



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 29, 2016

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	July 29, 2016
Recommended by	Date of Report
Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair	July 15, 2016
	Contact
	Colin Simpson, 415-865-4566 colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's Fiscal Planning Subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council approve two requests from two trial courts for Trial Court Trust Fund funds to be held on behalf of the trial courts. Under the Judicial Council-adopted process, courts may request funding reduced as a result of a court's exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap, to be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund for the benefit of that court. The total estimated amount requested by the trial courts that would be reduced from their fiscal year (FY) 2016–2017 allocations for exceeding the cap is \$1.3 million. The council will be informed of any final adjustments to the estimated amounts after FY 2015–2016 year-end.

Recommendation

Based on actions taken at its July 7, 2016, meeting, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's (TCBAC's) Fiscal Planning Subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 29, 2016:

1. Allocate and designate \$1,204,632 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Alameda County and \$99,325 to the Superior Court of Lassen County from funding to be reduced from the courts' allocation in fiscal year 2016–2017 as a result of the courts' exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap because of contracts that exceeded their three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the courts in FY 2016–2017 (see Attachments A1 and A2).
2. Direct those courts with approved requests relying on estimates before fiscal year-end to submit amended requests with final amounts, and direct Judicial Council staff to inform the council of any final adjustments to the estimated amounts after FY 2015–2016 year-end.

Attachment B, *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 TCBAC and approved by the Judicial Council at its April 15, 2016, business meeting. Attachment C, *Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court*, provides a summary of the court requests, including the amount of the request and other relevant information.

Previous Council Action

At the Judicial Council's June 24, 2016, business meeting, the council approved 13 requests from 11 trial courts that FY 2016–2017 allocations reduced as a result of a court's exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund for the benefit of those courts. The requests totaled \$6.9 million.

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 Trial Court Trust Fund–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 B) provides the following criteria 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 submittal
- 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
- Audit review as part of the normal audit cycle

The criterion for eligibility is that courts have significant court expenditures that cannot be financed within their annual budgets. 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 submittal 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 TCBAC 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

Trial Court Trust Fund 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.

The TCBAC 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 related to the 1 percent fund balance cap—to be retained in the TCTF for the benefit of that court. At its July 7, 2016, meeting, the subcommittee approved the recommendations provided in this report. The subcommittee is composed of:

- Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Fresno
- Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Court Executive Officer (CEO), Superior Court of California, County of Glenn
- Mr. Michael D. Planet, CEO, Superior Court of California, County of Ventura
- Hon. Glenda Sanders, Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Orange
- Hon. Winifred Younge Smith, Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Alameda
- Mr. Brian Taylor, CEO, Superior Court of California, County of Solano
- Mr. David H. Yamasaki, CEO, Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara

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

77203. (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 was amended as part of SB 1021 to add subparagraph (c)(2)(A) and further amended by SB 75, as follows:

68502.5(c)(2)(A). 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 authorizes 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 the recommendations were considered by the TCBAC's Fiscal Planning Subcommittee at its July 7, 2016, meeting. Further, no alternatives were considered by the subcommittee. In their attached applications (see Attachments A1 and A2), 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 (see Attachments A1 and A2), 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

Trial Court Trust Fund 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

1. Attachment A1: Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Superior Court of Alameda County
2. Attachment A2: Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court—Superior Court of Lassen County
3. Attachment B: *Judicial Council–Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts*
4. Attachment C: *Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court*

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 *(Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer):*

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:

6/2/2016

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

JULY 1, 2016 – JUNE 30, 2017

REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$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. 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.

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 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.

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 continue to use multiple case management systems to track case information. Having different case management systems limits administrative staff's ability to deploy case processing staff into other operational areas, when necessary, because the lack of knowledge and training in a particular CMS. There is a steep learning curve to navigate through each of the current case management systems, so divisions operate with reduced staffing in lieu of temporarily dispatching staff from other divisions, which ultimately impacts the service available to the public. Having a single CMS eliminates the need to learn the basic navigational functions of the system and allows for flexibility in staffing courtrooms and public counters.

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?

If the request is not approved the Court may have to deplete its reserves in order to fund the remainder of the project, leaving no emergency funding available in the Court's budget.

Alternatively, the Court could default on its contract with Tyler Technologies and continue using different case management systems for criminal, civil, family, and juvenile.

A final option would be to hold positions vacant for an extended period of time or reduce staffing levels in order to generate one-time salary savings that can be used to support the project.

Holding the funds in the TCTF is the preferred alternative so that the Court can maintain the ability to fund

Attachment A1
unbudgeted emergent needs that may arise during the fiscal year, avoid defaulting on a contract, and maintain appropriate staffing levels to meet the needs of the public and ensure access to justice for court users within the county.

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**

- 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**

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

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

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:

Lassen

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

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

Andi Barone, andi.barone@lassencourt.ca.gov 530-251-8205 x139

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

6/7/2016

TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FISCAL YEAR 13-14 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 15-16

REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$99,325.00

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 amount requested is the balance of our Tyler Odyssey case management system implementation. The project was part of a Northern California Court consortium that for many reasons on both the vendor side and courts' side became delayed. There were courts that had facility projects and needed their project implemented faster delaying our court's project. Tyler also faced many issues and concerns regarding staffing to fulfill the number of California courts coming onto the system, as well as, ensuring the product would function correctly with JBSIS and other components which have led to numerous delays beyond our court's control. Our court continues to work with Tyler, our IT vendor and is currently considering additional project assistance to complete the implementation however we expect that Tyler must deliver the product as promised.

SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES

A. Identify sections and answers amended.

n/a

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

n/a

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 were set aside from previous year's fund balance or reserves to pay for the case management system upgrade. Unfortunately due to circumstances beyond our control and described above, the project implementation will not be completed this 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?**

The court is expecting that Tyler Odyssey will allow for a paperless environment, easier, quicker access to documents for the public, justice partners and reduce overall future operational costs that come with antiquated case management systems.

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.

If the request is not approved, then the court would have wasted prior years of working with other courts and Tyler in collaborating with processes, forms, mapping and funding already paid to Tyler for the work done thus far. Court operations would be greatly impacted as the work continues daily to meet this goal of implementing an efficient paperless system.

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

Consequences to the public would be status quo which is essentially not good in that with the new system the public would be able to have quicker access to documents, files and eventually the court can implement e-filing. Given our small rural location this would be a successful venture for those in outlying areas to be able to access documents via the web application.

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

Given that the court is in the final stages of implementation, working on data review, vendor corrections and the final stages of integration, holding the funding is the preferred alternative. The project was delayed due to varying circumstances, most beyond our control. We have reviewed the viability of the project and given that we want to ensure that we have a working, product able to produce all of our data 100% as promised, JBSIS integration, DMV automation and integrated financials, we believe we must move forward in order to complete the project.

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

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

See table

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 B

- 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*)

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

#	Court	Amount	Time Period	Category	Quick Summary
1	Alameda	1,204,632	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
2	Lassen	99,325	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
	Total	1,303,957			