

## Transcript of TCBAC meeting March 26, 2026

00:00:02 Speaker 1

Excellent welcome everybody thank you to this ticket back meeting and while I hope it's not inappropriate considering the fact this is an open and public meeting I will also acknowledge that this.

00:00:12 Speaker 1

Is opening day?

00:00:14 Speaker 1

And and best wishes to all those who are concerned about today but with that let's get down to business we do have some material.

00:00:22 Speaker 1

To cover today the first would be the approval of the minutes from the January 15th meeting I did invite a motion.

00:00:29 Speaker 1

To approve those minutes.

00:00:31 Speaker 1

Rebecca your hands up did you have something immediately.

00:00:34 Speaker 2

Did judge Conklin the minutes actually reflect a certain order of the BCP 's and our materials that we will be addressing actually reorder them so I just wanted to confirm for the minute approval that that is the accurate prioritization of the BCP?

00:00:54 Speaker 3

That is a great question Rebecca the numbers were they do not reflect any form of prioritization it's the numbers that they were provided by the judicial branch budget committee.

00:01:07 Speaker 2

And I would propose in the minutes to reflect that there is no prioritization rather than saying they're approved in priority order.

00:01:15 Speaker 1

Thank you for that clarification so I would ask the minister reflect that the BCP 's are approved without priority.

00:01:23 Speaker 1

That's consistent with your comment Rebecca.

00:01:25 Speaker 2

Yes it.

00:01:25 Speaker 1

Is OK given that?

00:01:27 Speaker 4

I have a question I'm sorry I have a question about that.

00:01:30 Speaker 1

OK and remember we're not we're not getting yet now into the material about the priorities just the minutes go ahead judge embody.

00:01:38 Speaker 4

I think in the meeting I think we did set that priority I think the minutes should reflect that even if later we don't use that I mean I think that the minutes are accurate.

00:01:48 Speaker 1

Well I I guess the I guess the rub here is the definition of priorities and so I understand both perspectives.

00:01:58 Speaker 1

We.

00:02:01 Speaker 1

The minutes are what the minutes are.

00:02:05 Speaker 4

Right.

00:02:07 Speaker 1

So what's the very specific language that folks are concerned about.

00:02:12 Speaker 2

In the item 5.

00:02:14 Speaker 2

It it the action says the tick back unanimously voted to approve 3 budget change concepts for fiscal year 27 20:08 in the following priority order and then list them.

00:02:25 Speaker 2

Which I am fine with accepting the minutes as stated I just wanted to point out that if that indeed is a priority order then we're going to need to address it later in the meeting?

00:02:38 Speaker 2

If it's a if it's an if it's incorrect in the minutes then we should correct the minutes sorry didn't mean to do real ones right off the bat?

00:02:45 Speaker 4

And as always I completely agree with Rebecca.

00:02:48

Yeah.

00:02:49 Speaker 2

Sorry about that.

00:02:52 Speaker 1

Well OK so we did as I recall we did.

00:02:59 Speaker 1

Vote to approve the 3 concepts.

00:03:03 Speaker 1

I'm just unclear and I can't go back and look at my notes I don't believe we ranked them right.

00:03:09 Speaker 5

My recollection is that we did.

00:03:12 Speaker 1

And 2 and rank them 12 and 31 being inflationary adjustment 2 being technology funding and 3 being court interpreters.

00:03:21 Speaker 5

Yes that was that's my recollection.

00:03:24 Speaker 1

So the minutes would therefore be accurate.

00:03:24

Then.

00:03:29 Speaker 2

That is the consensus I'd be happy.

00:03:31 Speaker 2

To move approval.

00:03:32 Speaker 1

Thank you is there a second.

00:03:34 Speaker 1

Second moved and seconded that the minutes be approved with the cautionary note stated by Rebecca any objection to that.

00:03:42 Speaker 1

Hearing no objection the minutes will be unanimously approved with the note that of the.

00:03:48 Speaker 1

Prioritization of the BCP 's thanks for that clarification all right so that moves us beyond the minutes I want to confirm Megan that there were no written or requests for oral public comment today.

00:04:02 Speaker 3

That is correct we did not receive any requests for public comment.

00:04:06 Speaker 1

Great no written or public comment today so now we'll move to the discussion items and I'm going to preface the discussion items with a comment quickly and just an update concerning the dependency council.

00:04:18 Speaker 1

Funding working group headed by Rebecca with significant appreciation to Rebecca and her working group this is not intended to report on what that group is doing right now because they're just at the genesis of their work but is to report that that group in fact has met and is beginning their work.

00:04:39 Speaker 1

And I'll turn it over to Rebecca for any comment she has about just the task that you're undertaking.

00:04:45 Speaker 2

Yeah I I I would say that it was a very good first meeting we are kicking things off and jumping right into some pretty heavy discussions staff has been really great in providing us the history and detail as we have experienced them with the legislation and even our own methodologies.

00:05:05 Speaker 2

And so we will be I think pretty shortly identifying areas that perhaps can result in recommendations to FMS and tick back and perhaps involve some of our other advisory committees.

00:05:19 Speaker 2

Uh but overall very good discussion and what I would consider progress and I would welcome any comments from my fellow committee members.

00:05:32 Speaker 1

Sounds like you summed it up well for them Rebecca so we really appreciate that and the work you guys are doing it and we'll have continue to have updates as that work.

00:05:40 Speaker 1

Progresses I also just reminded myself that we I don't think we actually took role Megan could you do that.

00:05:48 Speaker 3

Happily judge Conklin we will start with you are we present today.

00:05:52 Speaker 1

I I think I am not sure but at least here in person so.

00:05:56 Speaker 6

It's opening day he's probably not present.

00:05:58 Speaker 3

We'll pick percentages percentages work as well miss Fleming.

00:06:02 Speaker 2

I am here.

00:06:04 Speaker 3

Thank you judge Bradshaw.

00:06:10 Speaker 3

Judge Bradshaw is having technical difficulties but is here uh judge Bowen.

00:06:18

I'm here.

00:06:20 Speaker 3

Thank you judge Clark.

00:06:23 Speaker 3

Thank you judge dulcich.

00:06:26 Speaker 4

I'm here.

00:06:28 Speaker 3

Thank you judge aneti.

00:06:33 Speaker 7

You're on mute.

00:06:35 Speaker 4

I'm here sorry about that.

00:06:37 Speaker 3

Thank you judge jessner.

00:06:40 Speaker 2

I'm here.

00:06:42 Speaker 3

Thank you judge Kevin carian judge Kevin carian let us let us know prior to the meeting that they would be absent judge Kelly.

00:06:50 Speaker 2

Here thanks.

00:06:53 Speaker 3

Judge Rogan.

00:06:55 Speaker 1

I just communicated with Roger and she's had an unexpected event come up and she most likely will not be joining us today.

00:07:00 Speaker 3

Thank you judge Conklin uh judge santu.

00:07:10 Speaker 3

Judge santu.

00:07:12 Speaker 3

All right.

00:07:15 Speaker 3

Judge young judge young did let us know that they would be absent from today's meeting miss speaker.

00:07:21 Speaker 8

Here.

00:07:25 Speaker 3

Thank you miss Cameron.

00:07:27 Speaker 7

Here.

00:07:29 Speaker 3

Thank you Mister chatters.

00:07:31 Speaker 9

I am here.

00:07:33 Speaker 3

Thank you Mister pinky.

00:07:35

Here.

00:07:36 Speaker 3

Thank you Mister harrigan.

00:07:38

Here.

00:07:40 Speaker 3

Thank you Mister Roddy Mister Roddy let us know that they would be absent today.

00:07:46 Speaker 3

Mister rule.

00:07:53 Speaker 3

Mister rule all right Mister slayton.

00:07:57 Speaker 5

I'm here.

00:07:58 Speaker 3

Thank you miss Turner.

00:08:01 Speaker 6

Present.

00:08:03 Speaker 3

Thank you Mister yamasaki.

00:08:05 Speaker 10

Yes good afternoon president.

00:08:07 Speaker 3

Thank you advisory member Mister Theodore rovic.

00:08:10 Speaker 11

I have here.

00:08:12 Speaker 3

Thank you we use on member uh judge alani.

00:08:23 Speaker 3

And roll is complete.

00:08:24 Speaker 1

Right Megan thanks so much so now that we've sort of backed into this agenda through the previous items we've talked about and I appreciate it because patients will try to get a little more focused we're now going to move into our items for today our action items so just as an introduction to these we're first going to talk about.

00:08:41 Speaker 1

ECP 's and then we're going to move into allocation proposals for 4 specific programs.

00:08:47 Speaker 1

Just as a brief note as we move into those allocation discussions I'm reminding everybody that yes they are previously approved allocation methodologies we're not discussing today the.

00:09:00 Speaker 1

Intricacies are those methodologies in the sense of they've been previously approved but we keep these on our agenda every year to make sure that all our members are updated I recognize that many of you are veterans that many of you are just coming into this for the first time and these discussions are very appropriate for both of those I've.

00:09:17 Speaker 1

I've been doing this for as long as I can remember and every time these come.

00:09:20 Speaker 1

Up I learn.

00:09:21 Speaker 1

Something new so it's very appropriate that we keep these very active and transparent also as is highlighted in each of these allocation methodologies and I'm just reading the the the highlighted language the final allocations are updated based.

00:09:37 Speaker 1

On any needed.

00:09:38 Speaker 1

Technical adjustments there's always technical adjustments which means we are very careful to look back down at these allocations and as they come out and make corrections for any.

00:09:50 Speaker 1

Technical adjustments sometimes called an error that occurs and if that happens we're able to pivot and adjust that that being said the first item on today's agenda are BCP 's for the fiscal year 2728 as we move

into this I remind everybody that that's exactly what they are so we are in budget year halfway through budget.

00:10:11 Speaker 1

Year 2526 right now.

00:10:13 Speaker 1

The governor 's proposed budget that's already come out from January addresses fiscal year 2627 these BCP 's are 2728 so that's how far we're working into the future we've already developed tick back has already developed its own list it's submitted that to.

00:10:32 Speaker 1

The trump our budget pardon me to JDBC JDBC has done significant work and they've developed a list that we're dealing with today so the list today comes back from JBC with not only tick backs recommended BCP 's but also a slew of other.

00:10:50 Speaker 1

Very important recommended be some peace and I'm going to turn it over now for further discussion just to detail all of these.

00:11:00 Speaker 1

2.

00:11:02 Speaker 1

Megan go ahead Megan.

00:11:04 Speaker 3

Thank you judge Conklin alright everyone so uh the uh this particular item is uh begins on page 8 in your materials as judge conference stated these are items that were previously reviewed by the judicial budget branch committee or branch budget committee my apologies.

00:11:24 Speaker 3

Of the 31 BCS that they reviewed uh at their previous meeting 18 of those were identified as having some impact on the trial courts and as such have been brought forward to tick back and that it also includes the 3 previous BC 's that we.

00:11:44 Speaker 3

Reviewed at our first meeting back in January uh 2 important things to note historically tick back has not provided any prioritization uh for additional BC 's introduced by other advisory bodies but we do have the opportunity to do so if we are so inclined.

00:12:02 Speaker 3

And we're also encouraged to provide any feedback on ABC 's that are relevant to to the trial courts secondly.

00:12:12 Speaker 3

I would like to note because we did discuss prioritization earlier uh the items that are listed on page 9 have been assigned concept numbers with no relation to prioritization by the JDBC they hold no ranking and they don't indicate any any sort of prioritization.

00:12:35 Speaker 3

They are the final numbers though moving forward to JDBC.

00:12:40 Speaker 3

So as you can see in the report they relate these concepts relate to facilities deferred maintenance data analytics and statewide technology and operational needs some of these BC 's are considered

safeguards as their items that are currently included in the governor 's budget but as we are still in the budget.

00:13:01 Speaker 3

Approval process they have not yet been finalized so they're concepts moving forward as sort of a a safeguard for those items in the.

00:13:08 Speaker 3

Budgets uh finally I will note that the JDBC is set to review all proposals again uh at its May 20th meeting before deciding which BCC 's will advance to the full budget change proposal packet for judicial council meeting at on July 17th.

00:13:29 Speaker 1

Alright Megan thanks so much so so this essentially summarizes that we move through the process.

00:13:34 Speaker 1

Z like or did you want to add anything.

00:13:36 Speaker 11

Yeah appreciate that Josh Conklin and with respect to say the items that are safeguarded that that has been our typical practice is that they were priorities last year and put forward and then they find a way into the budget we you know we're hopeful that they stay in and thus far all indications have been at least on the.

00:13:56 Speaker 11

The the the 2 items that were saying facilities related to the orange project and the Sprint street project the LL has been supportive and there's been no headwinds in fact as some of you might have tracked there was a hearing in the Senate.

00:14:11 Speaker 11

About a month ago in which we went deep into the facilities needs and talked about the the lack of funding with respect to the orange project and the Spring Street project just want to sort of highlight those in so much as those those came about as sort of unforeseen changes in circumstances.

00:14:33 Speaker 11

The orange project came about a half actually a handful of years ago and we need additional resources because of state fire Marshall.

00:14:41 Speaker 11

Issues concerns with the fire life safety system there so there's needed to be a you know some immediate action there and the Spring Street item is also been necessitated because of action at the federal government level and so the interaction with them and the and any of the other sort of priorities of our construction program are separate apart.

00:15:02 Speaker 11

From that and so we have to be able to pivot as issues arise and in this instance those in particular were were ones that.

00:15:11 Speaker 11

But came from from from outside of our standard planning and we had to be able to be pivoting to ensure that those kinds of projects are incorporated and they're primarily funded through the support budget and I know that you mean that wonder where that is that's different than the construction budget and so it's a it's also in a different bucket but but otherwise you know we we're hopeful again that.

00:15:33 Speaker 11

Those 2 projects the 70,000,000 that's in the that was in the governor 's budget will remain and while I don't know if I can't remember if I have a space for budget up.

00:15:43 Speaker 11

With things are are positive thus far and appreciate miss Baker coming and judge Kelly and we've had judge Mormon and justice hill and judge tapia and judge Cortez come speak in support of the budget this year and so that continued good work on their part and.

00:16:03 Speaker 11

And Shelly and the.

00:16:04 Speaker 11

Chief and that we'll we'll be able to get.

00:16:06 Speaker 11

It a this budget landed by June.

00:16:10 Speaker 11

But those items in the list that are the backstop covered and they won't need to go forward for the for the next year.

00:16:18 Speaker 1

Sako thanks so much so any questions concerns about this.

00:16:23 Speaker 1

Approve this action item just essentially we're now as a.

00:16:28 Speaker 1

Advisory committee acknowledging that we have we're in receipt of each of these back from JBC and we have no opposition to the action JBC is taking on any specific item.

00:16:42 Speaker 1

And I've paused I don't see any hands up or don't hear any bug.

00:16:46 Speaker 4

Actually my hands up.

00:16:48 Speaker 1

Who's I'm sorry is that sorry oh judge amity I'm sorry go ahead?

00:16:49 Speaker 4

Emily.

00:16:50 Speaker 4

Amandeep yeah.

00:16:54 Speaker 4

We just need to sort out the the issue of the order of the 3 items that we that were on the minutes I don't have a strong.

00:17:00 Speaker 4

Feeling about them.

00:17:02 Speaker 4

Whether they're 12 and 3 or 132 like I don't have a strong feeling about it but we should be consistent this memo says we prioritized them inflationary adjustment language access.

00:17:14 Speaker 4

Technology so either we make it consistent with what the minutes say or we all agree that it's fine in this particular order and have a strong feeling about that but we should at least make that decision one way or the other.

00:17:27 Speaker 1

I agree so and and Jake I see your hand up but let's clarify let's get this cleaned up before we move on so the memo does specifically say and I'm just reading from the memo take back identified and prioritized the following 3 BCP 's inflationary language access and trial courts.

00:17:46 Speaker 1

So that was our original intent that's what we sent to JDBC.

00:17:50 Speaker 1

The BCP 's back from JBC include.

00:17:55 Speaker 1

Those 3 take back recommendations now by coincidence only they're the top 3 on the list because they're the first 3 that JBC addressed so there are those item numbers from JBC but judge emidy and and Rebecca have both pointed out that we need to be consistent so as I understand it.

00:18:16 Speaker 1

But we would.

00:18:18 Speaker 1

Approved today from our actions in fact that yes we continue to prioritize 12 and 3 in that order the remaining proposals coming back from JBC are passed through essentially without any further discussion or objection from tick back Jake.

00:18:38 Speaker 4

Except that the the.

00:18:38 Speaker 1

You want to comment on that specifically or judge emidy did that address your concern.

00:18:42 Speaker 4

It doesn't actually the the the order of the 3 that are around the GB JBC memo are different than the order that was in the minutes and again I don't have a strong feeling about that but we should either we should be consistent.

00:18:54 Speaker 4

Either we should say yes we want it to be inflationary adjustment language access and technology.

00:19:01 Speaker 4

In the minutes it says inflationary adjustment technology language access.

00:19:08 Speaker 4

So.

00:19:09 Speaker 4

We just need to.

00:19:12 Speaker 4

Technicality I think but we should we should we.

00:19:14 Speaker 4

Should sort it out I think?

00:19:17 Speaker 11

We could work on the JB cemeteries to renumber them and the way in which you've just described so that going forward those materials will have the 2 and 3:00 AM in the correct order.

00:19:17

Sorry.

00:19:32 Speaker 1

So everybody 's on the same page here So what we'll do now is we will pass through based upon zlatko 's recommendation those 3 the prioritization will be inflationary adjustment.

00:19:45 Speaker 1

Trial court technologies number 2 and language access is number 3 as coming from Jake from kickback.

00:19:54 Speaker 1

Jake you're you're any you have your hand up.

00:19:58 Speaker 9

I I have it for the other items not for this 123 topic I I have comments about other of the items that.

00:20:02 Speaker 1

OK so is there.

00:20:06 Speaker 1

Are listed OK so let's first be any any concern about the way we've now clarified the first 3 will be consistent with the minutes from the original tick back meeting and the original?

00:20:18 Speaker 1

Prioritization.

00:20:21 Speaker 1

With that Jake your comments.

00:20:22 Speaker 1

Yes.

00:20:24 Speaker 9

Yeah so I guess I'm a little curious I know that typically it sounds like we're saying.

00:20:29 Speaker 9

No concern or these just kind of move forward but there are some here that it's not clear to me how they get reconciled so obviously we put forward the technology ongoing support.

00:20:40 Speaker 9

It you know the IT.

00:20:43 Speaker 9

Or I'm sending itac put forward improving branch wide security cyber security so I don't know if there's a way you know as loco to kind of clarify I I have 2 things so so I'll lay them all out then you can jump in but how how do those get reconciled like do those ultimately get merged into one item by JC.

00:21:01 Speaker 9

Staff before going going to JDBC and the council so I'm just kind of curious about process there.

00:21:06 Speaker 11

Sure so let me ask let me address that JBC does that often if you track the way the process works you could have multiple items that are individual line items and then they they often become merged as similar topics to represent a a programmatic.

00:21:21 Speaker 11

Theme and so that becomes part of the effectively we'll be with the may meeting have JBC in which they will be making decisions or recommendations to the council to what should go forward to the Department of Finance so there'll be that right now these are what was submitted as individual items but there is a review of all concepts.

00:21:43 Speaker 11

To think about what the best package is for.

00:21:48 Speaker 11

For the branch.

00:21:51 Speaker 9

OK then on like 20 on number 27 dash 26 which is the public lactation rooms I just don't remember is that one of those that's in the budget this year and it's a placeholder to try and preserve it if it drops out or is this not.

00:22:06

No.

00:22:07 Speaker 9

Included in this here's.

00:22:07 Speaker 11

It was it started as an initial initial \$15,000,000.00 legislative augmentation and then after that came a bill and we've gotten bits and pieces of money but we are out of compliance with the law and so therefore we.

00:22:22 Speaker 11

We come back to the Department of Finance and you've imposed this mandate on us and we need resources and so this is one that's been.

00:22:31 Speaker 11

Percolating for several years now and been a sort of a victim of the budget but we ultimately are out of compliance if we don't get resources for it and we've actually tried to get trailer build language so that it could alleviate the fiscal burden on us but that's not been entertained thus yet by the administration.

00:22:54 Speaker 9

OK so I I guess judge called can I I mean I have obviously thoughts but it doesn't sound like the rest of the group.

00:22:59 Speaker 9

You know really has a lot to comment on in terms of priority so I'll I'll leave them there I'll leave with my my one comment which is there are some things in here from the facility group you know reassessing projects and program support.

00:23:13 Speaker 9

You know we haven't moved very far on capital projects in last couple of years so I don't know that 14,000,000.

00:23:19 Speaker 9

Spent on that rather.

00:23:20 Speaker 9

And.

00:23:21 Speaker 9

Continuing to work on our existing capital plans to me as it makes sense but that's just a I don't know that the group is going to feel that way and I think the other courts might you know have different perspectives but so I'll leave it.

00:23:35 Speaker 11

To provide a little bit of context that that that is to do the next 10 year reassessment.

00:23:41 Speaker 11

Which could which would be funded and completed timely will impact the list?

00:23:48 Speaker 11

Clearly I think the top is where it is it's the fact that there were a number of courts that did not raise their hand in the 20172018 reassessment and as we've been we've heard from our legislative partners in the administration is there will there should need to be a reassessment done and so that's what this funding is is to.

00:24:10 Speaker 11

Look at change circumstances the lack of of investment in maintenance that may have now caused a building to be needed for renovation repair as opposed and replacement rather than just the continued so this is an this is a proposal that was put forward to the Department of Finance last year.

00:24:30 Speaker 11

Along with the 1.5 billion dollars that you'll see later on on that list which is to continue the projects that are currently on the list.

00:24:39 Speaker 1

And Jake your comments are always important so I.

00:24:41 Speaker 1

Do appreciate it thank you?

00:24:41 Speaker 11

Mm-hmm.

00:24:42 Speaker 11

Yeah.

00:24:43 Speaker 1

So the recommendation set forth on page of 10 of your materials and that is that will essentially.

00:24:51 Speaker 1

Provide back to JBC with the clarification of the 3 top items from tick back and their prioritization will pass through the remaining.

00:25:02 Speaker 1

Items without further objection or comment.

00:25:07 Speaker 1

Is there I didn't if there's any further discussion of course otherwise I'd invite a motion to approve the?

00:25:12 Speaker 1

Recommendation.

00:25:13 Speaker 10

Yamasaki moves approval of the recommendations.

00:25:16 Speaker 1

Dave thanks for David thank you very much is.

00:25:18 Speaker 1

There a second.

00:25:18 Speaker 6

Turner seconds.

00:25:20 Speaker 1

Moved and seconded the recommendation set forth at page 10 of the materials be approved with the clarification noted.

00:25:26 Speaker 1

Any further discussion?

00:25:30 Speaker 1

As the chair on calling for any objections to that recommendation.

00:25:34 Speaker 1

And hearing no objections I'm therefore deeming the recommendation unanimously approved that was a vibrant discussion thanks folks that's what we're all here for and I really do appreciate it we're now going to move to the next 4 items that as I commented on earlier we'll have separate presentations from budget services or related entities I really appreciate all the work that's gone into this there is a lot of work that goes.

00:25:55 Speaker 1

Into it but these are again approved methodologies to allocate these particular funds the first one is item number 2 and that's Care Act community assistance recovery empowerment act allocations these are to consider and support individuals with serious mental health conditions through a civil court.

00:26:16 Speaker 1

Process and Kelly is here to present this to us Kelly I turn.

00:26:20 Speaker 1

It over to you.

00:26:21 Speaker 12

Hi good afternoon my name is Kelly ragsdale and I'm a senior analyst with the Center for families children and the courts.

00:26:29 Speaker 12

The fiscal year 2627 governor 's budget allocates 32.9 \$1,000,000.00 ongoing for Care Act trial court operations.

00:26:40 Speaker 12

And the methodology used in this report was approved by the committee and the judicial council in 2023 and has been used since then to allocate Care Act fund.

00:26:53 Speaker 12

Staff recommend applying the existing methodology for 2627 funds which gives each court a base allocation for staffing and operations and then applies the remaining funds prorata using the workload formula and includes a.

00:27:12 Speaker 12

Half percent reserve.

00:27:14 Speaker 12

And the allocations are detailed in attachment to a that is my very brief presentation but I'm happy to answer any questions.

00:27:26 Speaker 1

Brief but appropriate thank you Kelly very much are there any questions concerning the recommendation to approve the Care Act allocations with the recommendation set for the page 12 of them.

00:27:38 Speaker 1

Zach or anything you wanted to add OK that was a no all right.

00:27:43 Speaker 1

So I'm inviting a motion to approve that recommendation.

00:27:47 Speaker 5

Some of this David slayton.

00:27:49 Speaker 1

David thank you is there a second.

00:27:50 Speaker 4

Kelly seconds.

00:27:52 Speaker 1

Moved and seconded the recommendation set forth at page 12 and the materials concerning the Care Act allocations be approved it's now a pending motion are there any additional questions or comments.

00:28:05 Speaker 1

Hearing and seeing none as enter any objection to the recommendation set forth at page 12 for the Care Act allocations.

00:28:14 Speaker 1

Hearing and seeing none as the chair of deeming that this recommendation is unanimously approved thank you very much folks so moving through these the next is consideration of allocations concerning the pretrial release program allocations for 2627 including funding floor for the pretrial release programs for the trial.

00:28:35 Speaker 1

Ports this is going to come to us through deidra who is with us.

00:28:40 Speaker 1

I'm going to highlight I do highlight at this proposed budget reduces so remember we are dealing with reductions here that are ongoing so this includes reducing funding for the pretrial services by \$15,000,000.00 for the current year and we that was built into this allocation methodology essentially so I'll now turn it over to deidre.

00:29:01 Speaker 1

Petra.

00:29:01

Go ahead.

00:29:02 Speaker 8

Thank you judge Conklin and good afternoon members of the trial court budget advisory committee.

00:29:07 Speaker 8

And yes you you.

00:29:08 Speaker 8

Gave away the ending judge Conklin that's OK I come to you today with the allocation recommendations for fiscal year 2627 and the budget governor 's budget does propose 48.9.

00:29:10 Speaker 1

I'll get.

00:29:22 Speaker 8

5,000,000 a reduction of 15,000,000 with a 2 year.

00:29:26 Speaker 8

UM reduction of 20,000,000 we are continuing to recommend a funding floor for the small to small medium courts we have adjusted that based on the reduction so the maximum funding floor this year would be 140 \$1987.00.

00:29:47 Speaker 8

This would allow each court to have a proportional reduction across the board.

00:29:53 Speaker 8

Last time we were at trial court budget advisory committee we were asked to provide or to dig a little deeper into the needs of small courts and we have done so we did some research across the board to all the funding floor courts looking at the actual expense expenditures and expenses for hiring.

00:30:13 Speaker 8

Probation officers and we do find that the actual cost needed to run a fairly basic program is about 204 \$1000.00 and that's for the cost of one probation officer who and probation as you know uses 70% of the server.

00:30:29 Speaker 8

Distance so it is outlined in the materials I won't go into any of it unless you have questions but even though we find 204 1000 is what is required we are recommending the funding floor court stay at a rate that is proportional to the other cuts the other courts will be taking.

00:30:50 Speaker 8

And so we ask that you approve the recommendations as outlined and and this is another technical adjustment it's actually attachment 3 a on pages 17 to eat.

00:31:01 Speaker 8

18 including any technical adjustments contingent on funding and that you direct judicial council staff to conduct a mid year survey of expenditures in November of 2016 or 2026 so that we may see if any courts are willing to return funding to be reallocated to other courts that have demonstrated needs.

00:31:23 Speaker 8

And I'm happy to answer any questions.

00:31:27 Speaker 1

Excellent deidre thank you Kim Turner your hands up.

00:31:30 Speaker 6

So Deirdre thank you so much for I think I was the one that suggested last year that maybe it's time to take a look at those small and small medium courts to try to validate whether or not the funding you know the funding floor should be left where it is or should be applied across that entire group of courts.

00:31:50 Speaker 6

And I would just like to raise that issue again slightly differently and I appreciate the work that you did and that it does take what I think you said 204 \$1000.00 to to stand up the basic program with one probation officer.

00:32:03 Speaker 6

But I would suggest and respectfully that in some courts they don't have enough workload to support one probation officer and so I I just I draw your attention to this because there are tiny 2 judge courts that are getting the same allocation as 8 judge courts.

00:32:24 Speaker 6

And I will tell you that the workload for an 8 judge court is significantly different than it is for a 2 judge court.

00:32:30 Speaker 6

And the number of you know defendants that are coming through that system is is I I would suggest probably considerably different so I realize you've already taken a look at this I appreciate that I just want to once again I'm a little bit of a broken record on this but I think when the funding is going down we have to make.

00:32:51 Speaker 6

Perhaps a more you know we have to use the scalpel a little more.

00:32:56 Speaker 6

You know carefully than we perhaps do when when we're more awash in funding and I would just ask I mean I'm I'm prepared to to make the motion to approve this as it stands right now but I just want to continue to kind of beat the drum that I I don't think that the small courts the 2 judge courts.

00:33:16 Speaker 6

Are in the same position that the 8 and 7 and you know 9 judge courts are in and would hope that we can perhaps have a conversation about that allocation methodology in the future?

00:33:29 Speaker 8

And I would I think.

00:33:29 Speaker 11

Did you come ask a question of you deja is there limitations on our ability to adjust the the formula because the the allocation methodology is effectively in budget bill language?

00:33:32 Speaker 8

Of course sure.

00:33:41 Speaker 8

It is and also we're dependent upon county restrictions in terms of salary and in smaller counties it's very very hard to recruit probation officers and even harder to read recruit a 0.5 or 0.25 probation officer to do this work so there.

00:34:01 Speaker 8

Yes we are there are a lot of limitations that we operate under that smaller.

00:34:05 Speaker 8

Health in spades yes.

00:34:09 Speaker 11

This is just one of the types of allocations that isn't just an amount in the budget there's actual structure that the pretrial funding came to us and so we have again some restrictions on how we can what we can do with it and it talks about the 18 to 24 year old population as being the.

00:34:26 Speaker 6

Right.

00:34:27 Speaker 11

A key driver and.

00:34:29 Speaker 11

We don't have room unless we unless you'd like to us to pursue some change in language but then that would be something beyond this.

00:34:35 Speaker 6

Well I appreciate.

00:34:36 Speaker 6

That context slot Co yeah I mean I I've kind of forgotten that it's.

00:34:39 Speaker 6

Budget bill language.

00:34:41 Speaker 6

But I I would say that it does really disadvantage you know courts that are not not small and and certainly not medium sized.

00:34:51

OK.

00:34:52 Speaker 11

The only other one other comment I would make and I know she's got his hand up so I don't want to stand in there too long.

00:34:56 Speaker 11

Yeah we we do know jiselle just from a state budget strategy perspective that there are folks in the probation world looking to restore the \$15,000,000.00 ongoing reduction so it it so we're uncertain about that but we're moving forward with what's in the budget and that's sort of and I wouldn't necessarily call this technical.

00:35:08 Speaker 6

Yes I'm aware of that.

00:35:17 Speaker 11

But but because there's an established methodology the way it came out and the way it would go in would be the same but this may be something we have to revisit because the budget you know the the the advocates for probation funding might might be successful we don't know.

00:35:36 Speaker 11

OK but we know.

00:35:37 Speaker 6

OK thanks thanks Steve.

00:35:37 Speaker 11

We are supporting the budget as is and and and that's where we are to support.

00:35:42 Speaker 1

The chief great thank you Jake.

00:35:45 Speaker 9

It's very safe I think 22 comments on that I mean one I think it is certainly disappointing that that the program is being reduced which we've known now for for a year obviously so that that is disappointing but I I guess and I understand the budget act.

00:36:00 Speaker 9

Directives or the the the statutory directives on how to allocate and I may not be an option for this year but I think to to Kim 's point maybe there's a way next year that if there are courts that indicate to judicial council that.

00:36:15 Speaker 9

This is not a program that they're going to be able to implement in a way that makes sense based on the size or other reasons in their county maybe there's a way for us to have a chart and B chart that you know the a chart is here is allocated based on statute we've been advised that these courts are not going to use those funds and so here's how.

00:36:36 Speaker 9

You know given you know assuming they confirm it in July that it will be reallocated so that it's quickly gets out to the courts that will use it just something to think about I don't know if if courts even give the money back it's possible that every one of the courts that are here use all of it and that's a moot point but some way that makes it quicker to get it out there I know it's not an option for this year but maybe for the future so.

00:36:57 Speaker 1

That's a comment.

00:36:58 Speaker 13

But.

00:36:59 Speaker 1

I like that if you have tonight.

00:36:59 Speaker 6

Thanks Jake I appreciate that suggestion.

00:37:01 Speaker 1

Yeah I do too.

00:37:02 Speaker 1

I think we can work on that so this will exemplify how how judges are are significantly less intelligent than CEO 's but the second part of the recommendation is the mid year reallocation survey so does that at least address to a degree the concerns you have about courts that get this money that simply just can't or don't.

00:37:22 Speaker 1

Send it.

00:37:23 Speaker 9

It it does it it's mitigated oh sorry yeah yeah.

00:37:23 Speaker 6

I yes oh go ahead Jake go ahead.

00:37:27 Speaker 9

I was going to say it mitigates it it's just the challenge of as we're working with our probation departments and they're they might be downsizing what they have available well if we then find out about that and even this year was a very early right there was an expedited process in the in the current.

00:37:42 Speaker 9

Or you know they then have to now go through a rehire and reallocation process so yes it is helpful it does mitigate some of that impact but the earlier we know the more likely probation is going to be in a position to deliver.

00:37:52 Speaker 3

OK.

00:37:54 Speaker 1

That makes a lot of sense OK Yep.

00:37:55 Speaker 9

Those.

00:37:56 Speaker 9

Years.

00:37:57 Speaker 6

And I know seapak is definitely sponsoring some legislation to restore funding.

00:38:03 Speaker 6

You know to this program because you know you know I'll just speak from Mendocino 's perspective 140 \$1000.00 will get us through the first 4 months of the year and then the rest of it comes out of the county general fund and so that's I don't think that was ever the intent and it's.

00:38:22 Speaker 6

You know it's it's an expensive program to run if you try to.

00:38:24 Speaker 6

Run it well.

00:38:25 Speaker 1

Sure.

00:38:27 Speaker 1

Good points all OK.

00:38:28 Speaker 8

And judge Conklin I just it's just to you know put some reality into the reallocation process I just want to remind you that last year we had a 23 courts request a total of 12.2 1,000,000 and we had one court return on 190 4000 so I don't expect this year is going to be much different.

00:38:47 Speaker 1

OK.

00:38:50 Speaker 8

Especially especially with an additional cut but we will certainly do everything we can to get to courts and see if they are willing to return funding.

00:39:00 Speaker 1

OK.

00:39:01 Speaker 1

I appreciate that well put that down all thank you very much is there any further discussion or questions for deidra before I call for a motion.

00:39:10 Speaker 1

Don't see any is there a motion to approve the recommendation is set forth on page 16 of the material.

00:39:16 Speaker 6

Through to my word I said I would make the motion judge Conklin and I'm prepared to make.

00:39:20 Speaker 6

It.

00:39:21 Speaker 1

Appreciate that thank you is there a.

00:39:23 Speaker 1

I'll second judge Chad.

00:39:25 Speaker 1

For the same reasons Jake think ohh was that.

00:39:27 Speaker 1

Jake or Chad.

00:39:28 Speaker 1

That was Chad OK echoed by Jake OK great thank you moved and seconded the recommendation be approved any further discussion.

00:39:29

That was me.

00:39:37 Speaker 1

And any opposed.

00:39:40 Speaker 1

Hearing and seeing none of the recommendations set forth on page 16 is approved unanimously we're now moving to item number 4 which is the AB 1050 AB 1058 child support commissioner and family law facilitator allocations for the same 2627.

00:39:59 Speaker 1

Fiscal year this considers the annual allocations for the AB 1058 commissioners and facilitators Wally is with us to present this Wally welcome and thank you.

00:40:10 Speaker 7

Good afternoon thank you I am lolly Roberts supervising attorney for the AB 1058 unit in the Center for family children and the courts here at the judicial council I'm here today to ask this committee to recommend that the judicial council approve at its July meeting the annual allocation as commit judge Conklin just said.

00:40:29 Speaker 7

For the Child Support commissioner and family law facilitator programs for the 2627 fiscal.

00:40:35 Speaker 7

Here as well as the distribution of federal drawdown funding as requested by the courts and consistent with the approved funding methodology in 1996 assembly bill 1058 created the Child Support commissioner and family law facilitator programs to improve the handling of governmental child support throughout California the AB 1058.

00:40:55 Speaker 7

Unit at the judicial council oversees the programs and is responsible for distributing approximately \$60,000,000.00 in federal funding between both programs.

00:41:05 Speaker 7

The judicial council approved the workload based funding methodology used to distribute the annual child support commissioner allocation in 2019 and the population based funding methodology for the family law facilitator program in 2021 also in 2021 the judicial council directed that the data used to support the methodology.

00:41:26 Speaker 7

Be refreshed every 2 years.

00:41:29 Speaker 7

The data was last refreshed in 2025 and this year 's allocation was determined based upon the same data used last year therefore courts will receive funding under the proposed allocation that is consistent with what they are currently receiving this fiscal year.

00:41:46 Speaker 7

The specific amount requested for each court is contained in the attachments found at pages 21 and 22 of the meeting materials thank you for your consideration and I'm happy to answer any questions.

00:42:00 Speaker 1

Excellent lolly thank you very much any questions for lolly about these allocations or the recommendations as set forth.

00:42:09 Speaker 1

I don't see any hints.

00:42:11 Speaker 1

With that I'd invite a motion.

00:42:15 Speaker 10

Yamasaki moves approval of the recommendation.

00:42:18 Speaker 1

David thank you is there a second.

00:42:19 Speaker 4

Emily I'll second.

00:42:21 Speaker 1

Moved and seconded the recommendation which is a 3 part recommendation at page 20 be approved now that it's open for discussion based upon the motion any further discussion.

00:42:33 Speaker 1

And seeing and hearing none is there any opposition to the motion to approve the recommendation set forth at page 20 the materials.

00:42:41 Speaker 1

I see and I hear none I'll deem the recommendation unanimously approved and we move to our final recommendation and by the way I should have mentioned earlier we have a 1:00 o'clock stop time on this meeting 2 out to have time for the one to 130 closed educational session just to update you about where we're going but let's not get there too fast.

00:43:01 Speaker 1

The last item item number 5 is court reporter allocation.

00:43:05 Speaker 1

And this considers allocations for the \$30,000,000.00 annual appropriation for the trial courts to support court reporters and family law and civil type cases rose.

00:43:17 Speaker 13

Thank you George Conklin good afternoon.

00:43:18 Speaker 1

Rose it's great to see you again and and and welcome back thank you.

00:43:22 Speaker 13

Thank you Josh Conklin good to see everyone too.

00:43:24 Speaker 1

Turning this over to you.

00:43:27 Speaker 13

My name is rose lane I'm a senior analyst with leadership support services as judge Conklin stated this report is a recommendation for the fiscal year 2627 allocation of 30,000,000 to support court reporters in family law and civil case types the allocation.

00:43:46 Speaker 13

Methodology was originally approved by the judicial council in January of 2022 it uses non criminal judicial need by court to calculate proportional percentages based on the 2022 judicial needs assessment study.

00:44:05 Speaker 13

Which is the most current data set available at this time to establish funding for amounts we use the most recent Schedule 7 a data available the funding floor is equivalent to a 0.25 of a full time court reporter calculated?

00:44:25 Speaker 13

Using the average salary and benefits reported in the scheduled 7 A.

00:44:30 Speaker 13

Previously using the fiscal year 2122 data the funding floor was 20 5011 quarts qualified for the fiscal year 2627 allocations in alignment with the council approved methodology the calculation is based on fiscal year.

00:44:52 Speaker 13

2526 schedule 78 data this update results in more quarts qualifying for the funding floor and approximately a 1% reduction in proportional allocations for the remaining courts compared to the last year.

00:45:09 Speaker 13

So for fiscal year 2627 the funding floor is 51,000 which is applied to all courts 16 courts qualify collectively receiving 816 \$1000.00 which is higher than what they would have received under a purely proportional.

00:45:29 Speaker 13

Methodology.

00:45:31 Speaker 13

After applying the funding floor the remaining 29.2 1,000,000 is allocated proportionally to all of the courts based on their non criminal judicial need.

00:45:44 Speaker 13

You'll find a detailed breakdown of the recommendation for the fiscal year 2627 allocations.

00:45:51 Speaker 13

By court and that is provided as attachment 5 A on page 25 of your materials and then lastly I'd like to note that the judicial needs assessment is in process of being updated and that is anticipated to be considered by the judicial council this year in October of 2026.

00:46:13

Thanks.

00:46:15 Speaker 13

And that concludes my presentation on I'll turn it back over to judge Conklin but staff were on the call and happy to answer any questions you may have.

00:46:23 Speaker 1

Rose again thank you very much for that explanation so the the funding floor courts have benefited from this and that will require that additional reports contribute more given that would that I see some hands up like I didn't know if you wanted to add anything at this point David slaying your hands up.

00:46:43 Speaker 5

Yes thank you judge Conklin and it's sort of is in the same line of Kim Turner 's comments earlier on pretrial.

00:46:51 Speaker 5

I understand we're not changing the methodology today and certainly I understand that's what we're adopting here but I will point out that you know before the funding formula was \$25,000.00 10 out of the 16 quarts that are receiving the funding for this year in the mid year allocation.

00:47:12 Speaker 5

Last time gave back their funding because they didn't use it as you all know we've been criticized about the branches and ability to spend this money in the past and so by raising that funding floor.

00:47:25 Speaker 5

To 51,000 and then assuming that those same courts who are receiving that presumably will also be unlikely to spend it or maybe they'll figure out a way to spend it this year but it certainly causes me some concern that we are.

00:47:41 Speaker 5

You know providing in increased funding and ultimately as you just pointed out judge Conklin to be able to do that increased funding for that money has to come from courts who've perhaps traditionally spent all of their money and so I think there's a you know my concern here is that we won't be able to spend that I note that there is no mid year reallocation and this mod.

00:48:01 Speaker 5

And you might want to consider whether or not we want to do a meteor allocation I know that makes it complicated for those who us who use this because you have to figure how to spend the money at the end of the year but it would be perhaps worth considering you know to Kim 's point earlier maybe in the future thinking about surveying courts about whether or not to be able to spend it and take that into account when we allocate.

00:48:23 Speaker 5

But more importantly for this year maybe looking at a mid year reallocation just a couple of thoughts on this increased funding floor issue.

00:48:31 Speaker 1

All right I want to leave those thoughts in play because I think that they're very warranted for a discussion but before that Jake did you have a follow up comment.

00:48:39 Speaker 9

Yeah so it's a long similar lines I think.

00:48:44 Speaker 9

I.

00:48:45 Speaker 9

I am curious and I realize this isn't the easiest thing to do but you know the the language that defines the use of these funds specifically for family law and civil and expansion into family law and civil.

00:48:56 Speaker 9

Now that's when the budget act of 2021 so you know the intent of this was to result in the increase of the availability of court reporters in those case types that was 5 years ago so that has either occurred or it has not occurred and you know these become core to our business you know these are court employee positions so.

00:49:16 Speaker 9

You know as we create positions that funding needs to stay so that we can continue to pay for those and inflation is slowly eating away at this line item right so it's a separate line item.

00:49:28 Speaker 9

As we see here you know to maintain a funding floor that has to increase which means it gets less for the remainder of the courts you know it means we have less ability and the other courts to continue to pay for these positions when they are allocated in this fashion we have the new assessed judicial need coming out in the fall which would inform this as a policy next year which could.

00:49:50 Speaker 9

Change which courts are receiving some level of funding and could have impacts on the number of positions they can spend to this with this so.

00:49:58 Speaker 9

I'm kind of curious whether we're at the point where.

00:50:00 Speaker 9

That statement that this money is intended to increase court reporters for family law and civil can be removed and we can just move this into part of our base.

00:50:09 Speaker 9

And.

00:50:10 Speaker 9

And that this can go into part of our base funding for case related processing work these are our court reporters these are our employees and you know the additional accounting that goes into this to say well today that person wasn't civil or family tomorrow they got pulled into criminal you know as those fluctuations occur it just adds a level of complexity.

00:50:30 Speaker 9

But.

00:50:31 Speaker 9

May have been necessary in the first few years but at this point we're half a decade in so you know continuing to keep.

00:50:38 Speaker 9

Separate line items is.

00:50:41 Speaker 9

I guess I question why we continue to do that other than knowing it is in the budget act from 2021 and will require some language changes so I guess I would just put that out there and say I think that would be helpful for us to eliminate this it would give us more certainty it would allow us to move forward as courts and not be wondering whether the funding is going to continue to dissipate.

00:51:00 Speaker 9

For these positions.

00:51:02 Speaker 1

Saucony comments.

00:51:04 Speaker 1

Yep.

00:51:04 Speaker 11

Yeah thank you judge so the budget bill language persists every year related to the the 30,000,000 and it doesn't speak to a methodology but rather a purpose I mean it it basically says that it shall be allocated by the council in the manner that ensures all courts are allocated funds to be utilized to increase.

00:51:25 Speaker 11

The number of official court reporters in the family and civil law cases.

00:51:30 Speaker 11

And that this may be used for recruitment or retention filling positions and then and then it concludes with you know funding shinobi used to supplant existing expenditures so the reason that I think it's there is because it demonstrates that this money is there for you know the the our stakeholders who.

00:51:50 Speaker 11

Worked hard to get it into the budget but I don't think there's anything that precludes it to be a fixed amount.

00:51:59 Speaker 11

And I think maybe that's more of what you're trying to get at is it's a fixed amount that it's there but I don't think there's going to be any appetite for at least the budget bill language which defines that to be removed from the budget how we manage that internally once the appropriate appropriation is received I think is up to us.

00:52:19 Speaker 11

But we still have to stay true to the intent though again there's no technical language that says like when we talked about pretrial 18 to 25 year olds and that that sort of thing it doesn't have that same structure more again intent and purpose.

00:52:33 Speaker 11

Of the funding.

00:52:34 Speaker 11

Use and to not supplant existing expenditures.

00:52:40

OK.

00:52:40 Speaker 9

OK can I follow up on that real quick judge.

00:52:43 Speaker 1

Pardon me.

00:52:44 Speaker 9

Kind of follow up on that real quick before going to David.

00:52:46 Speaker 1

Sure now we'll go to David we've got about 5 minutes left.

00:52:49 Speaker 9

So I guess I would just say then I I guess my I would revise my request to say you know again we're we are here changing these things at this point is not feasible can we consider adding this to the funding methodology.

00:53:02 Speaker 9

If that's where this would go uh but one of the subcommittees to look at this next year to see does Loki 's point is it time to look at the policy around how we're allocating these funds and perhaps look at these as a fixed amount that goes into the base in some way rather than revisiting each year but that could be a future item?

00:53:21 Speaker 1

Sure I think I mean recognizing Zaki 's comments that this is budget bill.

00:53:24 Speaker 1

Language so we.

00:53:25 Speaker 1

Can't there's no appetite to change it on the other end just because there's no appetite to change it doesn't mean we can't.

00:53:30 Speaker 1

Make it more.

00:53:30 Speaker 1

Effective and I think So what Jake 's comment.

00:53:33 Speaker 1

Recognize it so we'll we'll show this as going back to FMS for consideration of exactly what Jake sets.

00:53:39 Speaker 6

Yes.

00:53:40 Speaker 1

Good comment so I'll go to David yamasaki follow up quickly on David slaton 's comments and then I'm going to try to get us concluded before 1:00 o'clock David Gilmour.

00:53:47 Speaker 10

Yeah yeah thank you very much I I only wanted to to say that I I support I understand Jake 's comments and I&I do think that gives us tremendous flexibility and using these resources that have virtually in every core been used for the intended purpose as we're required to do.

00:54:06 Speaker 10

You but I get I'm a little concerned if we were to remove that language which was the the basis for getting them the money in the first place it becomes it could potentially become lost in some of the fiscal challenges and objectives that we have so at the very least.

00:54:27 Speaker 10

There are there are.

00:54:28 Speaker 10

Uh interest groups I would say that stand behind the additional funding and getting that level of support I think is very very helpful for us to to ensure that it's preserved and if this has become something that is discussed further you know maybe we can kind of look at all of the components.

00:54:49 Speaker 10

Whether that that particular direction is you know going to help us preserve that that funding but but anyway that's for another day to to do to.

00:54:59 Speaker 11

It's not nice to David I don't think that the suggestion was that the language be eliminated effectively after my response but rather.

00:55:07 Speaker 11

How do we?

00:55:08 Speaker 11

Reacts to it once we receive the funding cause I agree there won't be anybody that would like to have that language go away the money can stay but then that loses its visibility it's what we do with it I think is more.

00:55:21 Speaker 11

From a technical.

00:55:23 Speaker 11

And consistency approach I'm I'm I feel like I'm talking a little bit.

00:55:26 Speaker 11

On behalf of Jake but.

00:55:28 Speaker 11

But yeah I don't think.

00:55:29 Speaker 11

There's gonna be there's I.

00:55:29 Speaker 11

Don't think that we are looking to eliminate the language that's how do we use it once it's been.

00:55:34 Speaker 11

Received.

00:55:35 Speaker 10

Understood thank.

00:55:36 Speaker 1

You yeah we surely don't want anything that risks the discontinuation or continuation of the funding on the other hand that doesn't prevent us from being more effective about how we allocate that funding so very quickly back to David slayton 's comment about a mid year reallocation and his observation that there's some courts that just return significant amounts of money is there any.

00:55:56 Speaker 1

Anything that would prevent us from doing I know it's a lot of work.

00:55:59 Speaker 1

But amid your survey a reallocation.

00:56:06 Speaker 11

Technically no it could be part of your your motion is to add that we did that recently I'm trying to remember what we just did that for and to maximize the use of the funds.

00:56:16 Speaker 1

Well I think that plays well with Jake 's and and David 's I mean if we're going to get more efficient about this let's get the most current information so I don't want to cause trouble and especially when you have 3 minutes left but well let's first is there so the recommendation is set for the page 24 of them materials as set forth the only thought would be that we supplement the recommend.

00:56:36 Speaker 1

Relation with a mid year reallocation survey to the courts concerning any unspent funds and potential reallocation of those unspent funds.

00:56:48

Come.

00:56:48 Speaker 11

And that we would authorize and I from just from a technos timber to to make it hasten it a bit because I think there's times where the council staff have been.

00:56:56 Speaker 11

Authorized to then make that reallocation without returning to the council the council is inherently giving the outcome of the.

00:57:04 Speaker 11

The survey the ability to then move the money quickly out to the courts.

00:57:09 Speaker 5

Ohh like I'll make that motion and include the mid year reallocation and the authorization for the council to effectuate that reallocation.

00:57:18 Speaker 1

Well stated David is there a second there's a lot of seconds who did that first I said Kim Turner did it first so moved and seconded that the recommendation set forth on page 24 be approved with the supplemental language concerning the mid year reallocation and authority of budget services or the council to redistribute that money.

00:57:20 Speaker 6

100 seconds.

00:57:38 Speaker 1

Open for further discussion.

00:57:40 Speaker 1

Seeing none any objection to them recommendation is modified.

00:57:45 Speaker 1

Seeing and hearing none the recommendation is modified at page 24 of the materials is approved with 2 minutes left thank you all very much our next meeting I believe Megan is May 7th.

00:57:58 Speaker 1

Great we're making progress as always I really appreciate all the work that's gone into this both obviously from budget services and there's the significant.

00:58:08 Speaker 9

Work.

00:58:09 Speaker 1

That they do that keeps us running so thank you very much for that thanks for all the perceptive and and helpful comments today from everybody it's great to have you all along we are now going to essentially what we're going to do is everybody stay put we're going to go into this educational session but we will make this now a close.