicial Council offices (additional details on each of the programs are located in Attachment 1B):

1. **Audit Services** – Conducts operational audits and risk assessments and recommends improvement to all judicial branch entities.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$409,804; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
2. **Branch Accounting and Procurement** – Supports the trial courts' financial and human resources Phoenix System.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

- a. Approve an allocation of \$151,500; an increase of \$12,875 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for staff supporting the procurement needs of courts.
 - ii. The increase is due to increased staffing costs.
3. **Business Management Services** – Supports the judicial branch research, data, and analytic programs and manages the Temporary Assigned Judges Program. This is a newly established office.
 - a. Approve an allocation of \$8,500; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for travel related expenses for the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee; last fiscal year the \$8,500 resided with Budget Services.
4. **Center for Families, Children and the Courts** – Supports various programs within the courts for litigants.
 - a. Approve an allocation of \$6,957,692; an increase of \$1,050,000 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The increase is for the specific use of funds for Shriver Civil Counsel from Cy Pres funds that are held in reserve on the fund condition statement and may only be used for this purpose.
 - ii. Provisional language in the Budget Act requires unspent funds for Self-Help to revert to the General Fund.
 - iii. This program absorbed the Court Interpreter Testing and funding of \$143,000 during 2019-20 on an ongoing basis.
5. **Center for Judiciary Education & Research** – Provides education to judges, court leaders, court staff faculty, managers, supervisors, and lead staff.
 - a. Approve an allocation of \$1,202,000; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
6. **Budget Services** - Supports meetings of various committees and subcommittees as they relate to the trial courts funding, policies, and other issues.
 - a. Approve an allocation of \$371,500; an increase of \$13,784 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The two main expenditures are for Treasury Services-Cash Management and Budget Focused Training and Meetings.
 - ii. A portion of last fiscal year's allocation, \$8,500, was moved to the newly established Business Management Services office; the actual increase to Budget Services office is \$5,800.
 - iii. The increase is due to increased staffing costs.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

7. **Human Resources** – Supports the Trial Court Labor Relations Academy to provide assistance to trial court staff in addressing its many labor issues (not mandated).
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$22,700; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*

8. **Information Technology** – Supports information technology systems for the 58 superior courts.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$54,099,365; a decrease of \$14,006,619 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The decrease is largely due to an adjustment in multi-year funding authorized in a 2019-20 BCP for the case management system replacement project (see Attachment 1A, Column J, Row 34).
 - ii. Excluding the impact of 2020-21 BCPs, the net allocation request is lower by \$25,303,619 from the prior year. Decreases are due to sunseting BCP funding and program completion from prior years.

9. **Legal Services Office** – Supports the Judicial Council staff divisions and courts, manages litigation, and is responsible for rules and projects including the California Rules of Court and Judicial Council forms.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$2,109,438; a reduction of \$1,817,401 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The reduction is primarily due to litigation that did not materialize.

The 2020-21 IMF preliminary allocation request of \$65,332,499 is reflected in the IMF Fund Condition Statement (Attachment 1C). The fund is estimated to have a sufficient balance for these allocations based on current projections of revenues and expenditure savings in 2019-20.

While the anticipated reductions to revenues due to COVID-19 cannot be accurately quantified, the impacts of revenues could be immediate, affecting the 2019-20 fiscal year, and will certainly impact the 2020-21 fiscal year. Even a substantial temporary reduction to estimated revenues would not endanger fund solvency and would support the proposed level of allocation, assuming the support from the General Fund remains stable.

Should 2020-21 information technology BCPs that request General Fund dollars be denied, the total allocation request would decrease by \$11,297,000 to \$54,035,499. Additionally, there would be a net zero impact to the fund condition. (see Attachment 1A, Column I, Rows 48-49):

- (1) BCP Digitizing Documents Phases 2 & 3: \$5,900,000
- (2) BCP Information Technology Modernization: \$5,397,000

Approval of several BCPs in the 2019 Budget Act that shifted funding to the General Fund has removed a structural imbalance that previously existed in the IMF. Based on current revenue and

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

expenditure projections, the fund is expected to remain solvent (see Attachment 1C, Row 25) with this allocation level.

Recommendation

The following recommendation is presented to the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee for approval to be considered by TCBAC at its May 21, 2020 meeting and by the council at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting:

Adopt a recommendation to approve a maximum total of \$65,332,499 in allocations for 2020-21 from the IMF, contingent upon approval of two BCPs in the 2020-21 Budget Act. Should the BCPs not be approved, the total allocation request would be \$54,035,499. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, final allocation amounts for 2020-21 will be based on available state revenues and final budget decisions.

Attachments

1. **Attachment 1A:** Judicial Council Approved 2019-20 Allocations and 2020-21 Proposed Allocations from the IMF State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations
2. **Attachment 1B:** Summary of Programs
3. **Attachment 1C:** IMF Fund Condition Statement

**Judicial Council Approved 2019-20 Allocations and 2020-2021 Proposed Allocations
from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations**

#	Program Name	Office	2019-20 Allocations			Recommended 2020-21 Allocations			\$ Change from 2019-20	% Change from 2019-20
			Judicial Council Approved Allocations	Proposed Adjustments	Pending Total Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I = (G + H)	J = (I - F)	K = (J/F)
	Program Adjustments									
1	Audit Services	AS	\$ 409,804		\$ 409,804	\$ 409,804		\$ 409,804	-	0%
2	Trial Court Procurement/TCAS-MSA-IMF	BAP	\$ 138,625		\$ 138,625	\$ 151,500		\$ 151,500	12,875	9%
3	Phoenix Program ^{1/} (2019-20 BCP)	BAP	\$ -		\$ -			\$ -	-	
4	Workload Assessment Advisory Committee	BMS	\$ 8,500		\$ 8,500		\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	-	0%
5	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	BSO	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	-	0%
6	Treasury Services - Cash Management	BSO	\$ 298,216		\$ 298,216	\$ 312,000		\$ 312,000	13,784	5%
7	Revenue Distribution Training	BSO	\$ 9,500		\$ 9,500		\$ 9,500	\$ 9,500	-	0%
8	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	CFCC	\$ 17,000		\$ 17,000		\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	-	0%
9	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	-	0%
10	Self-Help Center	CFCC	\$ 5,000,000		\$ 5,000,000		\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	-	0%
11	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	CFCC	\$ 67,000		\$ 67,000		\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	-	0%
12	Shriver Civil Counsel- Cy Pres Funding	CFCC	\$ 520,692		\$ 520,692	\$ 1,570,692		\$ 1,570,692	1,050,000	202%
13	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	CFCC	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	-	0%
14	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	CFCC	\$ 143,000		\$ 143,000		\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	-	0%
15	CJER Faculty	CJER	\$ 36,000		\$ 36,000		\$ 61,500	\$ 61,500	25,500	71%
16	Essential Court Management Education	CJER	\$ 35,000		\$ 35,000		\$ 38,500	\$ 38,500	3,500	10%
17	Essential Court Personnel Education	CJER	\$ 215,000		\$ 215,000		\$ 136,500	\$ 136,500	(78,500)	-37%
18	Judicial Education	CJER	\$ 916,000		\$ 916,000		\$ 965,500	\$ 965,500	49,500	5%
19	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	\$ 22,700		\$ 22,700		\$ 22,700	\$ 22,700	-	0%
20	Data Center and Cloud Service (formerly CCTC Operations)	IT	\$ 1,718,714		\$ 1,718,714	\$ 1,787,268		\$ 1,787,268	68,554	4%
21	ISB Support	IT	\$ 946,153		\$ 946,153	\$ 800,828		\$ 800,828	(145,325)	-15%
22	Uniform Civil Filing Services	IT	\$ 423,779		\$ 423,779	\$ 382,382	\$ 27,000	\$ 409,382	(14,397)	-3%
23	CCPOR Development	IT	\$ 524,200		\$ 524,200	\$ 374,534		\$ 374,534	(149,666)	-29%
24	V3 - ICMS/CMS Release Management Support	IT	\$ 619,669		\$ 619,669			\$ -	(619,669)	-100%
25	Telecommunications Support	IT	\$ 11,749,425		\$ 11,749,425		\$ 13,204,519	\$ 13,204,519	1,455,094	12%
26	Telecommunications Support BCP	IT	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 992,633		\$ 992,633	992,633	
27	Enterprise Policy & Planning (Statewide Planning and Dev Support)	IT	\$ 4,342,185		\$ 4,342,185	\$ 563,497	\$ 3,515,494	\$ 4,078,991	(263,194)	-6%
28	Interim Case Management Systems	IT	\$ 1,441,032		\$ 1,441,032			\$ -	(1,441,032)	-100%
29	Data Integration	IT	\$ 1,841,149		\$ 1,841,149		\$ 1,507,514	\$ 1,507,514	(333,635)	-18%
30	Data Center and Cloud Service (formerly CCTC)	IT	\$ 7,995,247		\$ 7,995,247		\$ 7,361,614	\$ 7,361,614	(633,633)	-8%
31	Jury Management System	IT	\$ 665,000		\$ 665,000		\$ 665,000	\$ 665,000	-	0%
32	CCPOR (ROM)	IT	\$ 364,848		\$ 364,848		\$ 878,171	\$ 878,171	513,323	141%
33	V3 Case Management System (2018-19 BCP)	IT	\$ 1,481,970		\$ 1,481,970			\$ -	(1,481,970)	-100%
34	CMS Replacement - Phase IV (2019-20 BCP)	IT	\$ 22,777,259		\$ 22,777,259		\$ 6,358,000	\$ 6,358,000	(16,419,259)	-72%
35	Telecom	IT	\$ 5,509,354		\$ 5,509,354		\$ 4,383,911	\$ 4,383,911	(1,125,443)	-20%
36	Futures Commission (2019-20 BCP)	IT	\$ 853,000		\$ 853,000			\$ -	(853,000)	-100%
37	Digitizing Court Records (2019-20 BCP)	IT	\$ 4,853,000		\$ 4,853,000			\$ -	(4,853,000)	-100%
38	Phoenix Program ^{1/} (2019-20 BCP)	IT	\$ -		\$ -			\$ -	-	
39	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	\$ 1,200,000		\$ 1,200,000		\$ 1,312,438	\$ 1,312,438	112,438	9%
40	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	\$ 19,000		\$ 19,000		\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	-	0%
41	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	\$ 589,192		\$ 589,192	\$ 778,000		\$ 778,000	188,808	32%
42	Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program ^{1/} (2019-20 BCP)	LSO	\$ -		\$ -			\$ -	-	
43	Litigation Management Program	LSO	\$ 2,118,647		\$ 2,118,647			\$ -	(2,118,647)	-100%
44	Litigation Management Program ^{1/} (2019-20 BCP)	LSO	\$ -		\$ -			\$ -	-	
45	Subtotal Program Adjustments		\$ 80,079,860	\$ -	\$ 80,079,860	\$ 6,552,446	\$ 47,483,053	\$ 54,035,499	\$ (26,044,361)	
46	BCP Adjustments									
47	Digitizing Documents Phases 2&3	IT			\$ -		\$ 5,900,000	\$ 5,900,000	5,900,000	
48	Information Technology Modernization	IT			\$ -		\$ 5,397,000	\$ 5,397,000	5,397,000	
49	Subtotal BCP Adjustments		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 11,297,000	\$ 11,297,000	\$ 11,297,000	
50	Total		\$ 80,079,860	\$ -	\$ 80,079,860	\$ 6,552,446	\$ 58,780,053	\$ 65,332,499	\$ (14,747,361)	

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

**Judicial Council Approved 2019-20 Allocations and 2020-2021 Proposed Allocations
from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations**

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Office	Judicial Council Approved Allocations	Proposed Adjustments	Pending Total Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total	\$ Change from 2018-19	% Change from 2018-19
C	D	E	E	G	H	I = (G + H)	J = (I - F)	K = (J/F)
Totals by Office								
AS	\$ 409,804	\$ -	\$ 409,804	\$ 409,804	\$ -	\$ 409,804	\$ -	0.00%
BAP	\$ 138,625	\$ -	\$ 138,625	\$ 151,500	\$ -	\$ 151,500	\$ 12,875	9.29%
BMS	\$ 8,500	\$ -	\$ 8,500		\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	\$ -	0.00%
CFCC	\$ 5,907,692	\$ -	\$ 5,907,692	\$ -	\$ 6,957,692	\$ 6,957,692	\$ 1,050,000	17.77%
CJER	\$ 1,202,000	\$ -	\$ 1,202,000	\$ -	\$ 1,202,000	\$ 1,202,000	\$ -	0.00%
BSO	\$ 357,716	\$ -	\$ 357,716	\$ 312,000	\$ 59,500	\$ 371,500	\$ 13,784	3.85%
HR	\$ 22,700	\$ -	\$ 22,700	\$ -	\$ 22,700	\$ 22,700	\$ -	0.00%
IT	\$ 68,105,984	\$ -	\$ 68,105,984	\$ 4,901,142	\$ 49,198,223	\$ 54,099,365	\$ (14,006,619)	-20.57%
LSO	\$ 3,926,839	\$ -	\$ 3,926,839	\$ 778,000	\$ 1,331,438	\$ 2,109,438	\$ (1,817,401)	-42.99%
Total Allocations	\$ 80,079,860	\$ -	\$ 80,079,860	\$ 6,552,446	\$ 58,780,053	\$ 65,332,499	\$ (14,747,361)	-18.42%

Summary of Programs

Row #	Program Name	Office	Program Description
A	B	C	D
1	Audit Services	AS	Conducts performance and compliance audits of the State's 58 trial courts per the annual audit plan.
2	Trial Court Procurement/TCAS-MSA-IMF	BAP	Pays for phone services and rent allocation for one position in Business Services that provided procurement and contract related services at a statewide level.
4	Workload Assessment Advisory Committee	BMS	Pays for meeting expenses of the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee and travel expenses for court personnel and judges related to workload studies.
5	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	BSO	Supports meetings of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and associated subcommittees on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for trial courts and provides input to the Judicial Council on policy issues affecting Trial Court Funding.
6	Treasury Services - Cash Management	BSO	Used for the compensation, operating expenses and equipment costs for two accounting staff.
7	Revenue Distribution Training	BSO	Pays for annual training on Revenue Distribution to all the collection programs as well as annual CRT training.
8	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	CFCC	This program makes available to all courts, translation of domestic violence protective order forms in languages other than English. Since 2000, these forms have been translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese and Korean based on data from various language needs studies.
9	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	This program enables all courts to use Hotdocs Document Assembly Applications, which present court users with a Q&A format that automatically populates fields across all filing documents.
10	Self-Help Center	CFCC	Provides court-based assistance to self-represented litigants.
11	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	CFCC	Supports the biannual Beyond the Bench Conference, biannual Child & Family Focused Education Conference and annual Youth Summit.
12	Shriver Civil Counsel- Cy Pres Funding	CFCC	This program provides funding for legal services agencies and their court partners to provide representation to indigent persons in cases involving housing, child custody, guardianship, conservatorships, and domestic violence.
13	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	CFCC	The Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support Program updates and expands the online California Courts Self-Help Center on the judicial branch website. Further, this program facilitates the translating of over 50 Judicial Council forms that are used regularly by self-represented litigants.
14	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	CFCC	Pays for the testing, orientation, and recruitment of new interpreters.
15	CJER Faculty	CJER	Lodging, meals, and travel for faculty development participants. Primarily development of pro bono judge and court staff faculty who will teach all CJER programs for the trial courts.
16	Essential Court Management Education	CJER	National and statewide training for court leaders, including Institute for Court Management (ICM) courses, CJER Core 40 and Core 24 courses, & other local & regional courses for managers, supervisors and lead staff.
17	Essential Court Personnel Education	CJER	The Court Clerks Training Institute - courtroom and court legal process education in civil, traffic, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, appellate. Regional and local court personnel courses. The biennial Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute.
18	Judicial Education	CJER	Programs for all newly elected or appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers required by Rule of Court 10.462 (c)(1) to complete the new judge education programs offered by CJER; Judicial Institutes, courses for experienced judges; programs for PJs, CEOs & Supervising Judges.
19	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	The Labor Relations Academy and Forums provide court management staff with comprehensive labor relations knowledge that assists the courts in meeting its labor challenges. The Academies are held once per year in the spring and the Forums are held once per year in the fall. The allocation pays for costs tied to the setup and operations of HR's annual Labor Relations Academies and Forums. Typical expenses include: reimbursement of travel expenses for trial court employees who participate as faculty; lodging for all trial court attendees (including those who serve as faculty); meeting room/conference room rental fees; books/reference materials if needed; and meals for trial court participants of the Labor Relations Forum. Following each Academy, program staff send out surveys to gather feedback and receive suggestions for future events. In addition, participant attendance is gathered and reported to the Judicial Council as part of the Administrative Director's Report to the Council.

Row #	Program Name	Office	Program Description
A	B	C	D
20, 30	Data Center and Cloud Service (formerly CCTC and/or CCTC Operations)	IT	<p>The CCTC hosts some level of services for the 58 California superior courts, all the Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court and has over 10,000 supported users. Major installations in the CCTC include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) • California Court Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) • Phoenix - Trial Court Financial and Human Resources System • Sustain Interim Case Management System (ICMS) • Computer Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) system • Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health Trial Court Case Management System (V3) • Integration Services Backbone (ISB) <p>This program provides consistent, cost effective, and secure hosting services, including ongoing maintenance and operational support, data network management, desktop computing and local server support, tape back-up and recovery, help desk services, email services, and a disaster recovery program.</p>
21, 29	ISB Support (Data Integration)	IT	Data Integration provides system interfaces between Judicial Council systems and the computer systems of our justice partners, be they courts, law enforcement agencies, the department of justice and others. Without the Integrated Services Backbone (ISB), the current systems for sharing protective orders, for example, would not function.
22	Uniform Civil Filing Services	IT	This program supports the distribution and mandated reporting of uniform civil fees collected by all 58 superior courts, with an average of \$52 million distributed per month. The system generates reports for the State Controller's Office and various entities that receive the distributed funds. There are over 200 fee types collected by each court, distributed to 31 different entities (e.g. Trial Court Trust Fund, County, Equal Access Fund, Law Library, etc.), requiring 65,938 corresponding distribution rules that are maintained by UCFS. UCFS benefits the public by minimizing the amount of penalties paid to the state for incorrect or late distributions and ensuring that the entities entitled to a portion of the civil fees collected, as mandated by law, receive their correct distributions.
23	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	IT	The California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) is a statewide repository of protective orders containing both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers. CCPOR allows judges and law enforcement officers to view orders issued by other court divisions and across county lines.
25-26, 35	Telecommunications Support	IT	This program develops and supports a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local systems (email, jury, CMS, VOIP, etc.) and enterprise system applications such as Phoenix, via shared services at the CCTC provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources.
27	Enterprise Policy & Planning (Statewide Planning and Dev Support)	IT	The Enterprise Policy and Planning program provides the trial courts access to a variety of Oracle products (e.g., Oracle Enterprise Database, Real Application Clusters, Oracle Security Suite, Oracle Advanced Security, Diagnostic Packs, Oracle WebLogic Application Server) without cost to the courts.
31	Jury Management System	IT	The allocation for the Jury Program is used to distribute funds to the trial courts in the form of grants to improve court jury management systems. All trial courts are eligible to apply for the jury funding. The number of courts receiving grants varies according to the amount of grant funding available and the number of jury grant requests received.
33	V3 Case Management System	IT	V3 is used by the California Superior Courts of Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties. The courts use it to process
39	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSO	The allocation for the Judicial Performance Defense Insurance program is used to pay the insurance premium for trial court judges and judicial officers for the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) defense master insurance policy. The program (1) covers defense costs in CJP proceedings related to CJP complaints; (2) protects judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties, and (3) lowers the risk of conduct that could lead to complaints through required ethics training for judicial officers.
40	Jury System Improvement Projects	LSO	This program is related to Jury Instructions and is a "self-funding" PCC. Funds in this account are generated by royalties generated from sales of criminal and civil jury instructions. The funds are deposited pursuant to the Government Code.
41	Regional Office Assistance Group	LSO	The allocation for the Regional Office Assistance Group is used to pay for attorneys and support personnel to provide direct legal services to the trial courts in the areas of transactions/business operations, legal opinions, ethics, and labor and employment law.
47	Digitizing Documents Phases 2&3 (2020-21 BCP)	IT	This program extends and supports the Phase 1 of the digitizing of mandatory court records which was funded in the 2019 Budget Act. The next two phases will consist of the conversion of case files of at least one case type for approximately 15 courts. This includes both the appellate and trial courts.
48	Information Technology Modernization (2020-21 BCP)	IT	This program supports the implementation and deployment of three key essential initiatives for achieving the digital court: (1) Investing in a data-driven forms platform, (2) building a digital ecosystem for court innovations and integrations, and (3) creating next-generation data centers and cloud-based solutions. Implementation of these technology solutions is critical to realize the full scope of the digital court and its ability to be implemented throughout the state to improve access to justice.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
Fund Condition Statement
2020-21 IMF Allocations**

Updated: March 11, 2020

#	Description	Estimated					
		2016-17 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2017-18 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2018-19 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-22
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Beginning Balance	6,956,187	9,300,938	14,796,514	15,865,292	17,165,630	20,969,131
2	Prior-Year Adjustments ¹	4,187,917	-5,979,333	-973,149	-1,292	0	0
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	11,144,104	3,321,605	13,823,364	15,864,000	17,165,630	20,969,131
4	REVENUES²:						
5	Jury Instructions Royalties	607,672	604,495	648,480	560,000	660,000	660,000
6	Interest from SMIF	415,663	863,725	1,565,780	1,236,000	1,236,000	1,236,000
7	Escheat-Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds	7,615	2,158	244	0	0	0
8	50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue	13,160,903	22,077,608 ^{1/}	11,177,463	9,245,000	9,245,000	9,245,000
9	2% Automation Fund Revenue	12,792,097	12,367,362	10,698,861	10,170,000	10,400,000	9,958,000
10	Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments	0	146	359,153	10,000	2,000	2,000
11	Class Action Residue		205,615	1,311,975	574,000	0	0
12	Subtotal Revenues	26,983,950	36,121,109	25,761,957	21,795,000	21,543,000	21,101,000
13	Transfers and Other Adjustments						
14	To TCTF (GC 77209(j))	-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					
17	Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	12,992,950	22,130,109	11,770,957	7,804,000	7,552,000	7,110,000
18	Total Resources	24,137,054	25,451,714	25,594,322	23,668,000	24,717,630	28,079,131
19	EXPENDITURES³:						
20	Judicial Branch Total State Operations	6,002,342	4,405,086	4,724,200	4,786,893	6,552,446	6,677,804
21	Judicial Branch Total Local Assistance	65,451,774	63,462,762	49,813,207	71,110,477	58,780,053	51,175,700
22	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	659,579	305,352	305,622	106,000	289,000	289,000
23	Less funding provided by General Fund (Local Assistance)	-56,618,000	-57,518,000	-45,114,000	-69,501,000	-61,873,000	-57,131,000
24	Total Expenditures and Adjustments	14,836,116	10,655,200	9,729,029	6,502,370	3,748,499	1,011,504
25	Fund Balance	9,300,938	14,796,514	15,865,292	17,165,630	20,969,131	27,067,627
26	Reserve Funds (June 24, 2016 JCC)		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
27	Restricted Funds - Jury Management	1,104,525	900,431	826,656	702,656	678,656	654,656
28	Restricted Funds - Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel		205,615	1,517,590	1,570,898	0	0
29	Restricted Funds - Case Management Systems (CMS)			1,659,989	0	0	0
30	Fund Balance - less restricted funds	9,300,938	11,690,468	9,861,057	12,892,076	18,290,476	24,412,972
31	Structural Balance	-1,843,166	11,474,909	2,041,928	1,301,630	3,803,501	6,098,496

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 Revenue estimates include actuals through December 2019 and do not include possible effects of COVID-19.

³ 2019-20 expenditures reflect anticipated savings as recognized by programs in relation to the 2019-20 JCC approved allocations.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

(Action Item)

Title: 2020-21 Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF)
Date: 4/9/2020
Contact: Oksana Tuk, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-8027 | Oksana.Tuk@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider adopting recommendations for the 2020-21 preliminary allocations from the TCTF for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) at its May 21, 2020 meeting and for Judicial Council consideration at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting.

Recommendations under consideration fund specific programs that reimburse trial court costs from the TCTF Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation. Other allocations depend on enactment of the State Budget; have already been acted upon by the council; are required by statute; or are authorized charges for the cost of programs. Column D of Attachment 2C identifies which line items are not being brought forward for consideration and why.

The proposed allocations presented in this report include updated costs for current service levels as reflected in the 2020-21 Governor's Budget. The 2020-21 allocations do not include any new programs or services. The COVID-19 crisis has created uncertainties related to the state budget process, and it is anticipated that modifications to the allocations may be necessary based on available state revenues and final budget decisions.

Proposed 2020-21 Preliminary Allocations

The proposed TCTF allocations for the Judicial Council (Program 0140010), and Expenses on Behalf of Trial Courts (Program 0150095) are provided in Attachment 2A. Attachment 2B provides narrative descriptions of these programs.

The proposed TCTF allocations for the Support for Operations of the Trial Courts (Program 0150010) are provided in Attachment 2C. Column C identifies which line items are being brought forward for consideration. This attachment includes projected revenue-based allocations and includes various revenue distributions for the trial courts (see Column C, rows 35-41). Attachment 2D provides narrative descriptions of TCTF Support for Operations of the Trial Courts programs.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

While the TCTF is projected to have sufficient balance for these allocations as well as allocations that will be presented to the TCBAC and the council, as shown on Attachment 2E, this does not include the impact of the COVID-19 crisis. Reductions to revenues due to COVID-19 cannot be accurately determined at this time and are anticipated to be immediate due to reduced court operation, affecting 2019-20, and with certainty will impact 2020-21. A substantial temporary reduction to estimated revenues would be a significant impact to the fund, and should this occur, remedial action will need to be considered.

TCTF Judicial Council (Program 0140010)

Proposed 2020-21 allocation is \$3,764,417; a net decrease of \$151,483 from the 2019-20 allocation.

1. Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program
 - a. *Approve \$596,000; an increase of \$96,000 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The increase reflects additional funding included in the 2020-21 Governor's Budget as a result of a budget change proposal. This allocation would be reduced to \$500,000, the same amount as the 2019-20 allocation, if the budget change funding is not included in the 2020 Budget Act.
2. Equal Access
 - a. *Approve 246,000; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Allocation based on revenue.
3. Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections
 - a. *Approve \$260,000; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
4. Statewide Support for Collections Programs
 - a. *Approve \$656,000; a decrease of \$150,000 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Funding for a consultant was procured from savings in 2018-19, which resulted in \$181,000 in savings for 2019-20 and a reduced need in 2020-21.
 - ii. Funding was adjusted by \$31,000 due to increased staffing costs.
5. Phoenix Financial and Human Resources
 - a. *Approve \$1,584,250; an increase of \$110,350 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Funding from the TCTF is fully reimbursed by the courts that use the Phoenix Payroll System (\$1,505,000) and the Phoenix Virtual Buyer program (\$79,250).
 - ii. Funding has increased due to an increase in staff costs.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

6. Statewide E-Filing
 - a. *Approve \$422,167; a decrease of \$207,833 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Funding for the program is provided through a loan of \$1,162,000 (\$671,000 in 2017-18 and \$491,000 in 2018-19). Due to delays in implementation, the remaining unexpended funds are being requested for allocation in 2020-21.
 - b. *Approve \$1,162,000 in TCTF unrestricted fund balance to repay the General Fund loan due June 30, 2021, plus accrued interest.*
 - i. Implementation delays have resulted in delayed revenue collections to repay the loan.

Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts (Program 0150095)

Proposed 2020-21 allocation is \$22,179,152; an increase of \$12,164,153 from the 2019-20 allocation.

1. Children in Dependency Case Training
 - a. *Approve \$113,000; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
2. Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program
 - a. *Approve up to \$18,094,937; an increase of \$10,604,000 from the 2019-20 allocation due to increased revenues from AB 330 which has increased fees designated for this program by 150% starting January 1, 2020. This first-year allocation with new funding is projected at only a 100% increase to ensure sufficient funds are available.*
3. Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System (CMS)
 - a. *Approve \$1,656,767; an increase of \$1,092,767 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Three superior courts (Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura) have not completed their transition from CMS V3 and will fund the continued support of the system in 2020-21 as reflected on the TCTF Schedule C. This amount is the reimbursable due to the three trial courts paying for those services.
4. Data Center and Cloud Servicing (DCCS) (formerly California Courts Technology Center (CCTC))
 - a. *Approve \$688,803; an increase of \$3 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
5. Interim Case Management System
 - a. *Approve \$0; a reduction of \$62,200 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The reduction is based on zero courts utilizing CCTC hosting and the program ending in 2019-20.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

6. Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Contract
 - a. *Approve \$122,645; a decrease of \$433,417 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The OPEB valuation contract's current two-year cycle provides for the majority of the data gathering and development of actuarial reports be performed in the first fiscal year, 2019-20. The allocation for the second fiscal year, 2020-21, does not require the same level of data gathering.
7. State Controller's Office (SCO) Audits of Trial Courts
 - a. *Approve \$1,503,000; an increase of \$963,000 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. The increase reflects a 2020-21 BCP included in the Governor's Budget.

TCTF Support for Operations of the Trial Courts (Program 0150010)
Proposed 2020-21 allocation is \$42,712,686; a net increase of \$514,148 from the 2019-20 allocation.

1. Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program
 - a. *Approve \$455,346; a decrease of \$310,852 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Allocation based on anticipated court collections; approved by TCBAC via action by email and will be presented to the council at its May 2020 business meeting.
2. Self-Help Centers
 - a. *Approve \$25,300,000; no change from 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Funding of \$3.7 million included in the 2019-20 base is included in the \$25.3 million 2020-21 allocation request as it will no longer be included in the base as of 2020-21.
 - ii. The limited three-year funding of \$19.1 million was approved through a 2018-19 budget change proposal (BCP); funding sunsets in 2020-21.
 - iii. There is a 2021-22 BCP in progress that includes a request for ongoing \$19.1 million.
3. Jury
 - a. *Approve \$14,500,000; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
4. Screening Equipment Replacement
 - a. *Approve \$1,800,000; an increase of \$500,000 from 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Allocation based on the number of x-ray machines and magnetometers identified for replacement in 2020-21.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

5. Elder Abuse
 - a. *Approve \$332,340; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*

6. California State Auditor Audits
 - a. *Approve \$325,000; an increase of \$325,000 from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. Audits of trial courts occur every other year.

TCTF Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (Program 0150011)
Proposed 2020-21 allocation is \$156,700,000; no changes from the 2019-20 allocation.

1. Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel
 - a. *Approve \$156,700,000; no change from the 2019-20 allocation.*
 - i. This will be included in a request by the program to TCBAC in May 2020 and the council in July 2020.

Recommendation

The recommendation presented to the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee for consideration is to approve a total of \$225,356,255 in preliminary allocations for 2020-21 from the TCTF, and to approve repayment of the General Fund E-Filing loan amount of \$1,162,000 plus accrued interest by June 30, 2021 using TCTF unrestricted fund balance.

Adopt the preliminary recommendations for 2020-21 TCTF allocations for consideration by the TCBAC at its May 21, 2020 meeting and for council consideration at its business meeting July 23-24, 2020. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, final allocation amounts for 2020-21 will be based on available state revenues and final budget decisions.

Attachments

Attachment 2A: TCTF Judicial Council Staff and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Allocations

Attachment 2B: TCTF Judicial Council Staff (0140010); Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts (0150095) Narrative

Attachment 2C: TCTF Support for Operations of the Trial Courts (0150010) Allocations

Attachment 2D: Support for Operations of the Trial Courts (0150010) Narrative

Attachment 2E: TCTF Fund Condition Statement

TCTF Judicial Council and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Appropriations Allocations

#	Project and Program Title	2019-20 JC- Approved Judicial Council (Staff) (0140010)	2019-20 JC- Approved Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts (0150095)	2019-20 Total Approved Allocation	TCBAC R&E Subcommittee 2020-21 Recommended Preliminary Allocations			Program Allocation Increase/ (Decrease)
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col A + B)	Judicial Council (Staff) ¹ (0140010)	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts (0150095)	Total	
					Col. D	Col. E	Col F (Col. D + E)	Col. G
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	-	113,000	113,000		113,000	113,000	-
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	500,000	7,490,937	7,990,937	596,000	18,094,937	18,690,937	10,700,000
3	Equal Access Fund	246,000	-	246,000	246,000		246,000	-
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000	-	260,000	260,000		260,000	-
5	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	806,000	-	806,000	656,000		656,000	(150,000)
6	Programs Funded from Courts' TCTF Allocations			-				
7	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS		564,000	564,000		1,656,767	1,656,767	1,092,767
8	California Courts Technology Center (Data Center and Cloud Servicing)		688,800	688,800		688,803	688,803	3
9	Interim Case Management System		62,200	62,200		-	-	(62,200)
10	Phoenix Financial Services	72,500		72,500	79,250		79,250	6,750
11	Phoenix HR Services	1,401,400		1,401,400	1,505,000		1,505,000	103,600
12	Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations		556,062	556,062		122,645	122,645	(433,417)
13	Statewide E-Filing Implementation	630,000		630,000	422,167		422,167	(207,833)
14	SCO Audits of Trial Courts		540,000	540,000		1,503,000	1,503,000	963,000
15	Total, Program/Project Allocations	3,915,900	10,014,999	13,930,899	3,764,417	22,179,152	25,943,569	12,012,670
16	Department of Motor Vehicles Amnesty Program service charges	250,000		250,000	-	-	-	N/A
17	Estimated State Controller's Office services charges	303,000		303,000		-	-	N/A
19	Estimated Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,678,000	22,892,000	27,570,000	N/A
20	Appropriation Balance	N/A	N/A	N/A	913,583	712,848	1,626,431	N/A

1. Provisional language in the State Budget Act of 2018 allows the Judicial Council appropriation authority to be increased for support to the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot, Equal Access Fund, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections. Provisional language also allows up to \$11.274 million to be transferred to the Judicial Council appropriation authority for the recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts.

Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Program/Projects

Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Judicial Council (0140010)

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

This directed funding implements a pilot program required by Government Code section 68651 (AB 590-Feuer). Project funds come from a restricted supplemental filing fee on certain post judgment motions. That fee was increased from \$10 to \$25 effective January 1, 2020 by AB 330 (Gabriel). The funding currently supports eight pilot programs, which are each a partnership of a legal services' nonprofit corporation, the court, and other legal services providers in the community. With the additional funding available for the programs, it is likely that additional programs will be funded commencing October 1, 2020 based on a competitive grant process.

Government Code 68651 provides that the “participating projects shall be selected by a committee appointed by the Judicial Council with representation from key stakeholder groups, including judicial officers, legal services providers, and others, as appropriate... Projects approved pursuant to this section shall initially be authorized for a three-year period, commencing July 1, 2011, subject to renewal for a period to be determined by the Judicial Council, in consultation with the participating project in light of the project's capacity and success...” The current projects are in Fresno, Kern, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Yolo counties. The programs are currently in their third year of 3-year funding.

The programs provide legal representation to low-income Californians (at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level) in housing, child custody, probate conservatorship, and guardianship matters. Since not all eligible low-income parties with meritorious cases can be provided with legal representation, the court partners receive funds to implement improved court procedures, personnel training, case management and administration methods, and best practices.

Most administrative funds are being used for the evaluation of the pilot project. AB 330 requires that reports be submitted every five years on the program commencing June 30, 2020. Previous reports were submitted to the Governor and Legislature on January 31, 2016 and July 2017. Reports address the statutory requirement that “[t]he study shall report on the percentage of funding by case type and shall include data on the impact of counsel on equal access to justice and the effect on court administration and efficiency, and enhanced coordination between courts and other government service providers and community resources. This report shall describe the benefits of providing representation to those who were previously not represented, both for the clients and the courts, as well as strategies and recommendations for maximizing the benefit of

that representation in the future. The report shall describe and include data, if available, on the impact of the pilot program on families and children. The report also shall include an assessment of the continuing unmet needs and, if available, data regarding those unmet needs.” Evaluation continues in order to identify useful information for all courts on effective ways on handling these cases.

The pilots focus on providing representation in cases where one side is generally represented and the other is not. These are typically the most difficult cases for both the litigants and the courts. The intent is not only to improve access to the courts and the quality of justice obtained by those low-income individuals who would otherwise not have counsel, but also to allow court calendars that currently include many self-represented litigants to be handled more effectively and efficiently. The legislature found that the absence of representation not only disadvantages parties but has a negative effect on the functioning of the judicial system. “When parties lack legal counsel, courts must cope with the need to provide guidance and assistance to ensure that the matter is properly administered, and the parties receive a fair trial or hearing. Such efforts, however, deplete scarce court resources and negatively affect the courts’ ability to function as intended, including causing erroneous and incomplete pleadings, inaccurate information, unproductive court appearances, improper defaults, unnecessary continuances, delays in proceedings for all court users and other problems that can ultimately subvert the administration of justice.”

Equal Access

Commencing in 1999, the State Budget Act has contained a provision for the allotment of \$10 million to an Equal Access Fund “to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice.” That amount was supplemented by \$5 million in 2016-17, and then by an additional \$5 million in 2017-18. That additional \$10 million has been incorporated into the budget, and thus, the total amount of general funds allocated are \$20 million. In 2005, the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act was approved by the Legislature and the Governor. That act established a new distribution of \$4.80 per filing fee to the Equal Access Fund in the TCTF. The estimated revenue from filing fees for the fund is \$5.2 million per year.

The Budget Act provides that 90% of the funds are to support agencies providing civil legal assistance for low-income persons. The Business and Professions Code sets forth the criteria for distribution of those funds. 10% of the funds support partnership grants to eligible legal services agencies providing self-help assistance at local courts. Organizations must complete specific applications for these funds and have the approval of their courts. The Budget Act allocates up to 5% for administrative costs. Two thirds of the administrative costs go to the State Bar and one third to the Judicial Council.

Judicial Council administrative funds cover the costs of staffing to distribute and administer the grants, provide technical assistance and training support for the legal services agencies and courts, as well as the cost of Commission expenses, accounting and programmatic review. It

further provides staff support to develop on-line document assembly programs and other assistance for partnership grant projects.

The program serves all 58 courts by providing support to legal services programs which assist litigants with their legal matters. 42 partnership grant programs operate self-help centers in their partner courts. Parties who receive legal services – either fully or partly represented or helped in self-help centers – generally save the court valuable time and resources by helping litigants have better prepared pleadings, more organized evidence, and more effective presentation of their cases. Legal services programs also save significant time for courts by helping litigants understand their cases and helping them to settle whenever possible. Often a consultation with a lawyer is helpful for potential litigants to understand when they do not have a viable court case.

The administrative funds also provide the staff support to develop on-line document assembly programs and other instructional materials developed in partnership grant programs which are available to courts throughout the state.

The Budget Act of 2019 provided a one-time \$20 million allocation to the Judicial Branch to augment the Equal Access Fund for legal services to low-income persons for landlord-tenant issues to prevent homelessness. On July 17, 2019, the Judicial Council approved allocating these funds to the State Bar, which distributes the funding to eligible legal services agencies. As required by the Budget Act, 75% of the funds are distributed by formula to eligible organizations and 25% is being distributed through discretionary grants.

The State Bar and Judicial Council have worked together to ensure that the grants were issued promptly. \$14,850,000 has been allocated by formula to qualified legal services projects and support centers to provide eviction defense or other tenant defense assistance in landlord-tenant rental disputes, including pre-eviction and eviction legal services, counseling, advice and consultation, mediation, training, renter education, and representation and legal services to improve habitability, increasing affordable housing, ensuring receipt of eligible income or benefits to improve housing stability, and homelessness prevention. To ensure that meaningful funding is provided the Budget Act directed that a minimum amount of \$50,000 shall be allocated to each eligible program unless the program requests a lesser amount, in which case the additional funds shall be distributed proportionately to the other qualified legal services projects.

\$5 million has been allocated through a competitive grant process developed by the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission of the State Bar to award grants to qualified legal services projects and support centers to provide eviction defense or other tenant defense assistance in landlord-tenant rental disputes, to meet the needs of tenants not addressed by the formula funding. As set out in statute preference was given to qualified legal aid agencies that serve rural or underserved communities and that serve clients regardless of immigration or citizenship status. \$150,000 is available for use by the State Bar for administration of these special funds.

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.47 mandates the collections program. This funding provides staffing for administration of the statewide collections program and the overall dependency counsel program. Collections program staff assists trial courts in implementing the program in a variety of ways. A dedicated Judicial Resources Network webpage, maintained by staff, provides quick access to the guidelines, optional forms, and other program resources. Staff also administers a listserv for judicial officers and court staff to share questions and information with program staff and each other. The program analyst guides courts in completing the required implementation reports, receives and processes the reports, and follows up with individual courts as required.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

Budget Services

Statewide Support for Collections Programs

The Judicial Council Revenue and Collections Unit represents the only centralized professional and technical assistance team available to courts and counties statewide regarding issues relating to the collection and distribution of court-ordered debt and associated revenue. Support provided ranges from assistance with annual reporting requirements, collections master and participation agreements, operational reviews of individual collection programs, as well as daily assistance with policy and statutory guidance. The unit also responds to trial court revenue distribution inquiries and leads the planning and execution of related statewide training in partnership with the State Controller's Office and Franchise Tax Board.

Branch Accounting and Procurement

Phoenix Financial and Human Resources Services

The Judicial Council has sought to establish an administrative infrastructure at the state and local levels to provide appropriate accountability for the legally compliant, effective, and efficient use of resources; to provide the necessary information to support policymaking responsibilities; and consistently and reliably provide the administrative tools to support day-to-day operations.

The Phoenix Program supports this goal effectively by implementing a system that provides for uniform processes and standardized accounting and reporting and provides human capital management and payroll services to the courts in a cost-effective and efficient manner.

The program is primarily funded by the General Fund. The funding allocated from the TCTF is fully reimbursed by the courts that use the Phoenix Payroll System (\$1,505,000) and the Phoenix Virtual Buyer program (\$79,250). The Payroll System is currently supporting 17 courts. Approximately 23 courts are participating in the Virtual Buyer Program. Because these services are not utilized by all courts, these courts are asked to reimburse the TCTF for the services they receive.

Information Technology

Statewide e-Filing

The Statewide e-filing program will provide services designed to promote, enable, and assist full court participation in e-filing. The program, staffed by three positions (Supervisor, and two Sr. Analysts) will enable:

- Integration with an Identity and Access Management systems.
- Establishment of standards management, certification, and support services for statewide e-filing managers (EFMs) and e-filing service providers (EFSPs).
- Support for superior court e-filing implementations leveraging the established e-filing environment.

When the funding was initially approved for 2017-18, the program was scheduled to begin in 2017, but has been delayed. The delay is primarily related to the additional time needed to negotiate Master Agreements with the three selected EFM vendors. To date, Master Agreements have been executed with two of the three vendors. Additional negotiations with the third vendor, Tyler Technologies, failed to produce an agreement. At the most recent CEAC meeting, the Superior courts were provided information on the E-filing MSAs and program. JCC-IT and Los Angeles Superior court will be working with all the trial court for onboarding them to the new MSAs and cost recovery model. For the courts implementing Tyler Technologies, JCC-IT is working with each court on adding required terms of the branch MSA to each courts EFM/E-filing agreements. A full implementation timeline for interested courts is anticipated by spring 2020.

Journal Technologies Inc. will be the first EFM vendor to participate in the statewide eFiling environment. JCC-IT will ensure the standards-based approach planned for the program is accepted and adhered to. This will become the initial Statewide eFiling baseline version. Funding for the initial program was provided through a loan of \$1,162,000 (\$671,000 in 2017-18 and an ongoing \$491,000 starting in 2018-19) with loan repayment in the first two years based on cost recovery fees collected through filing fees. Due to the delay in program implementation, there is a delay in revenue collections to pay back the loan. The TCTF unrestricted fund balance can support the loan repayment which is due June 30, 2021.

California law authorizes both direct e-filing and e-filing through an EFSP (See Code Civ. Proc, §1010.6(d)(1)(B); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.253(a).) In most instances, parties or their attorneys file through an EFSP. A party or attorney sends the documents through a user interface to the EFSP for filing. The EFSP handles the actual filing, including compliance with any technical requirements. After filing, the EFSPs also provide feedback to the parties about the case; and can offer additional services, such as the service of documents on all parties in the case. Under current law, a court can institute mandatory e-filing only if it has more than one EFSP or direct e-filing. This requirement fosters competition and provides the public with a choice.

California has a variety of innovative EFSPs based or operating in the state. While some of the courts in California have realized a degree of success and innovation in e-filing, progress has been limited. This partial adoption of e-filing has been influenced by the actions of e-filing vendors who have created a difficult economic environment by:

- Focusing on high volume courts almost to the exclusion of the smaller courts;
- Creating monopolies through the use of proprietary designs;
- Creating barriers to entry and operation for innovative EFSPs; and
- Extracting higher fees for filing and payment processing.

Currently, courts that have implemented e-filing have an EFM provided by the same vendor as their case management system (CMS) and are deploying e-filing as a local county event. While this model satisfies many of the needs of the individual court, it creates challenges for attorneys that file in multiple counties and creates uneven services from county to county. Further, the majority of courts do not have any e-filing capability. Those courts that do have e-filing rely on either a single EFSP or EFM to provide identity management and financial gateway integration. The EFSP is analogous to the attorney service firm or couriers in a paper world; it provides the interface to the court filer, collects filing data, fees and may provide educational and other value-added services (e.g., process serving, billing assistance). The EFM is analogous to the counter clerk; it interacts with the EFSP by electronically accepting the filing, settling the payment, and presents the filing for clerical review and, upon approval, helps electronically move the data into the court's case and document management systems.

Fundamental to the multiple EFM-EFSP model is a statewide identity management capability. The filer ultimately has their relationship with the court in which their case is heard but may want to interact with the court (or multiple courts) through different EFSPs on the same or different cases. To ensure seamless access to their case, the branch should manage filer identities across courts, EFMs and EFSPs. To improve access the program enables a statewide identity management capability that will be used by all EFMs, EFSPs and courts in support of e-filing.

Lastly, establishing an EFM-EFSP certification process, providing ombudsman support, and facilitating issue resolution are necessary to ensure the statewide model is operational. Thus, to adequately support adoption of standards-based, statewide e-filing, the Judicial Council will need responsibilities in relation to EFMs, payment processors, identity management authority, and a certification authority. The program anticipates cost recovery for EFSP certification to be funded via fees to vendors; and following the initial two-year period, support for any ongoing positions will be funded via court e-filing/digital court cost recovery fees that will increase as more courts adopt the statewide e-filing model.

Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts (0150095)

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Children in Dependency Case Training

The program provides training designed to improve the trial and appellate advocacy skills of juvenile dependency court-appointed attorneys. All trial courts are eligible to send attorneys to this training. These funds are used to hire expert faculty and to support attendees' travel.

Attorneys educated in advanced trial skills save court costs by improving hearing efficiency, avoiding continuances, and adhering to federal standards for timeliness. If they are educated in establishing an adequate record, identifying issues for appeal, and meeting the appropriate timelines for writs and appeals, attorneys save the appellate courts considerable time by providing thorough and timely filings.

Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program

See TCTF Judicial Council (0140010) description for detail of program. Funds have been allocated by the Judicial Council on a three-year grant cycle in the amount of \$7,490,937 per year, based on the recommendations of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Implementation Committee, which is charged with this duty by the Government Code 68651, the legislation authorizing this program. These are dedicated funds which roll-over from year to year.

The Budget Act of 2019 allocated an additional \$2.5 million of general funds for the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel program. Government Code section 68651 provides that these Shriver funds are to be allocated to eligible legal services programs in partnership with trial courts to provide representation to low-income persons in civil cases with critical need including housing and child custody in three-year grant cycles. As 2019-20 is the last year of the current three-year cycle, the Judicial Council allocated the new funds pro rata to the existing programs for this final year of the grants.

As previously described, funding levels for the next cycle of three-year grants will be reviewed in 2020-21 based upon the increased revenue anticipated from the filing fees that were raised by AB 330 (Gabriel).

Information Technology

Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System

The Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health Case Management System (CMS V3) is a program that provides product releases including court change requests, judicial branch requirements, and biannual legislative changes; infrastructure support and hosting services for all environments, including development, testing, training, staging, and production; and daily court user support.

The civil, small claims, probate, and mental health interim case management system processes 25 percent of all civil cases statewide. V3 functionality enables the courts to process and administer their civil caseloads, automating activities in case initiation and maintenance, courtroom proceedings, calendaring, work queue, payment, and financial processing. Each V3 court configures its instance to support its staff, operations, and case management. This model allows for a single deployment and common version of the software, avoiding the cost of three separate installations.

E-filing has been successfully deployed at the Orange County and San Diego County courts, saving time and resources. The Superior Court of Sacramento County has deployed e-filing for its Employment Development Department cases. Sacramento County and Ventura County courts integrate V3 with public kiosks. E-filing and public kiosks are recognized as providing public and justice partners with increased ease of use and efficiencies.

In April 2018 the Judicial Council decided to eliminate funding V3 from the IMF by July 2020. The Judicial Council and the V3 courts requested and received funding over three years to replace V3 at each court. The budget change proposal for civil CMS (V3) replacement allocated a total of \$17,656,429 to the V3 courts for three fiscal years, 2016-17 through 2018-19, to fund their deployment and transition to new case management systems. Funds are allocated to the courts via intra-branch agreements based on disbursement milestones for software vendor contracts, consulting, equipment, and temporary project staff.

Three of the V3 courts will not have transitioned away from V3 by June 30, 2020: The Superior Courts of Sacramento, San Diego, and Ventura Counties. These courts will fund the continued support for V3 via Schedule Cs.

Data Center and Cloud Services

In alignment with Judicial Council directives to affirm development and implementation of statewide technology initiatives, the Data Center and Cloud Services (DCCS) program provides a Judicial Branch Technology Center for use by all courts.

Funding is utilized for maintaining core services and court requested services. Services include: operational support; data network management, desktop computing and local server support; tape back-up and recovery; help desk services; email services; and a dedicated service delivery manager. These services allow the courts to rely on the skills and expertise of the maintenance and support within the DCCS to remediate defects, implement legislative updates, configure and install software and hardware upgrades, and address other minor and critical issues.

The TCTF DCCS program costs are fully reimbursed by the participating courts. Courts reimburse the TCTF via the annual Schedule C process, where the courts confirm agreed upon technical charges. Once charges are confirmed by the courts, their monthly distributions are reduced over the year in the amount of the charges.

Interim Case Management System

For 2020-21, there are no courts which have their SJE CMS hosted at the CCTC and as a result, there is no allocation projected for 2020-21.

Budget Services

Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Valuation Contract

This funding supports the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 75 federally and state mandated annual reporting requirements for government entities to report on their OPEB liabilities and assets in irrevocable trusts set-aside for the payment of future OPEB expenses. The Judicial Council has centrally managed this effort on behalf of trial courts for the past four two-year reporting cycles.

The current actuary contract's two-year renewal term began September 1, 2019 and will end August 31, 2021. During the first year of the current two-year term, the valuation as of June 30, 2020 for 2019-20 will be completed at a not-to exceed cost of \$556,062, followed by the valuation as of June 30, 2021 for 2020-21 at a not-to exceed cost of \$122,645. These current contract costs have been increased by an inflation adjustment over the prior two-year contract term in accordance with the terms of the renewal.

The actuarial services performed during 2019-20, at a total cost of \$556,062, includes data gathering and development of actuarial valuation reports for each of the 58 trial courts. The actuary also provides a valuation of the trust assets for each of the 38 trial courts that have made contributions to their irrevocable OPEB trust. The cost for the same actuary work performed during the first year of the prior two-year reporting cycle for 2017-18 was \$535,000.

The allocation of \$122,645 for 2020-21 is substantially smaller compared to the prior 2019-20 year's allocation of \$556,062 because, during the first year of the contract's current two-year cycle, a very detailed review of each trial court's OPEB plan participants must be completed to comply with GASB 75 reporting requirements. The cost for the same actuary work performed during the second year of the prior two-year reporting cycle for 2018-19 was \$118,000.

SCO Audits of Trial Courts

Section 77206 of the Government Code requires the Judicial Council to contract with the State Controller's Office (SCO) to audit the revenues, expenditures, and fund balance of each superior court. State law further specifies that each court must be audited on a four-year cycle. The Legislature appropriates spending authority in the annual budget act to pay the costs of these audits. A portion of these costs are funded through the Trial Court Trust Fund (roughly \$540,000), with the remaining costs (nearly \$1 million) appropriated through the State's General Fund.

**2019-20 and 2020-21 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts:
Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2019-20	2020-21	Proposed Preliminary Allocations for Consideration	Explanation for Items Not Considered
			Budget Authority	Preliminary/ Approved Allocations		
			Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,909,382,153	1,944,669,167	1,944,669,167	
2	II. Adjustments					
3	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-1,734,620	0		JC policy
4	III. 2019-20 Allocations					
5	Remove Self-Help Funding from Base	Base	-19,100,000			prior year
6	2018-19 Benefits Cost Changes Funding (Non-Interpreter)	Base	21,635,634			prior year
7	Funding for Court Reporters in Family Law (Discretionary)	Base	8,787,706			prior year
8	Funding for Court Reporters in Family Law (Non-Discretionary)	Base	1,212,294			prior year
9	Support for New Judgeships Funding for Cluster 1 Courts to 100%	Base	1,083,819			prior year
10	Support for New Judgeships Funding for Courts Below Statewide Average	Base	11,473,418			prior year
11	Support for New Judgeships Funding for Courts Below 100%	Base	11,473,418			prior year
12	Support for New Judgeships Non-Sheriff Security Funding	Base	455,345			prior year
13	IV. 2020-21 Allocations (Governor's Budget)					
14	Trial Court Benefit Cost Changes (non-interpreter)	Base		33,135,000		prior year
15	General Inflationary Funding to Support Operation of Trial Courts	Base		61,700,000		Budget Act
16	Support for Operation of Trial Courts Discretionary Funding	Base		45,900,000		Budget Act
17	Court Navigator Program	Non-Base		7,500,000		Budget Act
18	V. Statutory Allocation Adjustments					
19	\$10 Million Emergency Reserve	Non-Base	-10,000,000	-10,000,000		N/A
20	1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-6,935,081	pending		pending
21	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-50,000,000	-50,000,000		Budget Act
22	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000		Item 4, F
23	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	0	pending		JC policy
24	VI. Allocation for Reimbursements					
25	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	156,700,000	156,700,000	156,700,000	
26	Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover	Non-Base	455,346	pending	pending	
27	Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program	Non-Base	766,198	455,346	455,346	
28	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	21,600,000	25,300,000	25,300,000	
29	Jury	Non-Base	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	
30	Screening Equipment Replacement	Non-Base	1,300,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	
31	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,340	332,340	332,340	
32	California State Auditor Audits	Non-Base	0	325,000	325,000	
33	VII. Estimated Revenue Distributions					
34	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	50,879,658	53,922,000		JC policy
35	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	21,134,177	20,524,000		statutory
36	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,514	10,907,000		statutory
37	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	4,545,042	4,039,700		JC policy/statute
38	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,899,267	3,409,000		JC policy
39	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840		JC policy/statute
40	Prior Year Revenues	Non-Base	0	0		JC policy/statute
41	VIII. Miscellaneous Charges					
42	Repayment of Prior Year Cash Flow Loan	Non-Base	-50,000,000			Non-allocation
43	State Admin Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment	Non-Base				JC policy
44	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-2,411,062	-3,971,215		JC policy
45	Prior Year Facility Payments Charge Adjustments	Non-Base				JC policy
46	Total		2,121,509,405	2,331,314,178	2,144,081,853	
47	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts (0250-101-0932)		2,116,842,000	2,268,078,000		
48	Court Appointed Dependency Counsel (0250-102-0932)		156,700,000	156,700,000		
49	Transfer to Compensation of Superior Court Judges appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships		-4,858,000	-4,858,000		
50	Transfer to Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund		-18,223,000	pending		
51	Adjusted Appropriation		2,250,461,000	2,419,920,000		
52	Estimated Remaining Appropriation		128,951,595	88,605,822		

Trial Court Operations Programs

Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Support for Operations of the Trial Courts (0150010)

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Center for Families, Children, and the Courts

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel

The 2019 Budget Act included an ongoing \$20,000,000 increase bringing the program's annual allocation to \$156.7 million. In April 2016, the Judicial Council approved a new allocation methodology recommended by a joint subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to allocate this funding to courts based on current filings, child welfare caseload and local economic factors. This methodology was implemented in 2016-17 and will continue to be employed. The Judicial Council approved adjustments to this methodology to small courts at its business meeting in January 2019.

This allocation funds court-appointed dependency counsel, who represent approximately 145,000 parent and child clients in the state. Representation begins at the initial filing of a petition to remove a child from the home and extends—sometimes for many years—through the processes of reunification, termination of parental rights, adoption, or emancipation of the child.

In juvenile dependency proceedings, the trial court is required by law to appoint counsel for a parent or guardian if the parent desires counsel but is financially unable to afford counsel, and the agency has recommended that the child be placed in out-of-home care; and to appoint counsel for a child unless the court finds that the child would not benefit from the appointment of counsel (W&I § 317, CRC 5.660, etc.).

For the 20 courts in the Dependency Representation Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program, the Judicial Council, in partnership with local court leadership, directly manages contracts with dependency attorney organizations, including solicitations, negotiation, financial management, invoicing and payment, statistical reporting, training, and other technical assistance. The 20 DRAFT courts account for approximately 60 percent of juvenile dependency filings statewide. The remaining courts manage their own dependency counsel contracts, and are reimbursed through the monthly TCTF distribution process for up to 100 percent of their budget.

Self-Help Centers

An approved 2018-19 budget change proposal (BCP) provided additional, three-year limited term funding of \$19.1 million which has been added to the \$6.2 million annual allocation for a total of \$25.3 million. Funding is distributed to all 58 trial courts for self-help centers. The increase in funding has expanded the availability of attorneys and paralegal staff at self-help centers in trial courts.

In 2018-19, the first year of the expanded funding, 96% of the funds were spent or encumbered in expansion of self-help services. Additionally, 45 trial courts added staff, 33 extended the number or type of workshops, 32 extended service hours, 38 added new locations or increased accessibility through technology, 36 added new case types, 28 added remote assistance so that litigants did not have to come to the court for help, 39 offered self-serve online functions, and 29 expanded services in languages other than English.

Courts expanded their settlement services to help litigants complete their cases, and provided other services in the courtroom to assist litigants to obtain an order after hearing documenting the court's decision to enable them to enforce the order. They expanded their use of on-line document assembly programs and other technological tools to increase efficiency. Funding for self-help centers comes from both the TCTF (\$25.3 million) and the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) (\$5 million).

Self-help centers, which provide assistance to self-represented litigants in a wide array of civil law matters to save the courts significant time and expense in the clerk's office and in the courtroom, serve over 450,000 persons per year. Self-help staffing reduces the number of questions and issues at the public counter substantially, thereby reducing line lengths and wait times. Similarly, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and clean-up work in the clerk's office. Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and carries measurable short and long-term cost benefits to the court. One study found that self-help centers workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent.

Demand for self-help services is strong and growing. Courts indicate that they are not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2017 survey, the courts identified a need of an additional \$66 million in additional funds to fully support self-help.

The Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants, which was approved by the Judicial Council in 2004, calls for self-help centers in all counties. California Rule of Court 10.960 provides that self-help services are a core function of courts and should be budgeted for accordingly. The Budget Act provides that "up to \$5,000,000 [from the IMF] shall be available for support of services for self-represented litigants." Based upon recommendations by the TCBAC, the Judicial Council has allocated an additional \$6.2 million for self-help services from the TCTF since 2007. The additional \$19.1 million has been distributed according to a formula based on population. The Budget Act further calls for a cost-benefit analysis of self-help services to be presented to the

Legislature in November 2020. This analysis will help guide funding decisions in future years.

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections

The Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) is a program under which courts collect reimbursements from parents and other responsible persons liable for the cost of dependency-related legal services to the extent that those persons are able to pay. Statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted through the JDCCP to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard.

At its business meeting on August 23, 2013, the council adopted amendments to the JDCCP Guidelines by adding current section 14, which addressed the outstanding issue of how the Judicial Council could equitably allocate the funds remitted through the JDCCP among the trial courts in compliance with the statutory mandate that the funds be used to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads. Section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines describes the allocation methodology, which considers each court's participation in the program and each court's percentage of the statewide court-appointed counsel funding need.

For a court to be eligible to receive an allocation of these funds, it must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. Every court that has satisfied those requirements receives an allocation. Each eligible court's allocated share of the JDCCP funds is equivalent to its share of the aggregate funding need of all the eligible courts.

The revenue collected in 2018-19 to be allocated in 2019-20 totals \$701,593, of this collection \$260,000 is reserved for administrative costs. Any portion of a court's allocated funds not spent and distributed in 2019-20 would be carried forward for distribution to the court in 2020-21 and subsequent years, even if a court is not eligible for an allocation in the subsequent fiscal year.

Facilities Services - Security Operations

Screening Equipment Replacement

The anticipated budget for 2020-21 will be used to purchase an estimated 59 magnetometers and 44 x-ray machines.

The Screening Equipment Replacement Program, originally funded by a BCP in 2006-07, is a reimbursement program that replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers in the trial courts. The equipment is replaced on an approximately eight-year cycle and is the property of the court. Funds are allocated to courts for replacement based on the age and condition of the equipment.

Master Agreements, which include pricing for the equipment, installation, training, maintenance, and removal of the old x-ray machines, are used for program purchases. The purchase price includes five years of service. A solicitation conducted in 2017-18 resulted in contracts that included a wider selection of makes and models and overall lower pricing than past contracts.

The number of units identified for replacement in each fiscal year is dependent upon the year the equipment was first purchased, with some years seeing higher demand than others. Due to the demand fluctuation, the actual expenditures will vary from one fiscal year to the next. The amount of equipment identified for replacement in 2020-21 is lower than the numbers estimated for replacement in subsequent years, therefore the projected savings of \$486,000 this year is not representative of estimated savings in future years.

Without this program, the courts will be responsible for the purchase and maintenance of the screening equipment. The cost of an x-ray machine with a five-year service agreement is approximately \$31,000. The cost of a magnetometer with a five-year service agreement is approximately \$5,675. These cost estimates are lower than those reported in the past due to the lower pricing in the current contracts. However, equipment prices may increase at the end of the current contract period.

Reimbursing the costs of screening equipment is particularly critical to the smaller courts, where equipment and service agreements can represent a significant expenditure relative to their overall operations budget. However, the need in large courts should not be minimized. The cost of a single year's equipment replacement and service agreement renewal costs in a large court can result in the expenditure of a several hundred thousand dollars.

The program also offers a service to the court staff responsible for the equipment. The Emergency Planning and Security Coordination Unit staff member who manages the program also acts as a liaison to the courts and assists in resolving issues with the vendors and the Judicial Council Customer Service Center and acts as a subject matter expert on radiation and code compliance associated with the x-ray equipment.

If a court chooses to purchase equipment or service that is not covered by the Master Agreements, the court is required to go out to bid. That process represents a direct cost to the court in staff time and in the overall cost of the purchase, as well as inconsistency in response to service calls at court expense.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

Budget Services

Jury

Beginning in 2015–16, the TCBAC recommended, and the council approved, that the program's annual allocation be reduced to \$14.5 million from \$16 million. The eligible juror costs for the past 10 years through 2018–19 have averaged \$14.4 million. The latest five-year average is \$13.4 million. The reimbursement for 2018–19 was \$12.4 million. Based on current year expenditure pattern, the 2018–19 reimbursement is estimated to be \$12.3 million.

The purpose of the jury funding is to reimburse courts for 100 percent of their eligible jury expenditures, which includes the following types of jury costs in criminal cases and non-reimbursed

civil cases:

- Jury per diem (\$15 per day after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Mileage (\$0.34 per mile one-way only, after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Meals and lodging for sequestered jurors
- Public transportation (criminal cases only, one-way only).

Elder Abuse

AB 59 (Stats. 1999, ch. 561) authorized elders and dependent adults to seek protective orders. As specified by this bill, the council approved form EA-100—Petition for Protective Orders (Elder or Dependent Adult Abuse)—effective April 2000. At its business meeting on April 27, 2001, the council approved the allocation of these funds to the courts by the end of that fiscal year. The reimbursement rate for each filing was set at \$185. It appears the rate was set at the level of the lowest first paper filing fee in limited civil cases and was not intended to cover the actual cost to a court of processing an order. Since 2001–02, courts that seek reimbursement are required to report quarterly to Judicial Council the number of EA-100 forms filed.

The Judicial Council adopted a permanent redirection of Elder Abuse funding in the amount of \$875,000 for other program areas at its business meeting on June 20, 2005. Since 2009-10 the annual allocation of \$332,000 has been insufficient to fully reimburse trial courts for Elder Abuse filings, only supporting full reimbursement of first quarter filings and partial reimbursement of second quarter filings submitted by trial courts.

California State Auditor Audits

The State Budget bill requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the council to reimburse the California State Auditor to the extent costs of trial court audits are incurred by the California State Auditor under section 19210 of the Public Contract Code. These statutorily-mandated audits evaluate whether the courts have complied with the Judicial Branch Contract Law when procuring goods or services.

**Trial Court Trust Fund
Fund Condition Statement
as of April 2, 2020**

Description		YEAR END FINANCIAL STATEMENTS		ESTIMATED	
		2017-18 (Financial Statements)	2018-19 (Financial Statements)	2019-20	2020-21
#	A	B	C	D	E
1	Beginning Fund Balance	66,659,468	60,478,281	71,630,938	74,869,921
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	(12,185,090)	7,380,390	-	-
3	TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS	1,303,563,015	1,314,999,921	1,330,915,000	1,348,222,000
4	<i>Total Revenues¹</i>	<i>1,283,589,015</i>	<i>1,295,031,921</i>	<i>1,311,438,000</i>	<i>1,329,907,000</i>
5	Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements				
6	General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing	671,000	491,000		(1,162,000)
7	Reduction Offset Transfers	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
8	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000
9	Total Resources	1,358,037,393	1,382,858,593	1,402,545,938	1,423,091,921
10	EXPENDITURES/ENCUMBRANCES/ALLOCATIONS				
11	Program 0140010 - Judicial Council (Staff)	2,657,200	3,446,535	3,452,975	3,764,417
12	Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,831,305,998	1,990,037,604	2,040,430,043	2,204,872,707
13	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	136,631,250	134,062,223	156,700,000	156,700,000
14	Program 0150019 - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	348,583,021	373,931,033	429,215,000	435,002,000
15	Program 0150028 - Assigned Judges	28,063,247	22,372,129	21,000,000	25,212,000
16	Program 0150037 - Court Interpreters	108,537,000	112,773,052	134,186,000	131,223,000
17	Program 0150075 - Grants	9,554,900	9,003,519	10,329,000	10,329,000
18	Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	10,078,398	8,950,559	10,014,999	22,179,152
19	<i>Total Local Assistance</i>	<i>2,462,675,415</i>	<i>2,651,130,120</i>	<i>2,801,875,042</i>	<i>2,985,517,859</i>
20	<i>Pro Rata/State Ops</i>	<i>128,098</i>	<i>176,000</i>	<i>240,000</i>	<i>383,643</i>
21	<i>Supplemental Pension Payments</i>		<i>98,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>
22	Total Expenditures (includes State Ops and LA)	2,465,332,615.79	2,654,576,654.54	2,805,328,017.00	2,989,282,276.23
23	<i>Less Funding Provided by General Fund:</i>	<i>1,177,981,000</i>	<i>1,343,623,000</i>	<i>1,477,968,000</i>	<i>1,640,148,000</i>
24	Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	1,297,558,112	1,311,227,655	1,327,676,017	1,349,593,919
25	Ending Fund Balance	60,478,281	71,630,938	74,869,921	73,498,002
26	Restricted Funds				
27	Total Restricted/Reserved Funds	31,502,608	29,701,648	28,599,894	28,448,051
28	Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance	28,975,673	41,929,290	46,270,027	45,049,951

¹ Revenue estimates include actuals through December 2019 and do not include possible effects of COVID-19.

² Pending request for Court Interpreters of \$12.1M not included in reserved funds