



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on July 28, 2017

Title

Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Trust
Fund Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial
Courts

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 28, 2017

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

July 14, 2017

Recommended by

Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial
Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair

Contact

Suzanne Blihovde, 916-263-1754
suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve two new requests and two amended requests for Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts. Under the Judicial Council-adopted process, a court may request funding reduced as a result of a court exceeding its 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the TCTF for the benefit of that court. The total estimated amount requested by the trial courts that would be reduced from their 2017–2018 allocations for exceeding the cap is \$448,133. The council will be informed of any final adjustments to the estimated amounts after 2016–2017 year-end.

Recommendation

Based on actions taken at its July 7, 2017, meeting, the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 28, 2017:

1. Allocate and designate \$448,133 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to be held on behalf of the following courts:
 - \$115,000 to be held for the Superior Court of Mono County
 - \$333,133 to be held for the Superior Court of Sacramento County

These funds will be reduced from the courts' allocations as a result of those courts exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap. The funds would be distributed back to the courts over three fiscal years, as delineated in Attachment A.

2. Approve the amended requests of the Superior Court of Alameda County and the Superior Court of Orange County. These funds have been reduced and reallocated from the courts' allocations in 2016–2017 as a result of those courts exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap. The funds would be adjusted and distributed back to the courts over two fiscal years, as delineated in Attachment D.

Attachment G, *Judicial Council–Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts*, provides the recommendations proposed by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and approved by the Judicial Council at its April 15, 2016, business meeting. Attachment A, Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court (new requests), and Attachment D, Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court (amended requests), provide the amount of the requests and other relevant information.

Previous Council Action

In 2016, at the Judicial Council's business meetings on June 24, July 29, October 28, and December 16, the council approved 18 requests from 15 trial courts that 2016–2017 allocations reduced as a result of a court exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the TCTF for the benefit of that court. The requests totaled \$8.5 million. In 2017, at the Judicial Council's May 19 business meeting, the council approved seven new requests totaling \$7.8 million and three amended requests from nine trial courts for funds to be retained in 2017–2018 allocations in anticipation of reductions from the 1 percent fund balance cap at the end of 2016–2017.

At the Judicial Council's April 15, 2016, business meeting, the council approved the TCBAC-recommended process, criteria, and required information for trial courts to request that TCTF-reduced allocations related to the 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted fund balance for the benefit of those courts. This retention allows the courts to prudently plan for and fund necessary court infrastructure projects such as technology or infrastructure improvements; facilities maintenance and repair allowed under California Rules of Court, rule 10.810; court efficiencies projects; and other court infrastructure projects that would not be possible as an unintended consequence of the 1 percent fund balance cap.

The council-approved process (see Attachment G) provides the following to ensure clear, transparent, and uniform standards for the courts requesting that funds be held on their behalf, as well as for the subcommittee members, Judicial Council staff, and Judicial Council members who will be processing, reviewing, and evaluating the requests:

- Criterion for eligibility;
- Submission, review, and approval process;
- Deadline for submission;
- Allowance for additional appropriate terms and conditions from the Judicial Council;
- Plan changes that require submission of an amended request;
- Plan changes that require submission of a new request;
- Postcompletion reporting requirements; and
- Audit review as part of the normal audit cycle.

The criterion for eligibility is that a court have significant court expenditures that cannot be financed within its annual budget. The submission, review, and approval process, and the allowance for additional appropriate terms and conditions, are consistent with the process for supplemental funding requests. The deadline for submission is based on the need to submit June council meeting draft reports almost six weeks before the meeting.

Forty business days is a short timeline, given staff analysis, generation of the report to a TCBCAC subgroup, scheduling of a meeting of the subgroup, and generation of a report from the subgroup. The requirements for submission of an amended or new request are intended to ensure that the council is aware of any modifications to an approved plan and has given its explicit approval. Postcompletion reporting and audit requirements provide final review of the plans and their adherence to the approved purpose.

Rationale for Recommendation

A TCTF fund balance held on behalf of the trial courts allows the courts to meet contractual obligations and fund necessary court infrastructure projects such as technology improvements or infrastructure, rule 10.810–allowable facilities maintenance and repair, court efficiencies projects, and other court infrastructure projects whose work extends beyond the three-year term of the contract encumbrance.

TCBCAC established the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee to review and make recommendations directly to the Judicial Council regarding trial court requests to permit trial court allocation amounts reduced due to the 1 percent fund balance cap to be retained in the TCTF for the benefit of that court. At its July 7, 2017, meeting, the subcommittee approved the recommendations provided in this report. The subcommittee is composed of:

- Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Judge, Superior Court of Fresno County;
- Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Court Executive Officer (CEO), Superior Court of Glenn County;
- Mr. Michael D. Planet, CEO, Superior Court of Ventura County;

- Hon. Glenda Sanders, Judge, Superior Court of Orange County;
- Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson, Judge, Superior Court of Trinity County;
- Mr. Brian Taylor, CEO, Superior Court of Solano County; and
- Mr. David H. Yamasaki, CEO, Superior Court of Orange County.

Government Code section 77203 (carryover funds) was added as part of Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41) and later amended by SB 75 (Stats. 2013, ch. 31), as follows:

- (a) Prior to June 30, 2014, a trial court may carry over all unexpended funds from the courts operating budget from the prior fiscal year.
- (b) Commencing June 30, 2014, a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year. The calculation of the 1 percent authorized to be carried over from the previous fiscal year shall not include funds received by the court pursuant to the following:
 - (1) Section 470.5 of the Business and Professions Code.
 - (2) Section 116.230 of the Code of Civil Procedure, except for those funds transmitted to the Controller for deposit in the Trial Court Trust Fund pursuant to subdivision (h) of that section.
 - (3) Subdivision (f) of Section 13963, Sections 26731, 66006, 68090.8, 70640, 70678, and 76223, subdivision (b) of Section 77207.5, and subdivision (h) of Section 77209.
 - (4) The portion of filing fees collected for conversion to micrographics pursuant to former Section 26863, as that section read immediately before its repeal, and Section 27361.4.
 - (5) Sections 1027 and 1463.007, subdivision (a) of Section 1463.22, and Sections 4750 and 6005, of the Penal Code.
 - (6) Sections 11205.2 and 40508.6 of the Vehicle Code.

Government Code section 68502.5 (trial court budget process) was amended as part of SB 1021 to add subdivision (c)(2)(A) and further amended by SB 75, as follows:

When setting the allocations for trial courts, the Judicial Council shall set a preliminary allocation in July of each fiscal year. The preliminary allocation shall include an estimate of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year and each court's preliminary allocation shall be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 77203. In January of each fiscal year, after review of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year, the Judicial Council shall finalize allocations to trial courts and each court's finalized allocation shall be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 77203.

Beginning June 30, 2014, Government Code section 77203 authorized trial courts to carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court’s operating expenses from the prior fiscal year. The section also exempts certain funds from the calculation of that 1 percent. Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) directs the Judicial Council, in setting allocations for the fiscal year, to reduce a trial court’s allocation in the amount that its prior fiscal year-ending fund balance exceeded 1 percent of its prior fiscal year operating expenses. Courts are also allowed to exclude encumbered funds from the cap.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

No public comments were received when TCBAC’s Fiscal Planning Subcommittee considered the recommendations at its July 7, 2017, meeting. Further, the subcommittee considered no alternatives. In their attached applications (see Attachments B–C and E–F), the requesting courts provided alternatives that they considered in case their requests were not approved.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

There is no additional cost to allocating the funds beyond the amount requested for allocation. In their attached applications, the requesting courts provided the consequences to court operations, the public, and access to justice if their requests were not approved.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

A TCTF fund balance held on behalf of the trial courts is consistent with strategic Goal II, Independence and Accountability, in that it helps courts to “[a]llocate resources in a transparent and fair manner that promotes efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of justice, supports the strategic goals of the judicial branch, promotes innovation, and provides for effective and consistent court operations” (Goal II.B.3).

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court (new requests)
 2. Attachment B: Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Mono County
 3. Attachment C: Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Sacramento County
 4. Attachment D: Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court (amended requests)
 5. Attachment E: Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Alameda County
 6. Attachment F: Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Request for the Superior Court of Orange County
- Attachment G: *Judicial Council–Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts*

Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court

Table 1: New Requests for July 28, 2017 Judicial Council meeting

Court	Request Number	Amount Requested	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	Total	Category	Quick Summary
Mono	26-17-01-00	115,000	75,000	20,000	20,000	115,000	Technology Improvement	Saving for new case management system. Anticipated additional funding of \$385K thru BCP process.
Sacramento	34-17-01-00	333,133		333,133		333,133	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Family Law and Traffic Case Management System
Total - New Requests		448,133	75,000	353,133	20,000	448,133		

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:

NEW REQUEST *(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)*

AMENDED REQUEST *(Complete Sections I through IV.)*



SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT:

Click here to enter court
MONO

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

Hector Gonzalez

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

Tammy Laframboise 760-923-2304

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

5/26/2017

TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:

FY 16-17 – FY 19-20

REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$115,000

REASON FOR REQUEST *(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):*

Mono Court needs to replace the current case management system that is over 15 years old. It is being phased out by our current vendor who will no longer offer technical support.

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES

A. Identify sections and answers amended.

B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.

The preliminary estimate for a new Case Management System is approximately \$500,000 including all hardware, software and staff training. This is nearly one fourth of our annual budget so it would be very difficult to cover that expenditure as well as the operating expenses without assistance.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

- B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**
Funding is needed to replace our case management system that provides the foundation of important operational functions such as maintenance of case information, defendant information, party information and attorney information. Current case management system is antiquated and is still a DOS based system. It is difficult to use since it requires keyboard stroke commands and is highly inefficient given the amount of staff time necessary to use the system. Replacing it with a graphic user interface Windows based system will increase staff productivity.
- C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).**
Cost efficiency is not the main benefit. Replacement of the current case management system with a reliable system that will be supported is the main benefit and increased staff productivity is a secondary benefit.
- D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.**
Current case management system is operating; however, it needs frequent technical support. Our current case management vendor is creating a new case management system platform that will replace the current system and has indicated that at some point in the future, technical support will not be provided for the old system. Failure to replace our current case management system will leave us vulnerable to system failures which could lead to the inability to do our basic court operations and the potential loss of irreplaceable court case data.
- E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.**
Court customer service to the public would be substantially impaired and significantly delayed if our case management system is not replaced and becomes unreliable. We may not be able to fulfill the public's request for case information or for search requests. We will have difficulty providing necessary information for our justice partners which will also negatively impact the flow of cases.
- F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?**
If necessary, our court will seek supplemental funding from the Judicial Council. However, we believe that use of our own funding to reduce the amount of supplemental funding needed from the Judicial Council will place us in a stronger position to be approved for supplemental funding. Rather than expend all our surplus funds on vitally important materials supplies and equipment, we decided it would be a better long-term investment to place the money in the Judicial Council holding fund.

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. A tab

B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. D tab

C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. C tab

D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

See attached TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Tables Template – Final, Sec. IV. B tab

Prior three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

FY 2015-16	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Beginning Balance	-	-	-					-
Revenues	1,942,902	49,060	132,957					2,124,919
Expenditures	1,904,795	36,599	139,591					2,080,985
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(6,634)		6,634					-
Ending Fund Balance	31,473	12,461	-	-	-	-	-	43,934

FY 2014-15	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Beginning Balance	10	24,915	-					24,925
Revenues	1,663,886	47,763	92,930					1,804,579
Expenditures	1,663,896	72,678	92,930					1,829,504
Operating Transfers In (Out)	-	-	-					-
Ending Fund Balance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

FY 2013-14	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
Beginning Balance	466,046	12,453	-					478,499
Revenues	1,437,860	12,622	78,195					1,528,677
Expenditures	1,903,896	160	78,195					1,982,251
Operating Transfers In (Out)	-	-	-					-
Ending Fund Balance	10	24,915	-	-	-	-	-	24,925

Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the c

	FY 2016-17		FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL	
REVENUES									
State Financing Sources	1,898,953	11,757						1,910,710	
Grants			111,738					111,738	
Other Financing Sources	32,650	40,248						72,898	
TOTAL REVENUES	1,931,603	52,005	111,738	-	-	-	-	2,095,345	
EXPENDITURES									
Salaries	755,900	5,892	12,090					773,883	
Staff Benefits	602,240	3,618	5,917					611,776	
General Expense	91,648	1,405	7,829					100,881	
Printing	1,646	91	-					1,738	
Telecommunications	20,458	837	3,503					24,798	
Postage	10,549	497	39					11,085	
Insurance	2,176	-	-					2,176	
Travel in State	3,185	-	488					3,673	
Travel Out of State	-	-	-					-	
Training	257	-	115					372	
Security	622	-	92					714	
Facilities Operations	32,592	3	3,009					35,604	
Utilities	-	-	-					-	
Contracted Services	183,308	3,455	75,561					262,324	
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,004	-	-					4,004	
Information Technology (IT)	129,232	6,750	2,227					138,209	
Major Equipment	43,262	-	-					43,262	
Other Items of Expense	5,123	-	724					5,848	
Juror Costs								-	
Other								-	
Debt Service								-	
Court Construction								-	
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-	
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,886,204	22,548	111,593	-	-	-	-	2,020,345	
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-	
Fund Balance (Deficit)									
Beginning Balance (Deficit)								-	
Ending Balance (Deficit)	45,399	29,457	144	-	-	-	-	75,000	

Current detailed budget projection on court's behalf

	FY 2017-18		FUNDS					
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
REVENUES								
State Financing Sources	1,998,953	11,757						2,010,710
Grants			111,738					111,738
Other Financing Sources	35,915	40,248						76,163
TOTAL REVENUES	2,034,868	52,005	111,738	-	-	-	-	2,198,610
EXPENDITURES								
Salaries	831,491	16,481	13,299					861,271
Staff Benefits	662,464	11,980	6,509					680,953
General Expense	90,812	1,545	8,612					100,969
Printing	1,811	100	-					1,911
Telecommunications	22,504	921	3,853					27,277
Postage	11,604	547	43					12,193
Insurance	2,394	-	-					2,394
Travel in State	3,504	-	536					4,040
Travel Out of State	-	-	-					-
Training	283	-	127					409
Security	684	-	101					786
Facilities Operations	35,640	3	3,310					38,953
Utilities	-	-	-					-
Contracted Services	181,639	3,800	71,561					257,000
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,405	-	-					4,405
Information Technology (IT)	112,155	17,425	2,449					132,029
Major Equipment	47,588	-	-					47,588
Other Items of Expense	5,636	-	797					6,432
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,014,612	52,802	111,197	-	-	-	-	2,178,611
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
Fund Balance (Deficit)								
Beginning Balance (Deficit)	45,399	29,457	144	-	-	-	-	75,000
Ending Balance (Deficit)	65,655	28,659	686	-	-	-	-	95,000

Current detailed budget projection

	FY 2018-19		FUNDS					
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
REVENUES								
State Financing Sources	2,383,953	11,757						2,395,710
Grants			111,738					111,738
Other Financing Sources	35,915	40,248						76,163
TOTAL REVENUES	2,419,868	52,005	111,738	-	-	-	-	2,583,610
EXPENDITURES								
Salaries	831,491	16,481	13,299					861,271
Staff Benefits	662,464	11,980	6,509					680,953
General Expense	90,812	1,545	8,612					100,969
Printing	1,811	100	-					1,911
Telecommunications	22,504	921	3,853					27,277
Postage	11,604	547	43					12,193
Insurance	2,394	-	-					2,394
Travel in State	3,504	-	536					4,040
Travel Out of State	-	-	-					-
Training	283	-	127					409
Security	684	-	101					786
Facilities Operations	35,640	3	3,310					38,953
Utilities	-	-	-					-
Contracted Services	181,639	3,800	71,561					257,000
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,405	-	-					4,405
Information Technology (IT)	112,155	17,425	2,449					132,029
Major Equipment	47,588	-	-					47,588
Other Items of Expense	5,636	-	797					6,432
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,014,612	52,802	111,197	-	-	-	-	2,178,611
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
Fund Balance (Deficit)								
Beginning Balance (Deficit)	65,655	28,659	686	-	-	-	-	95,000
Ending Balance (Deficit)	470,911	27,861	1,227	-	-	-	-	500,000

Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court

Current detailed budget projection

	FY 2019-20		FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL	
REVENUES									
State Financing Sources	1,998,953	11,757						2,010,710	
Grants			111,738					111,738	
Other Financing Sources	35,915	40,248						76,163	
TOTAL REVENUES	2,034,868	52,005	111,738	-	-	-	-	2,198,610	
EXPENDITURES									
Salaries	851,490	16,481	13,299					881,270	
Staff Benefits	662,464	11,980	6,509					680,953	
General Expense	90,812	1,545	8,612					100,969	
Printing	1,811	100	-					1,911	
Telecommunications	22,504	921	3,853					27,277	
Postage	11,604	547	43					12,193	
Insurance	2,394	-	-					2,394	
Travel in State	3,504	-	536					4,040	
Travel Out of State	-	-	-					-	
Training	283	-	127					409	
Security	684	-	101					786	
Facilities Operations	35,640	3	3,310					38,953	
Utilities	-	-	-					-	
Contracted Services	281,639	3,800	71,561					357,000	
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	4,405	-	-					4,405	
Information Technology (IT)	512,155	17,425	2,449					532,029	
Major Equipment	47,588	-	-					47,588	
Other Items of Expense	5,636	-	797					6,432	
Juror Costs								-	
Other								-	
Debt Service								-	
Court Construction								-	
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-	
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,534,611	52,802	111,197	-	-	-	-	2,698,610	
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-	
Fund Balance (Deficit)									
Beginning Balance (Deficit)	470,911	27,861	1,227	-	-	-	-	500,000	
Ending Balance (Deficit)	(28,831)	27,064	1,768	-	-	-	-	0	

Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

Expenses Category		Amount
GL Account	Description	
900000	Salaries	
910000	Staff Benefits	
920001	General Expense	
924000	Printing	
925000	Telecommunications	
926000	Postage	
928000	Insurance	
929000	Travel in State	
931000	Travel Out of State	
933000	Training	
934000	Security	
935000	Facilities Operations	
936000	Utilities	
938000	Contracted Services	100,000
940000	Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	
943000	Information Technology (IT)	400,000
945000	Major Equipment	
950000	Other Items of Expense	
972000	Other	
973000	Debt Service	
983000	Court Construction	
990000	Distributed Administration & Allocation	
Total		500,000

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Description	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	FY 2018-19 ▼	FY 2019-20 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	75,000	20,000	20,000						115,000
BCP Funding			385,000						385,000
Expenditures				500,000					500,000
Cumulative Balance	75,000	95,000	500,000	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: Mono Court has put in a request to be included in the next consortium of courts to receive additional funding to assist with the purchase of a new case management system. We anticipate that may happen in FY18-19 so included in the budget for that year is an additional \$385,000 to add to the \$115,000 that the court will have saved by using the TCTF Funds Held on Beheld of the Court process. The purchase will be paid in full (\$500,000) in the following FY19-20.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:

NEW REQUEST *(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)*

AMENDED REQUEST *(Complete Sections I through IV.)*



SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT: Sacramento	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Judge Kevin Culhane, Presiding Judge	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Rick Beard, Chief Financial Officer (916-874-8133)	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 5/30/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FY14/15 – FY18/19	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$ 333,133

REASON FOR REQUEST *(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):*

The court requests that funds encumbered for its case management system projects be held past the end of the encumbrance period so that the court can complete its projects. The court is currently in the process of replacing three of its oldest case management systems (CMS) projects in the Criminal, Family Law, and Traffic divisions.

- Criminal CMS Project: replaces a county-owned mainframe system that is being phased out by the county. Includes real-time exchange of criminal case data between the court and the county.
- Family Law CMS Project replaces a 25+ year old installation of Sustain. The new Family Law CMS will enable the court to employ e-filing services and improve order generation.
- Traffic CMS Project: this project replaces a 16 year old CMS and will allow the court to expand e-services in the Traffic division.

This request is to have funds that were encumbered in 2014-15 for two of these projects, Family Law and Traffic, held in the TCTF past the original encumbrance end period. These funds are the completion of funding provided over two fiscal years, 2013-14 and 2014-15, which are intended to fully fund the work necessary for the aforementioned CMS projects undertaken by the court. The court was approved to have 2013-14 remaining funds held through June 30, 2018 at the October 2016 Council meeting.

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES

A. Identify sections and answers amended.

B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.

A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.

The court is currently in the process of replacing three of its oldest case management systems which support the Criminal, Family Law, and Traffic divisions. These projects have required a greater amount of time to complete due to their complexity and the need to carefully examine and convert business rules, processes, and data into the new systems. Two of the replacement systems, Traffic and Family Law, had additional funding provided in 2014-15 to complete the necessary cost of full development of these CMS systems. This funding is in addition to the funding provided in 2013-14 for all three projects, which has been approved previously to have remaining funds held in the TCTF.

The amount of encumbered funds projected to remain on June 30th, 2017 for the two projects is as follows:

	Original	Remaining
PO #4300004218 – FL CMS	\$261,555	\$190,641
PO #4300004217 – Traffic CMS	\$281,920	\$142,492
Total Contribution –	\$543,475	\$333,133

The original timeline called for the start of the Family Law and Traffic CMS projects in latter half of 2014 and beginning of 2015. However, the start of these projects was delayed due to the increase in time required for the Criminal CMS Project and the concomitant use of resources needed on that project.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE****B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**

The CMS Projects all touch on various goals in the Judicial Council's Strategic Plan including:

- Goal I – Access, Fairness, and Diversity
- Goal II – Independence and Accountability
- Goal III – Modernization of Management and Administration
- Goal IV – Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
- Goal VI – Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence

Specific areas where these goals are met by the CMS Projects include:

- *Electronic Case Files:* The court will implement electronic case files in Criminal and Family Law as part of the new CMS implementations. Electronic files eliminate the need for storing, printing, and/or copying case files and thus expedite in-court processing. The case file and documents will be available through an online portal to government agencies, attorneys and/or parties (where appropriate and with secure access), and in the courthouse kiosk for general public. In Traffic, where case files are already electronic, there will be a reduction in the need for document printing and scanning and electronic signatures will be enabled. *(Goals III & VI)*
- *Electronic Filing and Data Exchanges with Justice Agencies:* Electronically filing cases directly into the new CMS means the filing agencies will have more time to file a case. Cases can be filed on a 24/7 basis. Case filing and verification will only take a few minutes, compared to manual filing. Government agencies can exchange data with the court, at any time of the day. *(Goals III & VI)*
- *Case Processing:* Automating current manual processes, where feasible, will add efficiencies for staff by saving time spent on tasks needing a clerk's review and data entry. For those cases that must still be manually entered, data entry will be streamlined through more efficient system configuration. Many workarounds currently in place due to system limitations will be eliminated. *(Goals III & IV)*
- *Government Agency and Public Access to Case Data:* Case files and case data will be made available, on-line, on 24/7 basis for government agencies, attorneys and/or parties (where appropriate and with secure access), and in the courthouse kiosk for general public. This should reduce case-related phone queries and foot-traffic to the courthouse. For Traffic, public kiosks and online access will increase payment/appearance options and reduce wait times. *(Goals I, III, & IV)*

- *Accurate Reporting:* The new CMS will improve reporting for JBSIS, and DMV which suffer inaccuracy and data collection due to limitations in the existing systems. (*Goals II & III*)
- *System Integration:* New system will integrate with external court systems like SAP, and also share data with other case categories, like Traffic and eventually Juvenile as well as other areas of the court. Existing integrations with the county and third-party collections will be improved, reducing the need for manual intervention by court staff. Furthermore, the new system will integrate with the court's Electronic Document System (EDS) and Public Case Access site (PCA). Notices, Minute, and Orders would be available to the parties soon after the documents are completed. (*Goals IV & VI*)

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

- *Reliance on Old Case Management Systems:*
 - Family Law: The CMS in Family Law is failing and must be replaced. The court is at extreme risk of losing data.
 - Traffic: the Traffic system is old and no longer supported by the vendor. What support there is expensive and the maintenance requirements for this system are steep.
 - Technology: continued reliance on the old systems is becoming increasingly difficult as current operating systems and database systems no longer support these systems. The court is required to continue operating old versions of software that are no longer supported by the vendors. Finally, this puts the court out of compliance with various cyber-security requirements.
- *No Electronic Case files:* the court cannot implement electronic files for Family Law cases as the current systems cannot support them. The court will need space to continue to store and process paper files.
- *Business Process Workarounds:* operations staff will continue to apply inefficient workarounds in their business processes due to system limitations.
- *Severely Limits Adoption of Electronic Filing:* current systems do not support e-filing. As a result, the court will be unable to realize any improvement in efficiencies or the ability to improve access to case information.
- *Manual Reporting:* Court will continue to manually collect and report data in various areas such as JBSIS and Title IV-D.
- *No Data Sharing:* no ability to share data among the various case categories due to continued use of disparate systems.
- *Continued phone and foot traffic:* No reduction in foot traffic or case-related phone calls to the courthouse.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

- *Access to Case Files:* access to Family Law case files will continue to be limited to the courthouse and its working hours. Very limited case data will be available online. Parties will have to call the courthouse to get information on the hearing time and status.
- *Strict Filing Deadlines:* the existing strictures for filing deadlines will have to be maintained in order to allow for the time needed to manually review, stamp, and file documents as they are presented to the court for filing. The impact of this is more keenly felt when filing a case for a same-day or next-day calendar.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

Left blank per instructions received from Judicial Council Staff.

D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Description	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19
Contribution	\$333,133		
Expenditures		\$171,964	\$161,169

Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court

Table 2: Amended Requests for July 28, 2017 Judicial Council meeting

Court	Request Number	Last Approved Amount	Does request change \$\$	If yes - \$\$ change +/-	Original Expenditures by FY		Amended Expenditures by FY		Category	Quick Summary
					2016-2017	2017-2018	2016-2017	2017-2018		
Alameda	01-16-01-00	1,204,632	No		1,204,632	-	345,429	859,203	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Court has terminated contract with Tyler. Needs the funds held during dispute resolution process.
Orange	30-16-01-A1	775,384	No		775,384	-	133,000	642,384	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
Total: Amended Requests		1,980,016			1,980,016	-	478,429	1,501,587		

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request:

- NEW REQUEST** *(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)*
- AMENDED REQUEST** *(Complete Sections I through IV.)*



SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

SUPERIOR COURT: Alameda	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> Chad Finke, Court Executive Officer	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Melanie Jones, Finance Director 510-891-6038, mjones@alameda.courts.ca.gov	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 5/30/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: JULY 1, 2017 – JUNE 30, 2018	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$859,202.96 (Balance of unspent funds from the previous request of \$1,204,632)

REASON FOR REQUEST *(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):*

The Court entered into a contract with Tyler Technologies, Inc. (Tyler) to provide a new case management system for criminal, juvenile, civil, and family law case types. The original go-live date was December 2015; however project delays required an extension of the go-live date. Thus work will be extending beyond the three-year contract term. The planned work and related expenditures are expected to be completed in FY 2016-17.

On September 28, 2016, the Court terminated our contract with Tyler for Phase II of Odyssey. Currently, the Court and Tyler are in dispute resolution proceedings and we are unable to spend the funds in FY16-17. The Court is requesting that the funds be reserved until the pending proceedings are finalized.

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES

A. Identify sections and answers amended.

Section I, added the second paragraph.
Section IIIA, added the third paragraph.
Section IIID, revised.
Section IIIF, revised.

B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request.

The Court terminated our contract with Tyler and the parties are in dispute resolution proceedings. For this reason, the Court is unable to spend down the funds as anticipated in FY16-17, and we are requesting to have the funds held until the dispute resolution proceedings are finalized.

SECTION III: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.

The funds set aside for Phase I of this project were encumbered in FY 2013-2014 and the work has extended beyond the original project completion date due to project delays. Phase II of the project is also currently underway. Funding for this portion of the project, with scheduled deliverables in FY 2016-17, will be budgeted in the upcoming budget year using a combination of TCTF General Funds and 2% Automation Funds.

In FY 2015-2016 the Court's TCTF allocation was reduced by \$1.2 million and another \$400k reduction is proposed for FY 2016-17 application of the WAFM. Use of the 2% Automation Fund has been committed to Odyssey implementation Phase II and support of ongoing software systems, such as our ADP payroll system. Our reduced budget coupled with ongoing financial obligations to maintain existing staffing and operational costs results in our inability to include an expenditure of over \$1 million in the upcoming annual operational budget process, without totally depleting the Court's reserves.

In FY 2016-2017, the Court depleted our reserves by allocating our funds to maintain staffing and operational costs. Our court balanced the budget this year by various court-wide cost savings measures, which include but are not limited to, elimination of employee positions and temporary staffing, hiring freeze, furlough, and cost reduction in discretionary expenses. If the time extension is granted, the Court will not need to implement further budget cuts for the settlement with next fiscal year's general funds.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)

SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?

Currently, there is a lack of consistency as there are different case management systems used for each case type. The current systems are outdated and will require significant investments to upgrade. Additionally, existing CMS products only store information rather than manage court and case information. The Odyssey case management system is a fully integrated case and financial management system; thus allowing staff the ability to manage complete case histories, process documents and handle cash/bond transactions, all the while benefitting from comprehensive security and auditing functions. Additionally, Odyssey has the capability to interface with justice partner systems. With Odyssey the Court will be able to:

- Manage all aspects of court administration.
- Locate case information and attach multiple file types.
- Create and view dockets in various ways.
- Generate forms, letters and a variety of reports with advanced tools.
- Calculate fees, fines and distribute payments automatically.
- Search data fast using many different criteria.

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

N/A

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

The Court will have to reduce staffing and operating expenses which will result in reduction of services in order to make payment for Tyler.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

The Court may decide to hold positions vacant for an extended period time or abolish vacant positions altogether. If that happens, already understaffed public counters will be further compromised making wait times for the public longer. If courtroom staffing is unavailable it may mean longer times to get matters calendared. In both cases there will be a negative impact to the public, thus denying litigants' access to justice.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

The Court has depleted its reserves in FY16-17. If the request is not approved, the Court will have layoffs to fulfill payment obligations in the requested amount.

Holding the funds in the TCTF is the preferred alternative so that the Court can maintain the ability to fund budgeted costs during the fiscal year and maintain appropriate staffing levels to meet the needs of the public and ensure access to justice for court users within the county.

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year


Original Request approved by Judicial Council June 24, 2016

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	1,204,632								1,204,632
Contribution									-
Expenditures		1,204,632							1,204,632
Cumulative Balance	1,204,632	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2013-14 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	1,204,632								1,204,632
Contribution									-
Expenditures		345,429	859,203						1,204,632
Cumulative Balance	1,204,632	859,203	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT

Please check the type of request: <input type="checkbox"/> NEW REQUEST <i>(Complete Section I, III, and IV only.)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AMENDED REQUEST <i>(Complete Sections I through IV.)</i>		
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
SUPERIOR COURT: Orange	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST <i>(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):</i> David Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Tanya Vu; t2vu@occourts.org; 657-622-5123 (Project Manager) Katrina Coreces; kcoreces@occourts.org; 657-622-7739 (Financial Planning)	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 5/10/2017	TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 7/1/2013 – 6/30/2018	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$642,384.00
REASON FOR REQUEST <i>(Please briefly summarize the purpose for this request, including a brief description of the project/proposal. Use attachments if additional space is needed.):</i>		
<p>In support of the Court's long-term business objectives, cost savings measures, and technology goals, the Court's leadership initiated the implementation of a new Case Management System ("CMS") from Tyler Technologies ("Tyler") to replace the Court's outdated Banner CMS, which supports Family Law and Juvenile case types. The implementation plan also included the conversion of the Civil Cashiering System ("CCS"). As such, the Court required professional and consulting services to assist with a gap analysis, configuration, data conversion, testing, and implementation. Services included technical project management support; inventory, assessment, and recommendations for Family Law, Juvenile Dependency, Juvenile Delinquency, and CCS data conversion; programming; and other services to ensure the Court's successful conversion to Tyler's Odyssey CMS.</p> <p>In FY 2013-14, the Court encumbered \$2,807,540 in professional and consulting services to implement the new CMS with the understanding that all deliverables would be completed before June 30, 2016. On December 7, 2015, despite lacking some functionalities, the new CMS for Family Law and Juvenile went live. On June 30, 2016, the three-year encumbrance period ended with significant deliverables still outstanding. As a result, the Court requested that \$775,384 in encumbered funds be held in the TCTF for two fiscal years. The Judicial Council approved this request.</p> <p>Despite the Court's best efforts, not all deliverables have been completed by Tyler and the Court does not expect them to be completed by June 30, 2017. This request therefore asks that the Judicial Council hold \$642,384 in encumbered funds on the Court's behalf beyond June 30, 2017, in order to allow the Court to complete the CMS implementation by June 30, 2018.</p>		
SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES		
A. Identify sections and answers amended. Sections I-IV.		
B. Provide a summary of the changes to the request. The prior request dated April 28, 2016, indicated that \$775,384 would be expended by June 30, 2018. The Court still expects to be able to expend all funds by that date. However, the Court was instructed to submit another request for the TCTF to hold the funds from July 1, 2017 until June 30, 2018. As the Court has already expended \$113,000 of the \$775,384, this request now asks that \$642,384 be held in the TCTF until June 30, 2018.		

A. Explain why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term.

Due to the size of the project, the complexity of the case types implemented, and Tyler's limited resources, Tyler is unable to deliver the custom development needed for improved efficiencies and cost savings solutions by June 30, 2017. Due to severe funding restrictions, the Court cannot afford an allocation reduction of \$642,384 in FY 2017-18 and spend an additional \$642,384 in FY 2017-18 funds in order to complete the implementation. Additionally, the request was approved by the Judicial Council last Spring to allow funds to be carried over for two additional years. The purpose/use of these funds has not changed since the original request was made by the Court last fiscal year.

APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT (Continued)**SECTION III (continued): TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE****B. How will the request enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs?**

Allowing the Court to hold these funds beyond FY 2016-17 will allow Tyler to continue development work to improve critical court operations such as generating minute orders effectively, accurately, and timely. Additionally, the Court is awaiting delivery of new features for its Alternate Defense Billing ("ADB"). The biggest ADB item that the Court is still waiting for is "Fast Track an Attorney Payment" or the "easy button." This is not slated for delivery until after FY 2016-17. The Court is also waiting for a few fixes to ADB items already delivered but that the Court found defective.

C. If a cost efficiency, please provide cost comparison (table template provided).

N/A

D. Describe the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved.

The backlog of minute orders continues to grow, significantly impacting court operations. Issues include: judges and attorneys not having up-to-date information; delayed attorney payments; more calls from the public wanting to get the status of their cases; disturbance of courtroom proceedings; blank minute orders bring printed; incomplete minute orders being uploaded to the case record; and incorrect party extensions. All of these require court resources to correct, validate, and report. If this request is not approved, the Court will be unable to continue to work with Tyler to get to the point where the minute orders and Odyssey in general are dependable and reliable.

The Court will also require additional resources to process attorney payments. This is because ideally the ADB functionality would function as designed and operations would be able to match up every item invoiced with Odyssey's record of which attorneys appeared on cases. Today, this matching is not precise and because attorney payments require a high level of accuracy and expediency, court resources are used to manually identify discrepancies and make sure the correct attorneys are paid the correct amounts. To make matters more complicated, currently the searches don't show complete data sets. So for now, research is a completely manual process.

E. Describe the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved.

The backlogs of minute orders are impacting services to children and families as well as reimbursements for services. Families or children cannot get into programs without a minute order. Public access to justice is compromised as the public is not able to move forward with their orders because the minute order is the official order. In other cases, due to the backlogs, hearings are not scheduled in the system and the public shows up, resulting in the Court not being prepared to call their case.

F. What alternatives has the court identified if the request is not approved, and why is holding funding in the TCTF the preferred alternative?

The Court is not in a financial situation that would support an alternative option. Due to the continued phase-in of the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) and the lack of restoration funding at the state level, the Superior Court of Orange County (Court) faces deficits in the millions of dollars over the next several years. Furthermore, trial courts are still unable to carry over reserves in excess of 1% of their operating budgets, which only amounts to less than \$2 million – or three days of payroll – for the Court. Because of a current year deficit for the Court, it does not anticipate any 1% reserve to be carried over to FY 2017-18. 2% Automation Fund reserves have already been earmarked for case management system replacements (for both Civil and Criminal case types). Additionally, should this request not be approved, the Court would suffer a reduction to funding in FY 2017-18, further acerbating the projected deficit.

Please provide the following (*table template provided for each*):

A. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures

N/A

B. Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years the trial court would either be contributing to or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf

N/A

C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project

N/A

D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Attached

A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts related to the proposal to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year

Description	FY 2016-17 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	775,384								775,384
Contribution									-
Expenditures	775,384								775,384
Cumulative Balance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Amended request

Description	FY 2016-17 ▼	FY 2017-18 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Encumbered Amount	775,384								775,384
Contribution									-
Expenditures	133,000	642,384							775,384
Cumulative Balance	642,384	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Judicial–Council Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

Process for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

1. Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance will be held on behalf of trial courts only for expenditures or projects that cannot be funded by a court’s annual budget or three-year encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement.
 - a. Categories or activities include, but are not limited to:
 - i) Projects that extend beyond the original planned three-year term process such as expenses related to the delayed opening of new facilities or delayed deployment of new information systems;
 - ii) Technology improvements or infrastructure such as installing a local data center, data center equipment replacement, case management system deployment, converting to a VoIP telephone system, desktop computer replacement, and replacement of backup emergency power systems;
 - iii) Facilities maintenance and repair allowed under rule 10.810 of the California Rules of Court such as flooring replacement and renovation as well as professional facilities maintenance equipment;
 - iv) Court efficiencies projects such as online and smart forms for court users and RFID systems for tracking case files; and
 - v) Other court infrastructure projects such as vehicle replacement and copy machine replacement.
2. The submission, review, and approval process is as follows:
 - a. All requests will be submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration.
 - b. Requests will be submitted to the Administrative Director by the court’s presiding judge or court executive officer.
 - c. The Administrative Director will forward the request to the Judicial Council director of Finance.
 - d. Finance budget staff will review the request, ask the court to provide any missing or incomplete information, draft a preliminary report, share the preliminary report with the court for its comments, revise as necessary, and issue the report to a formal review body consisting of members from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC); the TCBAC subgroup will meet to review the request, hear any presentation of the court representative, and ask questions of the representative if one participates on behalf of the court; and Finance office budget staff will issue a final report on behalf of the TCBAC subgroup for the council.
 - e. The final report to the TCBAC review subgroup and the Judicial Council will be provided to the requesting court before the report is made publicly available on the California Courts website.
 - f. The court may send a representative to the TCBAC review subgroup and Judicial Council meetings to present its request and respond to questions.

3. To be considered at a scheduled Judicial Council business meeting, requests must be submitted to the Administrative Director at least 40 business days (approximately eight weeks) before that business meeting.
4. The Judicial Council may consider including appropriate terms and conditions that courts must accept for the council to approve designating TCTF fund balance on the court's behalf.
 - a. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions would result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
5. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine need to be revised to reflect a change (1) in the amounts by year to be distributed to the court for the planned annual expenditures and/or encumbrances, (2) in the total amount of the planned expenditures, or (3) of more than 10 percent of the total request among the categories of expense will need to be amended and resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process discussed in 1–3 above.
 - a. Denied revised requests will result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
6. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine have a change in purpose will need to be amended and resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process discussed in 1–3 above, along with a request that the TCTF funds held on behalf of the court for the previously approved request continue to be held on behalf of the court for this new purpose.
 - a. Denied new requests tied to previously approved requests will result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
7. On completion of the project or planned expenditure, courts are required to report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee within 90 days on the project or planned expenditure and how the funds were expended.
8. As part of the courts' audits in the scope of the normal audit cycle, a review of any funds that were held on behalf of the courts will be made to confirm that they were used for their stated approved purpose.

Criteria for Eligibility for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

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

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

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

SECTION I

General Information

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

SECTION II

Amended Request Changes

- Sections and answers amended
- A summary of changes to request

SECTION III

Trial Court Operations and Access to Justice

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

SECTION IV

Financial Information

- Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures (*table template provided*)
- Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years during which the trial court would either be contributing to the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf (*table template provided*)

Attachment G

- Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project
(table template provided)
- A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year *(table template provided)*