



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: June 23–24, 2016

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Trust Fund Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts	Action Required
	Effective Date
	June 24, 2016
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
None	June 9, 2016
Recommended by	Contact
Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	Colin Simpson, 415-865-4566
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair	<a href="mailto:colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov">colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's Fiscal Planning Subcommittee recommends the Judicial Council approve 13 requests from 11 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 exceeding the 1% fund balance cap to be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund for the benefit of that court. Circumstances include projects that extend beyond the original, planned three-year term process. The total estimated amount requested by the trial courts that would be reduced from their 2016–2017 allocations for exceeding the cap is \$6.9 million. The council will be informed of any final adjustments to the estimated amounts after 2015–2016 year-end.

## **Recommendation**

Based on actions taken at its June 1, 2016 meeting, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's (TCBAC) Fiscal Planning Subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective June 24, 2016:

1. Allocate and designate \$90,807 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Glenn County from funding to be reduced from the court's allocation in 2016–2017 as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C1).
2. Allocate and designate \$895,286 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Kern County from funding to be reduced from the court's allocation in 2016–2017 as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C2).
3. Allocate and designate \$306,172 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Merced County from funding to be reduced from the court's allocation in 2016–2017 as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C3).
4. Allocate and designate \$51,914 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Monterey County from funding to be reduced from the court's allocation in 2016–2017 as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C4).
5. Allocate and designate \$228,196 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Napa County from funding to be reduced from the court's allocation in 2016–2017 as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C5).
6. Allocate and designate \$775,384 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Orange County from funding to be reduced from the court's allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C6).
7. Allocate and designate \$830,217 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Sonoma County from funding to be reduced from the court's allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding

its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C7).

8. Allocate and designate \$1,413,142 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Sacramento County from funding to be reduced from the court’s allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C8).
9. Allocate and designate \$476,962 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Sutter County from funding to be reduced from the court’s allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C9).
10. Allocate and designate \$264,870 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Placer County from funding to be reduced from the court’s allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2017–2018 (see Attachment C10).
11. Allocate and designate \$1,270,811 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Kern County from funding to be reduced from the court’s allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C11).
12. Allocate and designate \$89,669 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Lake County from funding to be reduced from the court’s allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C12).
13. Allocate and designate \$200,000 in Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance to the Superior Court of Orange County from funding to be reduced from the court’s allocation in 2016–2017, as a result of the court exceeding the 1% fund balance cap due to a contract exceeding its three-year term. The funds would be distributed to the court in 2016–2017 (see Attachment C13).
14. Direct those courts with approved requests relying on estimates prior to 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 2015–2016 year-end.

Attachment A, *Judicial Council-Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust 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 B, *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 April 15, 2016 business meeting, the council approved the TCBAC-recommended process, criteria, and required information for trial courts to request Trial Court Trust Fund-reduced allocations—related to the 1% fund balance cap—be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted fund balance for the benefit of those courts. This allows the courts to prudently plan for and fund necessary court infrastructure projects such as technology improvements/infrastructure; California Rules of Court, rule 10.810—allowable facilities maintenance and repair; court efficiencies projects; and other court infrastructure projects that would not be possible otherwise as an unintended consequence of the 1% fund balance cap.

The attached process (see Attachment A) provides the following to ensure that clear, transparent, and uniform standards for the courts requesting funds be held on their behalf as well as for the bodies and Judicial Council staff that would be processing, reviewing, and evaluating the requests:

- Criteria 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;
- Post-completion reporting requirements; and
- Audit review as part of the normal audit cycle.

The criteria for eligibility is that this process is intended for significant court expenditures that could not be financed within their annual budget. Both the submission, review, and approval process, and allowance for additional appropriate terms and conditions are consistent with the process for supplemental funding requests. The deadline for submittal is based on June council meeting draft reports needing to be submitted 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 a meeting of the subgroup, and generating 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. Post-completion reporting and audit requirements provide final review of the plans and their adherence to the approved purpose.

Government Code section 77203 was added as part of Senate Bill 1021 (Stats. 2012, ch. 41) and was later amended, as was Government Code section 68502.5 to add subparagraph (c)(2)(A) by Senate Bill 75 (Stats. 2013, ch. 31):

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.

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% of the court's operating expenses from the prior fiscal year. The section also exempts certain funds from the calculation of the 1% authorized to be carried over from the prior fiscal year. Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) directed the Judicial Council, in setting allocations for the fiscal year, to reduce a trial court's allocation in the amount its prior fiscal year ending fund balance exceeded 1% of

its prior fiscal year operating expenses. Courts are also allowed to exclude encumbered funds from the cap.

### **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/infrastructure; California Rules of Court, rule 10.810—allowable facilities maintenance and repair; court efficiencies projects; and other court infrastructure projects whose work extended 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% fund balance cap—to be retained in the TCTF for the benefit of that court. At its June 1, 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, 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

### **Comments From Interested Parties**

No public comments were received when the recommendations were considered by the TCBAC's Fiscal Planning Subcommittee at its June 1, 2016 meeting.

### **Alternatives Considered and Policy Implications**

No alternatives were considered by the subcommittee. In their attached applications (see Attachments C1 through C13), the requesting courts provided alternatives they have considered if their requests are 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 C1 through C13), 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 Goal II, Independence and Accountability, of the strategic plan, 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 A: Judicial Council—Approved Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts
2. Attachment B: Summary of Requests for TCTF Funds to be Held on Behalf of the Court
3. Attachment C1: Superior Court of Glenn County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
4. Attachment C2: Superior Court of Kern County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court (1 of 2)
5. Attachment C3: Superior Court of Merced County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
6. Attachment C4: Superior Court of Monterey County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
7. Attachment C5: Superior Court of Napa County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
8. Attachment C6: Superior Court of Orange County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court (1 of 2)
9. Attachment C7: Superior Court of Sonoma County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
10. Attachment C8: Superior Court of Sacramento County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
11. Attachment C9: Superior Court of Sutter County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
12. Attachment C10: Superior Court of Placer County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
13. Attachment C11: Superior Court of Kern County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court (2 of 2)
14. Attachment C12: Superior Court of Lake County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court
15. Attachment C13: Superior Court of Orange County—Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court (2 of 2)

***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*)

- 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	Glenn	90,807	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
2	Kern	895,286	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
3	Merced	306,172	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
4	Monterey	51,914	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
5	Napa	228,196	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
6	Orange	775,384	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
7	Sonoma	830,217	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Tyler Case Management System
8	Sacramento	1,413,142	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of case management system
9	Sutter	476,962	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of case management system
10	Placer	264,870	2016-17 to 2017-18	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of case management system and telephonic appearance system
11	Kern	1,270,811	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed leased facility improvements
12	Lake	89,669	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of a minute order generation application/interface
13	Orange	200,000	2016-17	Contract extending beyond 3-year term	Delayed implementation of Interactive Voice Recognition ("IVR") system
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6,893,430</b>			

## 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:**

Glenn

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

Hon. Donald Cole Byrd, Presiding Judge

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**

evin Harrigan, CEO

**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

4/29/2016

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

JUNE 30, 2016 TO FY2016-2017

**REQUESTED AMOUNT:**

\$90,807.00

**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.):*

Utilizing section 1.a.i. of the newly approved process for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts, Glenn Superior Court respectfully requests to have \$90,807 held on its behalf in order to successfully complete the implementation of a new case management system.

Glenn is a participant in the "NorCal Project" which was a group of seven trial courts that joined together to share efforts and achieve cost savings related to the Tyler/Odyssey Case Management System. Glenn Superior Court previously encumbered \$194,000 at the end of the 2013-2014 fiscal year at which time the expiration date associated with the encumbrance was June 30, 2016. The implementation process has been delayed due to many factors, which now puts \$90,807 of the previously set aside funds at risk. Glenn Superior Court's newly scheduled go-live date for the system is November 7, 2016, which is in the 2016-2017 fiscal year. Upon approval of this application, the Court intends to utilize the previously set aside funds to pay the vendor for each deliverable upon successful completion.

**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.**

Ongoing maintenance and service of the software is within the court's annual operational budget. However, the burden of implementation costs are too large for our small court and far exceed the 1% cap on fund balance. (1% for Glenn is approximately \$30k).

The three-year encumbrance term will be exceeded due to a variety of delays during the very difficult and complex implementation process. Further, Glenn Superior Court has been in the process of preparing to move its entire operation to a temporary facility leading up to a major expansion and renovation project in the Willows Historic Courthouse. All of which is being completed with fewer staff on hand now than five years ago.

**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?**

Glenn's current case management system (Ciber) is well over 20 years old. Once operational, the new system will allow for e-filing, paper on demand, and improved interfaces with other government agencies and justice partners, among many other additional improved features when compared to the current system in use.

**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 is approximately half way through the implementation process. If the request is not approved, the Glenn Superior Court would need to find a way to cut \$90k from its budget next year in order to pay for the remaining deliverables. The Court receives approximately \$2 million dollars in Program 10 monies, \$90k is substantial to Glenn, approximately 5% of its allocation.

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

The cut referenced above in Section III. D. would be the equivalent to the loss of 1 to 1.5 FTE's to an already short staffed court where the doors are currently shut to the public at 3 p.m. each day.

**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 mostly likely alternative would be to stall project implementation all together until funding was identified elsewhere and/or being forced to make more difficult choices on staffing levels and further reductions to public access hours.

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

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

Based on the instructions provided, Glenn Superior Court is not required to submit table templates. Specifically, the instructions state, "For contracts where the work is extending beyond the three-year term, if the planned work and expenditures are expected to be completed in 2016-17, you will not need to complete any of the Excel tables."

In the spirit of thoroughness, Glenn Superior Court has completed the table templates and provided them for your reference in the event it is still helpful to the decision making process.

**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 -Please see answer in Section IV, A. above.**

**C. Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project -Please see answer in Section IV, A. above.**

**D. A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year -Please see answer in Section IV, A. above.**

## Attachment C1

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

FY 2014-15 ▼	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>357,016</b>	<b>92,431</b>	-	<b>169</b>				<b>449,617</b>
Revenues	2,045,840	446,818	255,583	61,040				<b>2,809,281</b>
Expenditures	2,261,158	491,670	279,704	61,209				<b>3,093,742</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(33,913)	9,793	24,121					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>107,785</b>	<b>57,371</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>165,156</b>

FY 2013-14 ▼	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>559,201</b>	<b>19,704</b>	-	<b>126</b>				<b>579,031</b>
Revenues	2,050,936	521,713	283,263	54,215				<b>2,910,127</b>
Expenditures	2,206,786	448,986	329,597	54,171				<b>3,039,541</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(46,335)	-	46,335					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>357,016</b>	<b>92,431</b>	-	<b>169</b>	-	-	-	<b>449,617</b>

FY 2012-13 ▼	FUNDS							
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>757,663</b>	<b>1,627</b>	-	-				<b>759,290</b>
Revenues	2,055,272	476,447	269,916	40,289				<b>2,841,923</b>
Expenditures	2,218,531	458,370	305,118	40,163				<b>3,022,182</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)	(35,202)	-	35,202					-
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>559,201</b>	<b>19,704</b>	-	<b>126</b>	-	-	-	<b>579,031</b>



## Attachment C1

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 cc

	FY 2015-16		FUNDS					
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources	2,105,729	19,260		58,890				2,183,879
Grants		-	273,939					273,939
Other Financing Sources		509,929	-					509,929
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>2,105,729</b>	<b>529,189</b>	<b>273,939</b>	<b>58,890</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,967,747</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries	1,006,544	334,889	55,682					1,397,115
Staff Benefits	594,206	132,010	32,489					758,705
General Expense	63,400	15,903	6,041					85,344
Printing	12,001		1,158					13,159
Telecommunications	54,166	4,962	1,910					61,038
Postage	4,902	13,884	1,897					20,683
Insurance	1,800							1,800
Travel in State	15,147		1,700					16,847
Travel Out of State								-
Training			800					800
Security			750					750
Facilities Operations				58,890				58,890
Utilities	10,000							10,000
Contracted Services	406,402	14,069	145,875					566,346
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	1,800		14,000					15,800
Information Technology (IT)	3,600	5,465						9,065
Major Equipment	-	-						-
Other Items of Expense	1,298							1,298
Juror Costs	5,193							5,193
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation	(57,755)	46,118	11,637					-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>2,122,704</b>	<b>567,300</b>	<b>273,939</b>	<b>58,890</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,022,833</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>107,785</b>	<b>57,371</b>						<b>165,156</b>
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>90,810</b>	<b>19,260</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>110,070</b>

## Attachment C1

## Current detailed budget projection on court's behalf

	FY 2016-17	FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources	2,105,729	19,260		-				2,124,989
Grants		-	273,939					273,939
Other Financing Sources		509,929	-					509,929
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>2,105,729</b>	<b>529,189</b>	<b>273,939</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,908,857</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries	988,762	304,400	55,682					1,348,844
Staff Benefits	594,206	132,010	32,489					758,705
General Expense	63,400	15,903	6,041					85,344
Printing	12,001		1,158					13,159
Telecommunications	54,166	4,962	1,910					61,038
Postage	4,902	13,884	1,897					20,683
Insurance	1,800							1,800
Travel in State	15,147		1,700					16,847
Travel Out of State								-
Training			800					800
Security			750					750
Facilities Operations				-				-
Utilities	10,000							10,000
Contracted Services	406,402	14,069	145,875					566,346
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	1,800		14,000					15,800
Information Technology (IT)	94,407	5,465						99,872
Major Equipment	-	19,260						19,260
Other Items of Expense	1,298							1,298
Juror Costs	6,000							6,000
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation	(57,755)	38,496	11,637					(7,622)
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>2,196,536</b>	<b>548,449</b>	<b>273,939</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,018,924</b>
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>90,810</b>	<b>19,260</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>110,070</b>
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3</b>

## Attachment C1

## Current detailed budget projection:

	Select Fiscal Year ▼	FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources								-
Grants								-
Other Financing Sources								-
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries								-
Staff Benefits								-
General Expense								-
Printing								-
Telecommunications								-
Postage								-
Insurance								-
Travel in State								-
Travel Out of State								-
Training								-
Security								-
Facilities Operations								-
Utilities								-
Contracted Services								-
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided								-
Information Technology (IT)								-
Major Equipment								-
Other Items of Expense								-
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

## Attachment C1

## Current detailed budget projection:

	Select Fiscal Year ▼	FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources								-
Grants								-
Other Financing Sources								-
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries								-
Staff Benefits								-
General Expense								-
Printing								-
Telecommunications								-
Postage								-
Insurance								-
Travel in State								-
Travel Out of State								-
Training								-
Security								-
Facilities Operations								-
Utilities								-
Contracted Services								-
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided								-
Information Technology (IT)								-
Major Equipment								-
Other Items of Expense								-
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

## Attachment C1

## Current detailed budget projection:

	Select Fiscal Year	FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources								-
Grants								-
Other Financing Sources								-
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries								-
Staff Benefits								-
General Expense								-
Printing								-
Telecommunications								-
Postage								-
Insurance								-
Travel in State								-
Travel Out of State								-
Training								-
Security								-
Facilities Operations								-
Utilities								-
Contracted Services								-
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided								-
Information Technology (IT)								-
Major Equipment								-
Other Items of Expense								-
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

## Attachment C1

## Current detailed budget projection:

	Select Fiscal Year	FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources								-
Grants								-
Other Financing Sources								-
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries								-
Staff Benefits								-
General Expense								-
Printing								-
Telecommunications								-
Postage								-
Insurance								-
Travel in State								-
Travel Out of State								-
Training								-
Security								-
Facilities Operations								-
Utilities								-
Contracted Services								-
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided								-
Information Technology (IT)								-
Major Equipment								-
Other Items of Expense								-
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

## Attachment C1

## Current detailed budget projection:

	Select Fiscal Year ▼	FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources								-
Grants								-
Other Financing Sources								-
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries								-
Staff Benefits								-
General Expense								-
Printing								-
Telecommunications								-
Postage								-
Insurance								-
Travel in State								-
Travel Out of State								-
Training								-
Security								-
Facilities Operations								-
Utilities								-
Contracted Services								-
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided								-
Information Technology (IT)								-
Major Equipment								-
Other Items of Expense								-
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

## Attachment C1

## Current detailed budget projection:

	Select Fiscal Year ▼	FUNDS						
Description	General	Special Revenue Non-Grant	Special Revenue Grant	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Proprietary	Fiduciary	TOTAL
<b>REVENUES</b>								
State Financing Sources								-
Grants								-
Other Financing Sources								-
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
Salaries								-
Staff Benefits								-
General Expense								-
Printing								-
Telecommunications								-
Postage								-
Insurance								-
Travel in State								-
Travel Out of State								-
Training								-
Security								-
Facilities Operations								-
Utilities								-
Contracted Services								-
Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided								-
Information Technology (IT)								-
Major Equipment								-
Other Items of Expense								-
Juror Costs								-
Other								-
Debt Service								-
Court Construction								-
Distributed Administration & Allocation								-
Prior Year Expense Adjustment								-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Transfers In (Out)								-
<b>Fund Balance (Deficit)</b>								
<b>Beginning Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
<b>Ending Balance (Deficit)</b>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3



## Attachment C1

## 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	
940000	Consulting and Professional Services - County Provided	
943000	Information Technology (IT)	90,807
945000	Major Equipment	
950000	Other Items of Expense	
972000	Other	
973000	Debt Service	
983000	Court Construction	
990000	Distributed Administration & Allocation	
<b>Total</b>		<b>90,807</b>

## Attachment C1

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

Description	FY 2015-16 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Select Fiscal Year ▼	Total
Contribution	90,807								90,807
Expenditures		90,807							90,807
Cumulative Balance	90,807	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	181,614

## 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:**

Kern

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

Terry McNally, Court Executive Officer

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**Debra Ostlund, Deputy CEO-Finance [debra.ostlund@kern.courts.ca.gov](mailto:debra.ostlund@kern.courts.ca.gov)**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

4/29/2016

**TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2016/17****REQUESTED AMOUNT:**

\$89 ,286 estimated

**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 Superior Court, County of Kern, entered into a contract with Tyler Technologies, Inc. to replace its antiquated, legacy case management system provided by the County for the last 30-years. The new system will enhance court operations by providing a single case management system for all case types improving the operations of the Court. Further, the County of Kern Justice partners have also agreed to migrate to the new case management system providing for a fully integrated system using new technology including a digital file storage, e-filing, and other similar state-of-the-art enhancements that will improve the management of cases through the entire local justice system.

The Court's contract with Tyler Technologies Inc. provided for an amount of local programming, integration and development to comply with statutory obligations and requirements for court operations in California. Tyler Technologies Inc. subsequently signed agreements with another 25 or more courts in California. This will enable Courts in California to collaborate on a large number of state-wide development initiatives including DMV and DOJ interface, electronic citation processing, state-wide e-filing, and other similar improvements. However, due to programmer constraints local development efforts have been delayed. In turn, encumbered funds necessary to pay for the remaining project deliverables and any local development will not be expended within the three-year term of the agreement.

It is respectfully requested that the Superior Court, County of Kern, be allowed to carryover encumbered local funds to finalize this project, the second phase—Go-live for the Criminal, Traffic and Juvenile case management components—planned for completion in the fall of 2016.

**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 Superior Court, County of Kern, like many other courts in California was anticipating the provision of a new case management system with the launch of CCMS. With the demise of this project, the Court utilized its reserve balances to fund a vendor solution based on a recently approved MSA. The MSA provided for case management solutions from four approved vendors including Tyler Technologies, Inc. These one-time funding resources were accumulated from operational savings accrued over years and would be impossible to replace in the short term. To replace the encumbered funds, the Court would be required to implement reductions in staffing and service levels to save the necessary resources from operational budgets, given the current 1% cap on reserve funding.

**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?**

A new case management system will have a significant operational impact on the courts. The new system will include integration with Probation, the Sheriff, Public Defender and the District Attorney. Further it will include e-filing capabilities, integration with a digital document management system, and other similar functionality that have been proven by other Courts in California and the United States to improve efficiency and effectiveness of court operations.

**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 would not be able to complete the second phase of the Case management system for the installation of the Criminal, Juvenile and Traffic components of the system. Nor would the court be able to pay for local integration and development programming to fully enhance the interconnecting planned with local justice partners.

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

Current case management systems do not provide for e-filing or digital document storage. Thus, court users will not be able to access court documents and other case information without the necessity of personal visits to court. Some court locations in Kern are two-hour, one-way trips from the County Seat in Bakersfield.

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

Maintain the current system that is costing the court in excess of \$1/2 million in annual transaction fees paid to the County of Kern for maintenance of the legacy case management system.

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**

N/A

Deliverable and Milestone Payment Schedule

Deliverable and Milestone Payment Schedule													
Phases		EXHIBIT E SOW Deliverables		Invoices				EXHIBIT G					
		Criminal	Delivery Date	Invoice Date	Gross Amt	10% retention	Net Amt Pd	Project Mgr. Signoff -	CONTRACT AMOUNT	10% Retention *	Net Payment w/invoice		
C2	1	1.1.1	Project Mgmt Plan	11/18/13	12/26/13	92,000	9,200	82,800	T Davis signed orig.	13	92,000	9,200	82,800
		1.1.2	Project Operational Plans	12/3/13	12/26/13	116,000	11,600	104,400	T Davis signed orig.	13	116,000	11,600	104,400
		1.2.1	Business Process Review Report	4/9/14	9/17/14	122,000	12,200	109,800	T Davis signed orig.	13	122,000	12,200	109,800
		1.3.1	Solution Design	1/8/14	3/11/14	114,120	11,412	102,708	T Davis signed orig.	13	114,120	11,412	102,708
		2.1.1	Certification of Infrastructure Environment	2/11/14	3/27/14	98,000	9,800	88,200	T Davis signed orig.	13	98,000	9,800	88,200
		2.3.1	* Application CPD Documents - Civil	5/7/14						13	68,216	6,822	61,394
		2.3.2	* Application CPD Documents - Criminal	5/7/14						13	68,214	6,821	61,393
		2.3.3	* Application Development Complete - Civil	11/10/14						14	68,214	6,821	61,393
		2.3.4	* Application Development Complete - Crim	5/13/15						14	68,214	6,821	61,393
		2.4.1	* Integration CPD Documents	5/7/14	4/11/16	68,214	6,821	61,393	T Davis signed orig.	13	68,214	6,821	61,393
Attachment	2.4.2	* Integration Development Complete - Civil	11/17/14							14	68,214	6,821	61,393
	2.4.3	* Integration Development Complete - Crim	5/20/15							14	68,214	6,821	61,393
	3.1.1	Configuration Plan	1/29/14	3/11/14	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	13	50,000	5,000	45,000	
		3.1.1.2	Case Mgr Configuration Wkshp Complete	3/19/14	3/20/14	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	13	50,000	5,000	45,000
		3.1.1.3	Security Workshop Completed	5/14/14	1/27/15	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	13	50,000	5,000	45,000
		3.1.1.4	Forms Workshop Completed	5/27/14	10/14/14	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	13	50,000	5,000	45,000
		3.1.1.5	Configuration Tracking Spreadsheet - Civ	7/14/14	4/24/15	20,000	2,000	18,000	T Davis signed orig.	14	20,000	2,000	18,000
	3.1.2	3.1.2.1	Load of Legacy Data into Staging Database	2/5/14	3/11/14	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	13	50,000	5,000	45,000
		3.1.2.2	Completion of Data Mapping	4/9/14	8/13/14	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	13	50,000	5,000	45,000
		3.1.2.3	First Data Conversion Push	4/16/14	7/15/14	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	13	50,000	5,000	45,000
	3.1.2.4	Go-Live Push to Production	8/25/14	6/30/15	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	14	50,000	5,000	45,000	
3.1.3	3.1.3.1	* User Acceptance Testing Report - Civil	1/21/15	1/27/15	50,000	5,000	45,000	T Davis signed orig.	14	50,000	5,000	45,000	
3.1.4	3.1.4.1	Go-Live Transition Plan	1/28/15						14	82,000	8,200	73,800	
	3.1.4.2	Training Plans and Materials - Civil	1/28/15	1/30/15	99,000	9,900	89,100	T Davis signed orig.	14	99,000	9,900	89,100	
	3.1.4.3	Go-Live Status Reports	4/10/15	6/30/15	86,000	8,600	77,400	T Davis signed orig.	14	86,000	8,600	77,400	
3.1.5	3.1.5.1	E-Filing Configuration Documentation - Civ	6/25/15						14				
	3.1.5.3	E-Filing Training Plans & Materials - Civil	7/16/15						15				
	3.1.5.4	E-Filing Go-Live Status Reports - Civil	7/31/15						15				
3.2.1	3.2.1.1	Configuration Plan - Criminal	5/1/15	11/13/15	35,000	3,500	31,500	T Davis signed orig.	14	35,000	3,500	31,500	
	3.2.1.2	Case Mgr Configuration Wkshp Complete	5/21/15	3/18/16	35,000	3,500	31,500	T Davis signed orig.	14	35,000	3,500	31,500	
	3.2.1.3	Security Workshop Completed	7/16/15						15	35,000	3,500	31,500	
	3.2.1.4	Forms Workshop Completed	9/2/15	4/11/16	35,000	3,500	31,500	T Davis signed orig.	15	35,000	3,500	31,500	
	3.2.1.5	Configuration Tracking Spreadsheet	9/15/15						15	35,000	3,500	31,500	
3.2.2	3.2.2.1	Load of Legacy Data into Staging Database	6/4/15	3/9/16	18,000	1,800	16,200	T Davis signed orig.	14	18,000	1,800	16,200	
	3.2.2.2	Completion of Data Mapping	8/6/15	3/9/16	18,000	1,800	16,200	T Davis signed orig.	15	18,000	1,800	16,200	
	3.2.2.3	First Data Conversion Push	8/13/15	3/9/16	18,000	1,800	16,200	T Davis signed orig.	15	18,000	1,800	16,200	
	3.2.2.4	Go-Live Push to Production	12/22/15						15	18,000	1,800	16,200	
3.2.3	3.2.3.1	* User Acceptance Testing Report - Criminal	2/4/16						15	50,000	5,000	45,000	
3.2.4	3.2.4.1	Go-Live Transition Plan	3/15/16						15	89,000	8,900	80,100	
	3.2.4.2	Training Plans and Materials - Crim	3/15/16						15	79,000	7,900	71,100	
	3.2.4.3	Go-Live Status Reports	5/12/16						15	84,000	8,400	75,600	
	3.2.5.1	E-Filing Configuration Documentation - Cr	7/25/16						16				
	3.2.5.2	E-Filing Acceptance Testing Rpt - Cr	8/8/16						16				
	3.2.5.3	E-Filing Training Plans & Materials - Cr	8/15/16						16				
	3.2.5.4	E-Filing Go-Live Status Reports - Cr	8/30/16						16				
	4.1.	Project closeout Report	9/27/16						16	14,000	1,400	12,600	
3500 hours	*				\$ 1,424,334	\$ 142,433	\$ 1,281,901		2,319,620	231,962	2,087,658		
		Criminal	Civil										
					(2,319,620)			Potential funds lost	168,000				

Note: The 10% retention is payable upon final acceptance, go-live and productive use of the complete Odyssey Platform set forth in Exhibit C of the Tyler contract.

(2,319,620)  
(895,286) unspent @4/27/16

Potential funds lost  
Definite funds lost  
Custom development  
Total Funds at Risk

168,000  
98,000  
477,500  
743,500

x-ck 2,319,620

# 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:

Merced

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

Linda Romero Soles

### CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

eri Brasil, CFO

Keri.Brasil@mercedcourt.org or (209) 72 -41 6

### DATE OF SUBMISSION:

4/26/2016

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

### REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$306,171.81

### 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.):*

Merced Superior Court is requesting that our funds be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted fund balance due to work that has not been completed on an active purchase order with a signed contract. The contract is for our Tyler Case Management system project. This project will extend beyond the original planned three-year encumbrance period. The remaining funds on this purchase order are for the completion of - Clerks Edition, Customized ECR Report – CourTools and the Travel Reimbursement for Tyler Support staff assigned to the Clerks Edition project.

## 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.

Merced Superior Court went live with its new CMS (Tyler) for all case types on November 1, 2014. Since implementation there are still a number of outstanding issues/areas that were not completed and have been delayed. Some of these CMS components are in design or in production. Tyler's resources have also been limited due to the number of CA courts implementing their CMS all at once. Some of these components include: 1) DMV interface for Priors, 2) Abstract reporting, 3) Traffic School, 4) Warrant interface, 5) OCR jobs, 6) Judges Edition system, 7) Access to documents via web portal, 8) Customized ECR reports (Courtools, Amnesty Quarterly, Prop 47, AB109).

In addition, the number of court staff hours needed to develop and configure the Clerk's Edition portion of the system is approximately 400 hours plus an additional 400 hours required by Tyler developers. Our court was requested that we delay this portion of the project due to the issues that the Fresno and San Bernardino courts



Attachment C3  
were experiencing with Clerk's Edition. Tyler's specialists on Clerk Edition are focused on Fresno/San Berdo Courts and will not be available to assist our court until the 2016/2017 fiscal year, which places us beyond the three-year encumbrance term.

Customized ECR Reports listed above are being delayed until 2016/17. Due to this delay in completion, this places us beyond the three-year encumbrance term.

### **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?**

By allowing the court to use its encumbered funds for the projects listed above, the court, its justice partners and the public will all benefit and experience many efficiencies. Tyler's Clerks Edition is designed to work in conjunction with the Odyssey Case Manager as well as Judge's Edition. Clerk's Edition is a separate application used to expedite the data entry for the clerk during the court and enter the data in real time instead of writing the case updates manually and later entering them into the system after court sessions. Clerk's Edition also communicates directly with the Judge's Edition application which allows our judicial officers to view the updates made directly to the case immediately. This cannot be completed at present with our existing structure as Judge's Edition does not communicate directly with Odyssey in real time and our Courtroom clerks utilize the Minute Dialog in Odyssey to complete their orders. Information from the Odyssey Case Management system is downloaded in an overnight batch process into the Judge's Edition for the next business day so any last minute changes or updates made to a case is not reflected in the Judge's Edition.

The additional custom reports that will be designed for the Merced Superior Court will be shared with other CA courts thus making this efficient on a statewide basis for those 24 courts utilizing the Tyler system. Many of these reports are transmitted to the JCC.

**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.**

The court has an active purchase order and signed contract with Tyler to get the remaining items completed on this project. If this request is not approved the court will have a project that is not fully completed and thus not be allowed to benefit from the efficiencies and enhancements it is required to provide.

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

If this request is not approved this will limit the access to justice not only to the public but to our justice partners as well. Minute orders for court appearances will be delayed to the public. This will affect information that is also provided to the justice partners including the Sheriff's Department responsible for inmates.

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

Holding the courts funds is the preferred alternative otherwise the court will lose the funds that have been encumbered to complete its CMS project. If the courts request is denied, the Merced Superior Court will lose \$306,172 in Trial Court Trust Funds due to circumstances beyond the courts control.



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:

Monterey

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

Teresa Risi, Court Executive Officer

### CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

John Fleisher, Court Financial Officer

[John.fleisher@monterey.courts.ca.gov](mailto:John.fleisher@monterey.courts.ca.gov)

831-77 - 467

### DATE OF SUBMISSION:

4/29/2016

### TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: FY 2016/17

### REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$ 1,914

### 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.):*

Monterey Superior Court is in the process of implementing Tyler's Odyssey Case Management system, a project which was originally scheduled for completion by June 30<sup>th</sup> 2016. However, though our court has achieved steady progress of its implementation, due to circumstances beyond the control of the court, the expected completion date of this project will extend into FY 2016/17. As a result, the court anticipates \$51,914 of FY 2013/14 fund balance encumbered to fund the project will not be liquidated by the deadline of 6/30/16 and will be reverted to TCTF due to the 1% cap on fund balance calculated for FY 2013/14. It is necessary for the court to retain access to this funding to ensure project completion and avoid negative impact to services that would occur if not completed. This request is based on estimates of project deliverables completed by the current liquidation deadline of June 30, 2016 and may require revision after close of FY 2015/16. Please see attached for additional details relating to the project status and this request.

## 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 funding for this significant, multi-year project was encumbered from the court's fund balance during FY 13/14, the year in which the court entered into a contract as would be appropriate for a project of this purpose and scope. Funding of long-term (multi-year) projects or initiatives is one of the specific and appropriate functions of fund balance, funding the remaining \$51,914 from its FY16/17 annual appropriation would place undue burden on the court by requiring the court to replace previously available long-term funding set aside for the project with funding intended for normal annual operations. Though some level of reinvestment in the trial courts has occurred in recent fiscal years, those increases have not fully offset the significant reductions of the preceding years, and has resulted in a current level of funding which presents challenges to the court being able to fully fund its needs relating to annual operations. This request is intended to mitigate the negative impact to the court due to the requirement of fully liquidating the 3 year encumbrance by the end of the current fiscal year and undue restrictions relating to the 1% fund balance cap. It is relevant to note the agreement between the court and the vendor for this project was entered into near the end of FY 13/14, resulting in an actual encumbrance period of less than 3 full years of encumbrance.

**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's case management system is central to the court effecting its primary function and responsibility to the public in facilitating full and open access to the justice system. Implementation of the Tyler platform capitalizes on significant advances in technology achieved since the design of the Court's current case management system (Sustain). Further, the implementation of Odyssey is a cornerstone of the court's initiative to migrate to fully electronic processes and workflows, ensuring the court is able to capitalize on the superior efficiencies and effectiveness afforded by current day technological capacities.

**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 implementation plan for the court is one based on a staggered implementation based on categorization of specific case types identified as either civil or criminal case activities. The court has already completed migration of civil case types with preparations for migration of criminal case types currently in progress. In order to accomplish full implementation for all case types, it is necessary for the court to temporarily maintain use of the new and old platforms which also requires maintenance costs for both systems and additional staff resources to support two different processes and workflow designs for each system. If the court were to lose access to the funding needed to complete the project, it would increase the likelihood of prolonging the need for maintaining both systems for an extended duration, preventing the court from operating at level of necessary efficiency and unnecessarily increasing the overall costs to the court relating to this initiative.

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

In addition to delaying the realization of increased efficiencies relating to the migration to the Odyssey platform and negative impact to optimum efficiency of court processes and workflows during the implementation period, the implementation of a new case management system requires a significant commitment of court personnel and related resources which must be balanced with normal provision of ongoing service levels to the public. Should the completion of the project be jeopardized or unnecessarily delayed due to access to funding, it would exacerbate the difficulties presented to the court in maintaining open access to justice with the resources currently available.

**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 necessity of this request directly correlates to the restriction placed on trial courts regarding the 1% cap on fund balance, which as illustrated by the circumstances of the encumbrance for this project, is clearly detrimental to the court's ability to utilize fund balance for its specific and appropriate function. Unless a revision to the 1% limit were to become effective for fiscal year 2016/17, which is highly unlikely, the court would likely have no option but to utilize funding intended for its normal and ongoing operation from its FY 2016/17 annual allocation. Considering the current trend of continued decline of revenues from collection of fines and fees and significant increases to personnel benefit and other costs beyond the courts control is expected to continue, the court seeks to avoid further negative impact to available resources for annual operations by ensuring its project will be funded appropriately from sources originally available to the court when this project was initiated in FY 13/14.

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**

N/A

## **APPLICATION FOR TCTF FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT**

### **Section I, Reason for Request continued.**

On May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Monterey Superior court utilized the then recently established MSA (Master Service Agreement) by entering into a participation agreement with Tyler Technologies to implement Tyler's Odyssey case management system which included \$476,568 for implementation costs based on a schedule of 33 specifically identified deliverables and/or project milestones. The court issued a purchase order on June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014 which encumbered the implementation costs from fiscal year 2013/14 fund balance and required the full liquidation of this encumbrance by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> fiscal year of encumbrance which is June 30, 2016. The court is required to liquidate this encumbrance based on successful completion of identified deliverables as they occur, and though the original project timeline would have allowed for full liquidation by June 30, 2016, extension of the timeline necessary to complete all deliverables due to circumstances beyond the court's control will result in an estimated 7 deliverables totaling \$137, 568 to remain unliquidated as of June 30, 2016. The progress of the project has resulted in completion of deliverables relating to civil case activities, with the remaining deliverables relating to criminal case activities.

Although the total of unliquidated encumbrance as of June 30, 2016 is expected to be \$137,568, review of the court's FY 13/14 1% fund balance calculation indicates it was \$85,654 below the 1% threshold, which will result in reversion of \$51,914 of these unliquidated funds to the TCTF. This request for restriction of \$51,914 of TCTF on behalf of Monterey Superior Court is to specifically offset the negative impact to the court resulting from the requirement that it revert funds previously identified, available, and restricted appropriately at the local level for use to fund a significant capital project that is currently in progress.

Based on the specific intended use and source of funding relating to this request, we believe approval of this request would be entirely consistent with the appropriate function, utilization, and classification of fund balance. Should this request be approved the court anticipates full liquidation by June 30, 2017.

Your consideration of this request is greatly appreciated.

## 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:

Napa

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

Richard D. Feldstein

#### CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

Lisa Skinner 707-299-1248 lisa.skinner@napacourt.com

#### DATE OF SUBMISSION:

4/27/2016

#### TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2013/14 FUNDS TO BE USED IN 2016/17

#### REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$228,196

#### 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.):*

In fiscal year 2013/14, the court entered into a collaborative agreement with Tyler Technologies to provide new Case Management Systems (CMS) for Napa, Monterey, and Santa Clara courts in the same project. The collaborative agreement was designed to share expertise among the courts, create a greater uniformity, and for all three courts to be able to share in some of the vendor costs, therefore reducing the overall costs to all three courts. During the project planning phases early in the project, Tyler determined that it did not have sufficient resources to meet the original timeline set out in the initially agreed upon project plan. Specifically, the implementation resources that Tyler needed to support all three courts were needed in one location at a time, and therefore we had to stagger the implementation of the first phase further out to give each of the courts more attention in the months both before and after our implementation dates. The same strategy will need to be used for Phase II of each of our courts implementation, staggering out the three implementation dates through the end of fiscal year 2016/17.

### SECTION II: AMENDED REQUEST CHANGES N/A

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 project was based on a cooperative effort share the costs and establish greater intra-court uniformity. As such, it requires more time to allow for joining meetings and coordinating efforts that reduced the cost of the project by approximately 25% for Napa.

**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?**

Our current CMS (Sustain Justice Edition/SJE) is an outdated technology that will no longer be supported by the vendor. This project provides an updated CMS that is uniform with the majority of the other courts throughout the state and allows for greater sharing of future enhancements and maintenance costs. More importantly, the new CMS provides greater access to court services than the current CMS, in particular eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities.

**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.**

The court would have to either reduce services to the public and our justice partners to shift funding to the completion of this project. This would likely result in additional lay off of employees beyond those that occurred during the Great Recession. Such actions would bring the courts operations to a virtual halt as we have already reduced staffing from 91 FTEs in 2009 to only 69 in 2016. The court would be forced to reduce its operating hours further from its current hours which are already insufficient to provide adequate access to justice services.

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

The court has successfully implemented the new CMS for civil, family law, probate, small claims, and juvenile dependency cases. If this request is not approved and the funding reverted back to the Trial Court Trust Fund, the court would be unable to complete its implementation of the CMS for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency matters. As a result, the court would not be able to utilize the systems capabilities in the areas of eFiling, Internet portal access to case information, on-line automated self-represented litigant document preparation and filing services, court kiosks programs, cell and note pad access for judges, and internal workflow capabilities to increase access by litigants, justice partners, and other members of the public seeking services and information for criminal, traffic, and juvenile delinquency 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?**

The only alternatives available are:

1. The reduction of court services and access and shifting of current operating funds to the project as described in the answer to Item D.
2. Seek additional funding from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Council or through a Budget Change Proposal.

Both of these alternatives are undesirable because:

1. They would potentially draw funding away from other courts who are also in need to technology resources.
2. They would bring the project to a complete halt for one to two years thereby depriving the courts constituency of the badly needed technological improvements described above.
3. Such lengthy delays often result in increased costs as the stop and start process causes a great deal of duplication of project management and technological tasks.
4. We would have to maintain our current CMS system longer than expected and longer than budgeted. This is problematic for several reasons. This version is using very outdated technology. We would need to maintain separate versions of Microsoft products to maintain both the old and the new CMS systems. This platform is also in the process of being obsoleted by the vendor. This will affect our ability to maintain the system and the maintenance costs could skyrocket, if supported at all. We would also need to continue to pay for license costs in addition to paying for the new CMS license costs.

**SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

**N/A PER INSTRUCTIONS SINCE EXPENDITURES ARE EXPECTED TO BE COMPLETED DURING 2016/17 FISCAL YEAR**

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:**

Orange

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

Alan Carlson, Court Executive Officer

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**Tanya Vu; [t2vu@occourts.org](mailto:t2vu@occourts.org); 657-622-5123 (Project Manager)Katrina Coreces; [kcoreces@occourts.org](mailto:kcoreces@occourts.org); 657-622-7739 (Financial Planning)**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

4/28/2016

**TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 7/1/2016 – 6/30/2018****REQUESTED AMOUNT:**

\$775,384.00

**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.):

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 Odyssey Case Management System ("CMS") from Tyler Technologies ("Tyler") to replace the Court's outdated Banner CMS, which supports Family Law and Juvenile case types, as well as the conversion of its Civil Cashiering System (CCS), which was the cashiering system built to support the Banner system. As such, the Court required professional and consulting services to assist with a gap analysis, configuration, data conversion, testing and implementation. This 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.

At the end of 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 will be completed before June 30, 2016. With several deliverables still outstanding, the new CMS for Family Law and Juvenile finally went live on December 7, 2015. The three-year encumbrance period ends on June 30, 2016 but there are still outstanding deliverables and \$775,384 in encumbered funds left. This request asks that the Judicial Council hold \$775,384 in encumbered funds on the Court's behalf beyond June 30, 2016, in order to allow the Court complete the CMS implementation by June 30, 2018.

**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.**

Due to the size of the project, the complexity of the case types implemented, and Tyler's limited resources, Tyler was unable to deliver all of the custom development needed for improved efficiencies and cost savings solutions by the three-year encumbrance term. Due to severe funding restrictions, the Court cannot afford an allocation



reduction of \$783,137 (figure based on FY 2014-15 One Percent Calculation Form ("1% Form") in FY 2016-17 and spend an additional \$775,384 in FY 2016-17 funds in order to complete the implementation.

### **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?**

By extending the encumbrance term, Tyler will be able to finish the development work to improve critical court operations, for example, generating minute orders effectively, accurately, and in a timely manner. Additionally, OC implemented a Juvenile Dependency appointed counsel payment process that automates the tracking of billing/payment to attorneys for their representation of the minor or parent which Tyler has not completely delivered.

**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.**

Because of inefficiencies in the current version of the CMS, backlogs of minute order continue to grow, impacting other court operations areas. Judges and attorneys do not have up to date information, attorney payment processing is delayed, there are a higher numbers of phone calls from the public to get information on the status of their case, and disruption of the courtrooms when people ask about cases previously heard where no minute order is yet available. Court will also require additional staff resources to process attorney payments.

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

The backlogs of minute order are impacting services to children and families as well as funding. For example, families and 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 resulted in the Court not being prepared to hear 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?**

Two alternatives that the Court has identified are:

1) At the end of the fiscal year, sign off on, and pay for, the juvenile dependency contract attorney process that automates the tracking of billing/payment to attorneys for their representation of the minor or parent which Tyler has not completely and effectively delivered in order to minimize the loss of encumbered funds. In addition, forego unused development hours and lose \$280,800 as Tyler simply cannot deliver by June 30, 2016. This means that Tyler will not be able to continue development work to improve critical court operations such as generating minute orders effectively, accurately, and in a timely manner. Although this option reduces the Court's FY 2016-17 allocation reduction to \$283,608 (figure based on 1% Form), this significantly reduces the benefits of the new CMS and increases the staff resources required to perform everyday tasks.

2) Encumber an additional \$775,384 of FY 2016-17 funds in order for Tyler to complete the implementation. This alternative will result in an allocation reduction of \$783,137 (figure based on 1% Form) in FY 2016-17 and an additional use of \$775,384 in FY 2016-17 funds. This is a waste of public funds and the Court simply cannot afford this option.

#### **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

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	Select Fiscal Year	Total
Contribution	775,384									775,384
Expenditures	775,384									775,384
Cumulative Balance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



## 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:**

Sonoma

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

Jose Guillen

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**

Cindia Martinez, Asst. CEO, 707-521-6854, cmartine@sonomacourt.org

**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

5/9/2016

**TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:** ORIGINAL ENCUM. FY 12/13, EXPIRING 6/30/16. WILL INCUR REMAINING EXPENDITURE IN FY 16/17 AND REQUEST CONTRIBUTION FOR THAT PERIOD

**REQUESTED AMOUNT:**

\$ 830,217.46

**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.): Conversion to Odyssey , Tyler Case Management System- The Court contracted with Tyler Technologies in FY 13/14 off of Master Agreement MA 132003, The contract was for the Odyssey Case Management System with a big-bang implementation for all case types set to be carried out in five phases, including pre-implementation planning and business process review; design and development of the overall solution; completion of the deployment of the CMS; deployment of e-filing; and close out of the project. The contract includes software licensing, maintenance and support services, and electronic filing. The Court was originally planned to go live in Sept. 2015, but has since been delayed 3 times and is currently anticipated to go live hopefully by Dec. 2016. These delays are a result of the availability of limited Tyler resources, given multiple conversions in California. Further, our integrated Criminal System and fully automated Traffic System have proved challenging for Tyler with their limited resources. The Court currently uses a County built, fully integrated system and cannot convert to Odyssey until all interfaces have been completed and all data conversion errors have been resolved. As indicated, our current Traffic System, which operates from a web-based program (eCourt by Daily Journal Technologies) contains a multitude of automated workflow that exceeds the current Tyler offering and if implemented as currently configured, that would result in going backwards in technology and efficiency. This has created increased work for Tyler to make the court whole with the Traffic System. The Court has added a project management consultant firm to assist the court in meeting deliverables and identifying risk factors that continue to create delays for the project. Court and Tyler Technologies are mutually working toward a successful implementation and developing a comprehensive mitigation plan to phase-in implementation.

**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 total purchase price of this conversion and new case management system could not be met out of our annual operation budget, without laying off a significant number of our workforce. Therefore we used reserved funds, prior to the 1% restriction toward this project, which the Court had been planning and saving for. With the implementation of the 1% restrictions, this moved up our timeline for this project so that we would not lose the funds we had been reserving. Since we were still finishing our conversion to a new Traffic system, this created a resource depletion for the Court, juggling two large projects. Additionally, as mentioned above, Tyler's resources were also limited due to the roll-out of multiple courts requiring new case managements systems during the same three year period. There was also a shift in the project team from Tyler as it appeared we had less experienced Tyler resources which further caused delays. We have already exceeded the number of data pushes in order to clean up the data and we still have no Traffic workflow and multitude of errors in the financials. Therefore our court will not approve the go-live date until we have overcome these important issues and mitigated high risk areas.

#### **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?**

Our current County legacy CMS is 30 years old and is not a web based system. Since the system is owned by the county, it requires competition for improvements to the system over other county departments and at a significant cost. A web based system will allow more data to be shared across the internet as well as implement e-Filing, increasing the efficiency for users, reducing workload and improving accuracy. It will also allow the court to control its case management system allowing for increased improvements, data collection and further technology considerations.

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

While ultimately the conversion to this new system will save the court money, at least initially, it was not the ultimate basis for the project. Increasing efficiency and access to justice were the key drivers in making this decision.

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

The court will continue on an expensive system which will not allow for increased efficiencies in operations and improving workload backlogs and optimizing our resources. Training on this old antiquated system remains a challenge for new court employees and validating data is difficult to achieve. Since e-filing is not an option on the current system it causes more court resources to process paper and can result in more errors. If we are not able to carry forward the remaining encumbrance to finish this project, the investment, both in terms of dollars and staffing costs, made thus far by all parties will be lost.

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

The current non-user friendly system continues to limit public access to court information and requires that they physically come to the courthouse to access this current system. If we are unable to convert to a web based system it will continue this inefficient process and create additional delays and inefficient access to justice. Additionally e-filing is not an option for users, continuing the same inefficient and expensive use of court runners in order to file documents.

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

These funds were specifically set aside for this project. If this request is not approved the court loses over \$830,000 which would require us to eliminate positions in FY 16/17 in order to complete the project out of our annual operating budget. It would create a staffing shortfall at a time when we need all staff to complete and learn the new case management system. It could result in a failure of the conversion, requiring additional delays in creating the project, which further delays the public's improved access to justice and loss of efforts and CMS investment.

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



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

DAVID DE ALBA  
ASSISTANT PRESIDING JUDGE  
DEPARTMENT 30

720 9TH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814  
(916) 874-7861

April 28, 2016

Mr. Martin Hoshino  
Administrative Director  
Judicial Council of California  
2860 Gateway Oaks, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: Request to Retain Funds Previously Encumbered

Dear Mr. Hoshino:

The Sacramento Superior Court is formally requesting, per the Judicial Council's recently adopted application process, to retain funds previously encumbered beyond the three year encumbrance period for three (3) Case Management System (CMS) projects. The CMS projects were originally encumbered in FY 2013-14, with an encumbrance expiration date of June 30, 2016. This previously encumbered funding is expected to be exhausted in FY 2016-17, thus requiring one additional fiscal year for expenditure. The court is providing the required application and financial information in anticipation of having the request included in the June 24<sup>th</sup> Judicial Council regular business meeting.

Thank you for your assistance with this application. Should you require additional information or have questions, please contact Rick Beard, Chief Financial & Administrative Officer, at 916-874-8133 or [beardr@saccourt.ca.gov](mailto:beardr@saccourt.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David De Alba", is written over a horizontal line.

Honorable David De Alba,  
Assistant Presiding Judge  
Sacramento Superior Court

Cc: Hon. Kevin R. Culhane, Presiding Judge  
Tim Ainsworth, Interim CEO



## 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**

<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> Sacramento	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> (Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer): Honorable Kevin R. Culhane, Presiding Judge	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> Rick Beard, Chief Financial & Administrative Officer (916-874-8133)	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 4/29/2016	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:</b> FY15/16 – FY16/17	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> \$ 1,413,142

**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 in 2013-14 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.

**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 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 carefully examine and convert business rules, processes, and data into the new systems.

The amount of encumbered funds projected to remain on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2016 for the three projects is as follows:

PO #4300003759 – Crim CMS	\$359,261
PO #4300004218 – FL CMS	\$690,301
PO #4300004217 – Traffic CMS	\$363,580
Total Contribution –	\$1,413,142

The original timeline called for the start of the Family Law and Traffic CMS projects in the 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, DOJ, CDCR and DMV which suffer in accuracy 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 will be available to the parties soon after the documents are completed. *(Goals IV & VI)*

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

- *Reliance on Old Case Management Systems:*
  - Criminal: The court will continue to rely on a 30 year old mainframe system to process Criminal cases. The mainframe system belongs to the county who intends to retire the system in next 3-5 years. If the court is the last tenant on the mainframe system, the cost to the court will exceed \$500,000/year, making it impossible to ever fund a new CMS.
  - 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 is available is very 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 Criminal and 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 AB109 (PRCS/Parole) cases, JBSIS, and Title IV-D.
- *No Data Sharing:* no ability to share data among the various case categories (e.g. Traffic and Criminal) 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 Criminal and 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 event.

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

Denial of this request would force the court to utilize regular, annual budgeted IT dollars in 2016-17 which would require cuts, delays, or other unforeseen budget reductions to cover the cost of completing these in-progress CMS build projects. This could result in necessary upgrades, equipment exchanges, software upgrades, etc. being delayed that could lead to outages, higher cost, etc.

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**

	FY 2015-16 ▼	FY 2016-17 ▼
<b>Description</b>		
Contribution	1,413,142	
Expenditures		1,413,142

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

Description	FY 2013-14	FY 2016-17										Total
Contribution	1,413,142											1,413,142
Expenditures		1,413,142										1,413,142
Cumulative Balance	1,413,142	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,826,284

## 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:**

Sutter

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

Stephanie M. Hansel, Court Executive Officer

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**

Brenda Cummings bcummings@suttercourts.com 30 822-3340

**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

4/29/2016

**TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 1 YEAR****REQUESTED AMOUNT:**

\$476,962 estimated

**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.):

Professional services and deliverables for new case management system, software, equipment and maintenance extending beyond the three year term. Court will not know the exact amount until the end of FY 15-16 and will submit an amended request in July.

**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.**

Court encumbered funds June 2014. Project has been delayed twice, with go live scheduled for May 2016. Court will not be able to expend the funds within the three year encumbrance term that ends June 30, 2016.

**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?**

**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.**

Court would default on contract with CMS vendor.

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

Access to court records would be jeopardized. The legacy CMS will no longer be supported.

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

There are no other alternatives.

**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. Court will expend funds in FY 16-17.

**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. Court will expend funds in FY 16-17.

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

N/A. Court will expend funds in FY 16-17.

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

N/A. Court will expend funds in FY 16-17.

## 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**

<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b> Placer	<b>PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST</b> (Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer): Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer	
	<b>CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:</b> Vicki Nissen, <a href="mailto:vnissen@placer.courts.ca.gov">vnissen@placer.courts.ca.gov</a> , 916-408-6108	
<b>DATE OF SUBMISSION:</b> 4/26/2016	<b>TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:</b> FY 13/14, FY1617, FY1718	<b>REQUESTED AMOUNT:</b> \$264,870.00

**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 court requests the total amount of \$264,870 be held by the Judicial Council for an overage of the 1% fund balance from FY13/14 for two projects that final completion will be delayed beyond the three year encumbrance term: (1) In FY13/14 the court encumbered \$250,000 for the development and installation of a new case management system for the court. This project has been delayed beyond the 3 year encumbrance period. The court requests \$250,000 be held on behalf of the court with expenditure expected to be made during FY1617 and/or FY1718. (2) Also, in FY13/14 the court encumbered a contract for the installation of a telephonic appearance system. The amount of \$14,870 remains to be expended. This project has been delayed beyond the 3 year encumbrance period as the amount is tied to integration with the case management system noted in (1). The court requests the total of both projects, \$264,870, be held on behalf of the court in the Trial Court Trust Fund.

**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 court continued its effort to replace an aged case management system. The court has completed deployment for the traffic case type, June 2014, and anticipates implementation for the criminal case type in May 2016. As of the end of FY1516, the civil, family law and juvenile case types will remain to be deployed. Deployment activities for the remaining case types are expected to begin in May 2016, with ultimately completion in late FY 16/17 or early FY 17/18. The telephonic appearance system interfaces with the case management system and will also need to be upgraded when the civil case type is deployed in FY 16/17 or early FY 17/18. As such, both of these projects extend beyond the three year encumbrance period which expires at FY1516.



## 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 new case management system provides the public and justice partners with a public portal or website to access case related information such as documents, court dates, and payment information. The new system will also include automated workflows, automatic generation of documents, time standard expiration which will result in staff operational efficiencies. The new system will also enable the capture and use of a fully electronic case record, including e-filing, significantly reducing staff time and improving access to the court system.

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

As a result of the recession earlier this decade, the court has reduced from 186 filled positions to roughly 110 positions. Efficiencies gained from the new system are expected to support the remaining staff's ability to timely process incoming work and more effectively meet the needs of the public.

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

Deployment of future case types may be significantly delayed or cancelled. The court will need to run two case management systems leading to additional costs for licenses and maintenance.

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

The current case management system will not allow for e-filing nor a public website for public and justice partner access to case related information. The system is built on three-decade old programming language that also severely limits or precludes electronic integration with local and state justice partners.

**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 not identified any alternatives. The court plans on completing the projects and liquidating the encumbrances within the next two fiscal years, so it is the court's preference that these funds be held in the TCTF to avoid further delay in improving court efficiency and public access.

**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 attached spreadsheet. The court does not expect any changes to these amounts.

## Attachment C10

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 ▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	Total
Contribution									-
Expenditures		264,870							264,870
Cumulative Balance	-	(264,870)	(264,870)	(264,870)	(264,870)	(264,870)	(264,870)	(264,870)	264,870

## 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:**

Kern

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

Terry McNally, Court Executive Officer

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**Debra Ostlund, Deputy CEO-Finance [debra.ostlund@kern.courts.ca.gov](mailto:debra.ostlund@kern.courts.ca.gov)**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

4/29/2016

**TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE: 2016/17****REQUESTED AMOUNT:****\$1,270,811.00 (estimated)****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 Superior Court, County of Kern, had two new courthouse projects that were indefinitely suspended due to state budget problems. One of these projects was to replace the Delano Regional Court facility. As such, when the Delano Police Department, which is adjacent to the Delano Regional Court facility, was vacated it presented an opportunity to address problems related to this court location. Delano serves, in addition to the second fastest growing community in the County of Kern, two large prisons – Kern Valley and North Kern. These two facilities generate a significant amount of case work for the courts which have overtaxed current facilities and necessitated transfer of many of the CDCR related matters to the already overcrowded Metro Bakersfield Court location. The remodeling of the leased facility would enable the court to manage this caseload in a secure and efficient court environment. Further it would save significant tax payer resources as CDCR would no longer have to transport their inmates to Bakersfield, some 45 minutes away from Delano. The remodel project was delayed by approximately eight months due to the requirements of the Office of State Fire Marshall plan review. Thus the Court is requesting authorization to carryover encumbered local funding to complete the remodel project estimated to be done in August 2016.

**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 for this project were originally encumbered in June 2014 and the three-year limitation will expire in June 2016. The original encumbrance amount was for \$2,047,200 and the unspent balance as of the end of March 2016 was \$1,270,811. (See attached report from the Judicial Council Facilities group.

**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?**

This funding will enable the completion of the remodeled leased facility designed to provide a highly secure, local court facility to serve the two large prisons that generate a considerable amount of workload for the Superior Court. The facility, which is within ten miles of the Delano Court facility, would save time and money by reducing the transportation costs for hearings and trials. While the court is currently using video conferencing for arraignments, subsequent hearings and jury trials will benefit from this newly remodeled facility by reducing wait times and improving the secure management of in-custody inmates.

**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.**

There are two primary problems with the current facilities. One, the volume of cases emanating from the local prisons necessitate a large number, as many as 15 to 20, of CDCR transport vehicles with their CDCR staff and inmates be parked in the Delano court lot waiting for their hearing. The vehicles are acting as holding cells due to the limited cells in the current building. This poses a significant security concern, potential delays in court calendar management due to shuttling inmates from vehicles to courtrooms, and high costs for inmate management and security. Secondly, due to the physical constraints of the Delano, a large percentage of these cases are transferred to Bakersfield further overtaxing Kern County's busiest court facility and requiring the costly transport of in-custody inmates to and from the County seat on a daily basis.

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

The ability to have a secure facility in Delano enables local witnesses, justice partners, CDCR staff, and the public to access hearings and trials without the significant expense and time necessary to commute to Bakersfield.

**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 only alternative is to use current year revenue, which would involve cutting operational staffing to make up the shortfall.

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**

N/A

**Kern County Superior Court Trial Court Trust Fund**

**March 2016**

**Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Encumbrances**

Judicial Council Encumbrance: Chamblin-Landes; Delano Police Dept. (15-D2) Tenant Improvements Project - Balance	\$1,270,811.00
--	----------------

**Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Encumbrances**

Judicial Council Encumbrance: Chamblin-Landes; Delano Police Dept. (15-D2) Tenant Improvements Project - Balance	\$792,364.00
--	--------------

**Fiscal Year 2013-2014 "Pre-Paid" Expenditures (Reclassification from Pre-Paid Expense)**

Facility	Description/Vendor	Service Order #/ Contract #	Work Description	Amount	Total
Delano Police Department	Chamblin-Landes	FM #0052756	Tenant Improvements	108,577.00	108,577.00
<b>Total FY 2013-2014 Reclassification from Pre-Paid Expense</b>				<b>\$108,577.00</b>	<b>\$108,577.00</b>

<b>Total Expenditures:</b>	<b>\$108,577.00</b>
----------------------------	---------------------

# 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:

Lake

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

Krista LeVier, Court Executive Officer

### CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:

Michaela Noland, Administrative Services Manager, (707) 263-2374 x2263

### DATE OF SUBMISSION:

4/29/2016

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

JUNE 30, 2016 TO JUNE 30, 2017

### REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$ 89,669.00

### 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 Court contracted with StreamWrite LLC in December 2013 to develop and install a new minute order generation application/interface called Proceedings. Proceedings interfaces with the Court's Case Management System (Sustain Justice Edition) to create and/or update records relating to Criminal and Civil scheduled events that have occurred. This automates many data entry steps courtroom clerks are currently having to perform manually. The project began in December 2012/13. The project cost was contracted at \$157,339.00. The Court encumbered the funds at the end of Fiscal Year 2013 which means the funds need to be expended by the end of Fiscal Year 2015/16. The court has paid StreamWrite \$67,670.00 to date. The Court is requesting that the remaining funds totaling \$89,669.00 be held on behalf of the Court.

The project was originally scheduled to be complete well before the end of Fiscal Year 2015/16. However, the project has faced delays for several reasons. The Sustain Justice Edition is hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). The CCTC has certain security requirements and approvals required which took more time than anticipated. As a result of the Sustain Justice Edition being hosted at the CCTC, the project required staff and resources from the Judicial Council Staff. As a result of the funding reductions made to programs funded out of the Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF), including the Sustain Justice Edition program, this project was delayed. Additionally, the final testing has recently hit another obstacle which has required engaging the Sustain vendor, Journal Technologies. The application has been developed and tested successfully in StreamWrite's Development environment and has been deployed to the Court's UAT environment in the CCTC. Upon deployment in the UAT environment, it was determined that certain necessary functionality was not working properly and therefore further deployment into the Staging and Production environments has not been able to move forward. The Court is concerned that these delays may push the project completion date past June 30, 2016.

## 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.**

This project is a one-time expense which was encumbered prior to the implementation of the 1% fund balance restriction. The funds to complete this project were encumbered in Fiscal Year 2013/14. The court continues to struggle to adjust to a significantly reduced operations budget and resulting staffing shortages. As such, it is essential to develop innovative and more efficient ways to process the workload. This project does just that by using technology to automate what is currently a very labor intensive manual process.

The reasons this project was not able to be completed within the three year encumbrance period are explained above.

**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 Proceedings application will improve efficiency and the effectiveness of court operations by allowing staff to complete minute orders much more quickly by automating the data entry required following court hearings. The application is estimated to reduce the time it takes to finalize minute orders after a court hearing by 3 full days for criminal calendars and two days sooner for civil calendars. This project will also report convictions to DMV and DOJ more quickly. This means the public and justice partners would have access to the minute orders sooner as well.

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

While not necessarily a cost efficiency, the court expects to realize approximately 1.5 FTE equivalent in time savings, which is significant in a court with approximately 29 FTE. Those are resources that can be allocated to better serve the public by more quickly process other workload or assist at the public counters or telephones.

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

The total court investment to date totaling \$163,501 would be lost. This amount includes the total paid to the vendor to date, the amount paid to additional consultants, and the \$89,669 of this request which is encumbered and to be expended upon completion of the project. Almost as important as the monetary loss is the fact that the court would not realize the anticipated staff efficiencies. The court continues to be short staffed and the time savings for the court clerks would enable the court to function much more efficiently.

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

The court would not be able to operate as effectively with the continued shortage of staff. Since there would be no time savings for the court clerks, their work would continue to be backlogged which slows down the public's access to records. The public and justice partners will continue to be delayed in getting copies of minute orders and the reporting of convictions to DMV records.

**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 making every effort to complete this project prior to June 30, 2016, which is the only viable alternative. If that does not occur, the court has no other alternative. The three year encumbrance period ends June 30, 2016, therefore any remaining unspent funds will revert to the Trial Court Trust Fund.

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:**

Orange

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

Alan Carlson, Court Executive Officer

**CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO**Luis Najera; [lnajera@occourts.org](mailto:lnajera@occourts.org); 949-399-2256 (Court Technology)Katrina Coreces; [kcoreces@occourts.org](mailto:kcoreces@occourts.org); 657-622-7739 (Financial Planning)**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

4/29/2016

**TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REQUEST, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE:** 7/1/16 – 12/31/16**REQUESTED AMOUNT:**

\$ 200,000.00

**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 new Interactive Voice Recognition ("IVR") system currently being implemented will automate and save several hours of staff time disseminating general court and case information to the public in the three most commonly used languages in this region of California. The IVR Project Plan timelines encountered unavoidable delays involving user testing acceptance and unexpected delay of vendor deliverables.

In October 2014, the Court encumbered \$465,528 to obtain a new IVR system. The three-year encumbrance period ends on June 30, 2016 but there is still \$363,840 left in the contract. It is expected that outstanding invoices will total \$200,000 at the end of the fiscal year. This request asks that the Judicial Council hold \$200,000 in encumbered funds on the Court's behalf beyond June 30, 2016, in order to allow the Court to complete its IVR implementation as originally planned by December 31, 2016.

**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.**

Although the project was approved in December 2013, a qualified vendor was not awarded until October 2014. Therefore, an expected 36-month project was quickly compressed into 26 months, once the new project rules were publicized. In addition, this was the first time the vendor implemented a 'cloud based' solution and the vendor was working with other sub-contractors to implement this solution. As a result, there were a number of technical difficulties and coordination issues that impacted the vendor's ability to meet the delivery timeframe. Although we are pushing the vendor to finish by June 30,



we are not confident that they will be able to deliver and this extension would give us time to make sure things are done right and not be too rushed.

### 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?**

This IVR system will be available 24 hours a day 7 days a week to provide the public with general information and specific case information. The departments using the new IVR system include: Jury, Probate, Civil, Family Law, Juvenile, and Traffic/Criminal. With only a partially implemented IVR system, if the extension is not approved, the public will have to wait for normal business hours to get necessary information.

**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.**

This court will operate a partially functioning IVR system to address the public's inquiries. Full-time staff operators will need to continue answering the calls to provide general and case information to the public in those areas where implementation was not completed.

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

The public will face longer waiting times on the phone to get general information about their cases and in some cases not be able to reach court staff by phone, requiring a visit to the courthouse.

**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 will have to decide whether to spend money from the next fiscal year to be able to complete this project, or forego complete implementation. Holding the funding in the TCTF will allow the Court to proceed with the intended project as planned to meet the desirable outcome of providing the public access to an IVR system that will provide general information and case information around the clock.

**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**

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	Select Fiscal Year	Total
Contribution	200,000									200,000
Expenditures	200,000									200,000
Cumulative Balance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-