



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on January 19–20, 2017

Title

Trial Courts: State Trial Court Improvement
and Modernization Fund Allocations

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

January 19, 2017

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
None

Date of Report

January 6, 2017

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair
Judicial Council Technology Committee
Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair

Contact

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

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and the Judicial Council Technology Committee recommend approving a one-time allocation of \$399,111 to the Superior Court of Humboldt County in 2016–2017 and \$572,622 to the Superior Court of Madera County in 2017–2018 from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to address information technology infrastructure needs.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and the Judicial Council Technology Committee recommend that the Judicial Council approve and allocate the one-time funding requests of the Superior Court of Humboldt County for \$399,111 in 2016–2017 and the Superior Court of Madera County for \$572,622 in 2017–2018 from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF). These funds will be used by the courts to transition from the California Court Technology Center (CCTC) to their own independent information technology

(IT) infrastructures. In addition, both courts will be required to perform year-end reviews of their finances to identify one-time funding that could be used to help offset migration costs and reduce the impact on the IMF.

Previous Council Action

At its June 24, 2016, meeting, the Judicial Council unanimously voted to adopt the recommendation of the TCBAC, in alignment with the Judicial Council Technology Committee's action taken on April 14, 2016, to:

1. Endorse the position that all Sustain-hosted courts move away from the current IMF subsidized funding structure to an IT administrative program that is funded in a manner consistent with other trial courts throughout the state.
2. Endorse "Scenario 3: Elimination of the ICMS [Interim Case Management System] and Managed Court Program use of CCTC [California Court Technology Center], if any use remains at the start of FY 19/20, any such costs are paid by the participating courts."
3. Via the Judicial Council Technology Committee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, find one-time funding for the support of this effort, as early as the current year.
4. Continue to support the Sustain-hosted courts in their efforts to acquire a replacement of the outdated Interim Case Management System as a longer term goal, which would further reduce the IMF expenditures.

These recommendations were part of a larger action item approving allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and the IMF for 2016–2017. The approved allocations included an allocation of \$736,500 for a Placer Court Hosting Center that would allow a consortium of six Sustain-hosted courts to migrate from the CCTC to the new hosting center, thus eventually reducing IMF expenditures and helping meet the approved objectives above. See Link A for additional background on the actions taken.

Rationale for Recommendation

At its December 12, 2016, meeting, the TCBAC unanimously recommended that the Judicial Council approve the allocation of \$399,111 in 2016–2017 for Humboldt County court (Attachment B) and \$572,622 in 2017–2018 for Madera County court (Attachment C). Madera had originally requested \$658,315 for migration costs, but the TCBAC recommended that this request be reduced to \$572,622 to fully use the available balance in the court's 2 percent automation fund. The recommendation to approve both courts' requests is consistent with the previous allocation of funding for the Placer Court Hosting Center and the goals approved by the Judicial Council at its June 24, 2016, meeting to move the courts away from the current IMF-subsidized funding for IT services at the CCTC.

The current status of the IMF is provided in Attachment D. Given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations, the 2016–2017 allocations already approved under the appropriations for Programs 0140010 (formerly 30), Judicial Council, and 0150010 (formerly

45.10), Support for Operation of Trial Courts, the IMF will end 2016–2017 with a fund balance of almost \$5.2 million (see Attachment D, column C, row 23). Since the June 2016 Judicial Council meeting, the IMF fiscal status has been updated. Revenues through 2019–2020 are now projected to decline an additional \$5.6 million. Also, prior-year adjustments for unspent encumbrances and additional prior-year revenue help offset the decline in revenues one time by \$3 million. Through 2019–2020, based on additional expenditure adjustments to three IT office-managed programs—CCTC, V3 CMS, and ICMS—the IMF is estimated to have at its lowest ending fund balance \$3.7 million in 2018–2019. The TCBAC had previously approved the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee’s recommendation to maintain a \$2 million fund balance floor to address any unanticipated decreases in revenues.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

No public comments were received when the recommendations were considered by the TCBAC at its December 12, 2016, meeting.

The TCBAC was presented information on the fiscal status of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) as a potential alternate source of funding. In the Budget Act of 2016, up to a \$75.0 million General Fund backfill for the continued decline in fee and assessment revenues that support courts’ base allocation is provided for the TCTF (see Attachment E). Given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations and the 2016–2017 allocations already approved by the Judicial Council, the TCTF will end fiscal year 2016–2017 with a fund balance of \$44.5 million (see Attachment E, column C, row 35). Excluding about \$23.1 million in fund balance that is either statutorily restricted or restricted by the council (mainly the emergency needs reserve and savings related to the Program 45.45 court interpreter appropriation), the unrestricted fund balance is projected to be \$21.4 million (see column C, row 47). This figure reflects an increase of \$16.7 million from the unrestricted fund balance reported in the July 2016 meeting of \$4.7 million as a result of:

- \$9.5 million in year-end revenue and expenditure adjustments for FY 2015–2016;
- \$3.7 million in current-year fund balance–based allocation reductions to the trial courts;
- \$1.9 million in prior-year revenues above estimates; and
- \$1.6 million in planned prior-year disencumbrances.

Assuming \$3.2 million in judges’ compensation savings in 2016–2017, the TCTF would have a revenue shortfall of \$7.8 million (see column C, row 49; amount includes a one-time \$10 million General Fund transfer to establish emergency needs reserve, a one-time \$4.6 million net reduction in trial court allocations, and \$2.2 million in court interpreter overallocation adjustments). There is estimated to be \$45.8 million in excess Program 0150010 expenditure authority based on the current approved and estimated allocation amounts. This excess is primarily the result of estimated reduced FY 2016–2017 trial court distributions related to civil assessment revenue resulting from the amnesty program. Because a structural deficit within the TCTF still needs to be addressed, the TCBAC did not consider the TCTF as a viable funding option.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

The Superior Courts of Humboldt and Madera Counties would be required to perform a year-end review of their finances to identify one-time funding that could be used to help offset migration costs and reduce the impact on the IMF.

Attachments and Links

1. Link A: Judicial Council report, June 24, 2016, Item 16-092,
Trial Court Allocations: Fiscal Year 2016– 2017 Allocations from Trial Court Trust Fund and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund located at
<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4496693&GUID=FE6C1F1D-A68F-4CB8-B4E7-0596B5A59994>
2. Attachment B: *December 2, 2016, Letter From Ms. Kim M. Bartleson to the TCBAC on Funding Request for Humboldt Superior Court Migration From CCTC*
3. Attachment C: *Madera Superior Court Revised Funding Justification*
4. Attachment D: *State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund—Fund Condition Statement*
5. Attachment E: *Trial Court Trust Fund—Fund Condition Statement*



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

Kim M. Bartleson
Court Executive Officer/
Jury Commissioner

Joyce D. Hinrichs
Presiding Judge

December 2, 2016

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Re: Funding request for Humboldt Superior Court migration from CTCC

Dear Committee Members:

Humboldt County Superior Court requests one-time funding in the amount of \$399,111.00 for migration from the CTCC to a locally hosted solution. All of this funding is required for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

Pursuant to the directive of the Judicial Council for elimination of subsidies from the TCTF and IMF, Humboldt Superior Court has been actively participating in an eight court consortium that has recently gone through an RFP for the purpose of selecting a new CMS. The consortium is also collectively seeking funding for the new CMS in a joint BCP.

Independent of the collaborative work we have been doing for obtaining and funding a new CMS, Humboldt is now submitting its funding request for one time funding for migration from the CTCC to a locally hosted solution. A locally hosted solution is the only viable option as our court is too large to be hosted by Placer.

Attached with this narrative is our detailed funding request which delineates what funds will be needed for the migration from CTCC. Please note in the footnote on the funding request that the court has already expended funds for two servers, for a backup solution, for a fiber run to improve network performance with increased speed and bandwidth as well as a router upgrade for the new fiber in the amount of \$65,952.00.

Approximately a year ago, the court made a request for additional funding for increased costs associated with a 200% increase in homicide trials. The court was able to self fund the additional expenses associated with those trials and as such did not use any of the originally authorized funds. As of October 3, 2015 the court had 10 murder, 1 voluntary manslaughter and 5 vehicular manslaughter cases pending. While we have been working on getting the older cases out, new cases have been added and as of today we have 13 homicides, 8 vehicular homicides and 8 attempted vehicular homicide cases pending.

In addition to the technology expenses referenced above and the homicide related expenses the court was able to fund, the court must replace it's outdated jury management system in order to meet mission critical operational needs of the court as well as to mitigate possible public safety threats due to no availability of jurors for criminal cases, at a cost of \$83,271.00.

The court has exhausted its 2% automation and fund balance in order to fund daily operations inclusive of the acquisitions identified above. Without the one-time funds we are requesting we will have no ability to move out of CTCC nor will we have the ability to bear additional costs if we are the only entity left in the CTCC. Based on the present IMF costs of \$186,000, ongoing locally hosted application costs will be \$151,828.00, resulting in a first year savings of \$34,158.00.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kim M. Bartleson

Kim M. Bartleson
Court Executive Officer
Humboldt Superior Court

Sustain Local Installation Migration Costs
(estimated costs)

| Base Configuration (year 1) | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----------|------------------|
| | Description | Qty | Cost | Total |
| Software | HIS Server (Host Integration)* | 2 | \$6,000 | \$12,000 |
| | HIS Software | 2 | \$2,500 | \$5,000 |
| | OTECH License fees for DMV (50 users) | 1 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| | DMVQUERY licenses (50 users) | 1 | \$5,340 | \$5,340 |
| | Sustain License Cost Increase | 180 | \$108 | \$19,440 |
| | Sustain License Increase Justice Partner Recovery | -72 | \$108 | -\$7,776 |
| | Pervasive Database licenses (250 users) | 2 | \$13,970 | \$27,940 |
| | SQL Database License | 1 | \$7,500 | \$7,500 |
| | Operating system licenses (Server 2008) † | 3 | \$600 | \$1,800 |
| | Bluezone for TN3270 DMV Terminal Emulator | 1 | \$4,800 | \$4,800 |
| | Citrix Licensing (per month cost) | 12 | \$1,057 | \$12,684 |
| | Crystal Reports | 4 | \$450 | \$1,800 |
| Subtotal | | | | \$94,528 |
| Hardware | Virtual Host Server with Software Assurance (Hyperconverged) | 5 | \$20,000 | \$100,000 |
| | Load Balancer | 1 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| | Database Server | 3 | \$7,600 | \$22,800 |
| | Storage arrays (300Gb+) - Production & Staging | 2 | \$10,000 | \$20,000 |
| | Cisco 10GBps Network Switches (48 port) | 2 | \$5,500 | \$11,000 |
| | Server Rack & Power Distribution | 1 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| | Storage array (500Gb+) - Backup | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 |
| | Microsoft Azure for DR storage (cloud) | 1 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |
| Subtotal | | | | \$178,800 |
| Consulting Costs (year 1 estimate) | | | | |
| | Donna Argo | 100 | \$175 | \$17,500 |
| | CCTC migration costs | 1 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| | Data Migration Support (JTI) | 240 | \$200 | \$48,000 |
| | DMV/DOJ connection migration support | 100 | \$200 | \$20,000 |
| Subtotal | | | | \$89,500 |
| 10% Cost Contingency (for future price variations) | | | | \$36,283 |
| Year 1 Estimated Funding Need: | | | | \$399,111 |
| Humboldt Contribution | | | | |
| Court | Virtual Host Server with Software Assurance | 2 | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| | AT&T Internet Upgrade / Installation | 1 | \$8,341 | \$0 |
| | Copper installation and cabling | 1 | \$240 | \$0 |
| | Fiber Optics installation and cabling(onsite) | 1 | \$5,834 | \$0 |
| | Barracuda Backup Solution | 1 | \$31,537 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$65,952 |
| Recurring Costs (year 2+ estimate) | | | | |
| | OTECH License fees for DMV (50 users) | 1 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| | DMVQUERY licenses (50 users) | 1 | \$5,340 | \$5,340 |
| | Sustain License | 180 | \$1,006 | \$181,080 |
| | Sustain License Justice Partners | -72 | \$1,006 | -\$72,432 |
| | Pervasive Database licenses (250 users) | 1 | \$13,970 | \$13,970 |
| | Bluezone for TN3270 DMV Terminal Emulator | 1 | \$4,800 | \$4,800 |
| | Citrix Licensing (per month cost) | 12 | \$1,057 | \$12,684 |
| | Microsoft Azure for DR storage | 1 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |
| | | | | \$152,442 |
| Offsets | | | | |
| | CCTC Hosting Cost | 1 | \$186,600 | \$186,600 |
| Estimated Annual Savings (after year 1): | | | | \$34,158 |

* HIS Server bridges between old database systems and SQL

† Server 2008 not certified by Sustain, but are compatible with SJE infrastructure

MADERA SUPERIOR COURT REVISED FUNDING JUSTIFICATION

Madera Superior Court is one of the "Managed Courts" currently being hosted at the CCTC and is not one of the six courts that will be moving from the CCTC to the Placer Hosted Model. Madera has been a Managed Court since the beginning of the CCMS Pilot Project in 2002. Being a Managed Court, the CCTC currently hosts our IT infrastructure, including but not limited to, our email, file storage, backup and recovery, and our critical business applications. Madera is provided with an IT support person once a week, which is available on-site for any IT issues.

Due to the funding shortfall in the IMF, the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) was directed to develop a plan to migrate the courts out of the CCTC which is subsidized by the IMF. Placer Superior Court is becoming a Hosting Solution for six (6) of the smaller courts currently at the CCTC. Madera will have to transition to a locally hosted solution for our IT infrastructure.

The cost of migrating out of CCTC to a locally hosted infrastructure is an expense the court cannot cover. We have been working diligently on obtaining quotes for such a transition, and as of today the estimated cost is \$872,750 (See attachment A); this includes equipment and professional services. There are a couple of quotes we are still lacking at this time and have estimated the costs of those items which are highlighted in yellow. The line item highlighted in red (CCTC associated labor or PS needed) are unknown potential expenses associated with any labor costs the JC IT department may charge Madera for assisting in the transition. All other quotes are actual figures based on today's costs; we have included a 10% contingency expense for price increases due to lag time in funding and purchasing equipment. We request a contingency is between 10% - 15%. No equipment or services has been purchased to date.

At this time, the court has the ability to offset these costs by \$300,000. Below is a summary of our 2% automation account:

| 2% Automation Fund Balance | | |
|---|----------------|-------------------|
| Fund 180004 | | |
| IVR Upgrade | PO# 4500091549 | -26,075.00 |
| UPS Battery/Bass Lake | PO# 4500091551 | -354.37 |
| Printer for HR | PO# 4500091555 | -992.61 |
| IVR Upgrade | PO# 4500091697 | -3,177.17 |
| Fund Balance as of 10/4/16 (Includes above Encumbrances) | | 509,284.25 |
| IVR Upgrade | PO# 4500091580 | -19,870.00 |
| Computer/Printer Refresh | | -122,271.06 |
| Balance Remaining : | | 367,143.19 |

Madera's FY 15-16 "Schedule C" costs total \$396,661; we have not yet received our "Schedule C" cost for FY 16-17. (See attachment B) Some of these costs will no longer be paid once we have transitioned our IT infrastructure to a locally hosted solution. Some of these cost savings will be used for on-going expenses associated with an in-house IT infrastructure which are listed in attachment A, column I. (Items highlighted in orange are estimates) Madera will also need to hire IT staffing to manage this infrastructure which will be an on-going expense we currently do not realize. As previously stated, Madera currently does not employ any IT staff positions.

Madera at this time is requesting funding in the amount of \$658,315 in FY 17-18. The cost savings will come from the IMF and TCTF subsidies which will no longer be expended on behalf of Madera in maintaining the court infrastructure at the CCTC.

Madera -- ITEMS FOR QUOTE

| Quantity | CAPEX | OPEX / SUBSCRIPTION | Extended CAPEX | Extended OPEX / SUBSCRIPTION | On-going Court Expenses |
|--|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | \$ 24,006 | | \$ 24,006 | | \$ 9,500 est |
| Power | | | | | |
| APC redundant UPS & PDU solution + APC DCE | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 24,006 | | \$ 24,006 | | |
| Servers | | | | | |
| HP C7000 blade chassis - single phase | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 122,457 | | \$ 122,457 | | \$ 11,976 |
| 1 | \$ 25,707 | | \$ 25,707 | | \$ 1,158 |
| 1 | \$ 4,629 | | \$ 4,629 | | |
| HP FC HBA | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 67,881 | | \$ 67,881 | | \$ 5,813 |
| 12 | \$ 30 | | \$ 360 | | |
| Storage | | | | | |
| Nimble CS1000 (20TB) storage array | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 67,881 | | \$ 67,881 | | |
| 12 | \$ 30 | | \$ 360 | | |
| Backups | | | | | |
| Barracuda Backup 895s (Madera) w/ cloud | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 49,905 | | \$ 49,905 | | \$ 17,997 |
| 1 | \$ 34,514 | | \$ 34,514 | | \$ 7,998 |
| Barracuda Backup 895s (Bass Lake) -- for DR plan -- offsite backup replica w/o cloud | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 42,832 | | \$ 42,832 | | \$ 4,100 |
| 1 | \$ 7,500 | | \$ 7,500 | | \$ 10,000 est |
| Network | | | | | |
| AT&T quoted Network Equipment & install (6/30/2016) | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 42,832 | | \$ 42,832 | | \$ 4,100 |
| 1 | \$ 7,500 | | \$ 7,500 | | \$ 10,000 est |
| Misc | | | | | |
| Physical Tools & Toolbox | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 7,500 | | \$ 7,500 | | \$ 4,100 |
| SOFTWARE | | | | | |
| VMware host licensing (for 3 hosts) & vsphere | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 40,536 | | \$ 40,536 | | \$ 19,625 |
| 1 | \$ 12,169 | | \$ 12,169 | | \$ 25,000 |
| 1 | \$ 24,000 | | \$ 24,000 | | \$ 25,000 |
| 1 | \$ 19,215 | | \$ 19,215 | | \$ 8,000 est |
| 1 | \$ 77,931 | | \$ 77,931 | | \$ 3,938 |
| 1 | \$ 3,938 | | \$ 3,938 | | \$ 2,800 |
| 2 | \$ 1,400 | | \$ 2,800 | | \$ 5,428 |
| 2 | \$ 2,714 | | \$ 5,428 | | \$ 7,086 |
| 2 | \$ 3,543 | | \$ 7,086 | | \$ 4,014 |
| 1 | \$ 4,014 | | \$ 4,014 | | \$ 2,075 est |
| 1 | \$ 2,075 | | \$ 2,075 | | \$ 2,075 est |
| 1 | \$ 8,500 | | \$ 8,500 | | \$ 145,508 |
| ELECTRICAL | | | | | |
| Pride Industries / FMU | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 8,500 | | \$ 8,500 | | \$ 145,508 |
| PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | | | | | |
| AT&T -- network | | | | | |
| 1 | \$ 19,000 | | \$ 19,000 | | \$ 11,976 |
| 1 | \$ 40,000 | | \$ 40,000 | | \$ 1,158 |
| 1 | \$ 115,270 | | \$ 115,270 | | \$ 5,813 |
| 1 | \$ 30,000 | | \$ 30,000 | | \$ 4,100 |
| 1 | \$ 1,656 | | \$ 1,656 | | \$ 2,075 est |
| 1 | \$ 77,786 | | \$ 77,786 | | \$ 145,508 |
| RECOMMENDED TO ADD 10%-15% FOR CONTINGENCY & UNKNOWN | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | | | | |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | |

| Service Description | FY 2015-2016 Preliminary Charges | | | Total FY 15-16 Court Charges | Comments |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|------------------------------|-----------|
| | 1x Costs | Per Month/Unit charge | Units | | |
| CCTC SERVICES | | | | | |
| Line #1: Court to CCTC Network Line Maintenance (Cisco Router Maintenance) | | \$285 | 1 | 12 | \$3,420 |
| Line #2: Court to CCTC Network Line Maintenance (Cisco Router Maintenance) | | | | | \$0 |
| Line #3: Court to CCTC Network Line Maintenance (Cisco Router Maintenance) | | \$2,565 | 1 | 12 | \$30,780 |
| Local Network Monitoring and Management | | \$24.11 | 97 | 12 | \$25,171 |
| Help Desk | | \$443.11 | 1 | 3 | \$1,329 |
| Line #1: Dedicated connection to CCTC (T1, DS3) | | \$1,612.11 | 1 | 9 | \$14,509 |
| Line #2: Dedicated connection to CCTC (T1, DS3) | | \$479.83 | 1 | 12 | \$5,758 |
| Line #3: Dedicated connection to CCTC (T1, DS3) | | \$168.58 | 1 | 0 | \$0 |
| VPN Site-To-Site Services | | | | | \$0 |
| Other Services | | \$10,830 | 1 | 12 | \$129,957 |
| Desktop Services | | \$2,700 | 1 | 12 | \$32,400 |
| Server Monitoring | | \$1,212 | 1 | 12 | \$14,544 |
| Remote Site Backup | | \$3,156 | 1 | 12 | \$37,872 |
| Hosted Exchange Services | \$0 | \$23,476 | | | \$235,741 |
| CMS - SUSTAIN APPLICATION SERVICES - WBS O-9901-3 | | | | | |
| Staging Environment: HW, SW Installation and Support | | \$1,819 | 1 | 12 | \$21,828 |
| Production Environment: HW, SW Installation and Support | | \$4,597 | 1 | 12 | \$55,164 |
| Non-USB Interface Environment: Production & Staging HW, SW, and Support | | \$1,466 | 1 | 12 | \$17,592 |
| Citrix Licenses | \$0 | \$528 | 1 | 12 | \$6,336 |
| | \$0 | \$3,410 | | | \$100,920 |
| CCMS V2 APPLICATION SERVICES - WBS O-9902-3 | | | | | |
| Production, Staging, Training and Test environments: HW Installation & Support | | | | | \$0 |
| V2 Application Installation, Setup & Support in all environments | | | | | \$0 |
| Non-USB Interface Environment: HW Installation & Support | | | | | \$0 |
| CLETS | | | | | \$0 |
| Additional SAN Storage | \$0 | \$0 | | | \$0 |
| CCMS V3 APPLICATION SERVICES - WBS O-9903-3 | | | | | |
| Production, Staging, Training and Test environments: HW Installation & Support | | | | | \$0 |
| Deployment Staff | | | | | \$0 |
| | \$0 | \$0 | | | \$0 |
| INTEGRATION SERVICES | | | | | |
| CLETS | | | | | \$0 |
| | \$0 | \$0 | | | \$0 |
| | | | | | \$396,651 |
| | | | | | Total |

Attachment D

State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

| # | Description | Estimated | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | 2014-2015 (Year-end Financial Statement) | 2015-2016 (Year-end Financial Statement) | 2016-2017 1st Turn Revenue Estimates | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 |
| | | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| 1 | Beginning Balance | 26,207,006 | 8,956,870 | 6,956,091 | 5,199,439 | 3,961,444 | 3,728,011 |
| 2 | Prior-Year Adjustments | 2,880,385 | 1,051,239 | 3,023,108 | - | - | - |
| 3 | Adjusted Beginning Balance | 29,087,391 | 10,008,109 | 9,979,199 | 5,199,439 | 3,961,444 | 3,728,011 |
| 4 | Revenues | | | | | | |
| 5 | 50/50 Excess Fines Split Revenue | 23,702,658 | 20,219,295 | 16,987,000 | 16,537,000 | 16,537,000 | 16,537,000 |
| 6 | 2% Automation Fund Revenue | 14,730,023 | 12,463,280 | 9,605,000 | 13,379,000 | 12,752,000 | 12,752,000 |
| 7 | Jury Instructions Royalties | 532,783 | 552,000 | 542,000 | 532,000 | 532,000 | 532,000 |
| 8 | Interest from SMIF | 100,734 | 170,114 | 141,000 | 128,000 | 128,000 | 128,000 |
| 9 | Other Revenues/SCO Adjustments | 30,233 | 63,942 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | Transfers | | | | | | |
| 11 | From State General Fund | 38,709,000 | 44,218,000 | 56,618,000 | 53,418,000 | 44,218,000 | 44,218,000 |
| 12 | To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act) | (20,594,000) | (594,000) | (594,000) | (594,000) | (594,000) | (594,000) |
| 13 | To TCTF (GC 77209(k)) | (13,397,000) | (13,397,000) | (13,397,000) | (13,397,000) | (13,397,000) | (13,397,000) |
| 14 | Net Revenues and Transfers | 43,814,431 | 63,695,632 | 69,902,000 | 70,003,000 | 60,176,000 | 60,176,000 |
| 15 | Total Resources | 72,901,822 | 73,703,741 | 79,881,199 | 75,202,439 | 64,137,444 | 63,904,011 |
| 16 | Expenditures | | | | | | |
| 17 | Allocation Less Telecommunications Program (LAN/WAN) | 71,466,600 | 53,289,458 | 56,463,381 | 53,716,419 | 44,634,825 | 38,842,205 |
| 18 | Telecommunications Program | | 16,159,000 | | 16,762,144 | 15,160,055 | 15,835,226 |
| 19 | Telecommunications Program (financing) | | | 17,558,800 | 457,081 | 309,201 | 156,885 |
| 20 | Less: Unused Allocation | (7,823,266) | (3,467,899) | | | | |
| 21 | Pro Rata and Other Adjustments | 301,618 | 767,091 | 659,579 | 305,352 | 305,352 | 305,352 |
| 22 | Total Expenditures | 63,944,952 | 66,747,650 | 74,681,760 | 71,240,995 | 60,409,433 | 55,139,669 |
| 23 | Fund Balance | 8,956,870 | 6,956,091 | 5,199,439 | 3,961,444 | 3,728,011 | 8,764,342 |
| 24 | Potential Liability | | | | | 2,118,647 | |
| 25 | Fund Balance Reflecting Inclusion of Recommended IMF Allocation | | | 4,800,328 | 2,904,018 | 551,938 | 5,588,269 |

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

Attachment E

| | | FY 2014-15 (Year-End Financial Statement) | FY 2015-16 (Year-End Financial Statement) | FY 2016-17 (Estimated) | FY 2017-18 (Estimated) | FY 2018-19 (Estimated) | FY 2019-20 (Estimated) | FY 2020-21 (Estimated) |
|----|--|---|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| # | Description | Col. A | Col. B | Col. C | Col. D | Col. E | Col. F | Col. G |
| 1 | Beginning Balance | 21,218,232 | 6,614,017 | 34,829,875 | 44,515,289 | 33,962,269 | 26,416,442 | 18,496,169 |
| 2 | Prior-Year Adjustments | 5,624,798 | 7,208,461 | 653,287 | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance | 26,843,030 | 13,822,478 | 35,483,161 | 44,515,289 | 33,962,269 | 26,416,442 | 18,496,169 |
| 4 | Revenue | 1,341,324,951 | 1,294,611,392 | 1,273,892,898 | 1,331,543,982 | 1,329,312,970 | 1,329,312,970 | 1,329,312,970 |
| 5 | <i>Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue</i> | <i>659,050,502</i> | <i>659,050,502</i> | <i>659,050,502</i> | <i>659,050,502</i> | <i>659,050,502</i> | <i>659,050,502</i> | <i>659,050,502</i> |
| 6 | <i>Civil Fee Revenue</i> | <i>355,952,541</i> | <i>360,029,026</i> | <i>351,928,045</i> | <i>348,464,093</i> | <i>352,050,222</i> | <i>352,050,222</i> | <i>352,050,222</i> |
| 7 | <i>Court Operations Assessment Revenue</i> | <i>139,931,778</i> | <i>120,193,147</i> | <i>106,217,441</i> | <i>131,186,979</i> | <i>122,317,989</i> | <i>122,317,989</i> | <i>122,317,989</i> |
| 8 | <i>Civil Assessment Revenue</i> | <i>159,372,012</i> | <i>128,402,757</i> | <i>127,729,329</i> | <i>162,971,715</i> | <i>165,107,610</i> | <i>165,107,610</i> | <i>165,107,610</i> |
| 9 | <i>Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue</i> | <i>24,994,594</i> | <i>25,069,491</i> | <i>27,248,562</i> | <i>28,085,130</i> | <i>29,004,384</i> | <i>29,004,384</i> | <i>29,004,384</i> |
| 10 | <i>Interest from SMIF</i> | <i>151,376</i> | <i>335,260</i> | <i>613,938</i> | <i>613,938</i> | <i>613,938</i> | <i>613,938</i> | <i>613,938</i> |
| 11 | <i>Sanctions and Contempt Fines</i> | <i>1,586,715</i> | <i>981,144</i> | <i>978,231</i> | <i>978,231</i> | <i>978,231</i> | <i>978,231</i> | <i>978,231</i> |
| 12 | <i>Miscellaneous Revenue</i> | <i>285,431</i> | <i>550,065</i> | <i>126,851</i> | <i>193,394</i> | <i>190,095</i> | <i>190,095</i> | <i>190,095</i> |
| 13 | General Fund Transfer | 922,648,255 | 943,724,000 | 1,021,832,000 | 972,498,000 | 972,498,000 | 972,498,000 | 972,498,000 |
| 14 | General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel | - | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 |
| 15 | General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill | 30,900,000 | 58,900,000 | 71,100,000 | 47,900,000 | 52,200,000 | 52,200,000 | 52,200,000 |
| 16 | Reduction Offset Transfers | 26,080,000 | 6,080,000 | 6,080,000 | 6,080,000 | 6,080,000 | 6,080,000 | 6,080,000 |
| 17 | Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements | 12,678,778 | 13,217,422 | 11,857,803 | 12,998,023 | 12,998,023 | 12,998,023 | 12,998,023 |
| 18 | Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements | 2,333,631,984 | 2,431,232,814 | 2,499,462,701 | 2,485,720,005 | 2,487,788,993 | 2,487,788,993 | 2,487,788,993 |
| 19 | Total Resources | 2,360,475,014 | 2,445,055,292 | 2,534,945,862 | 2,530,235,293 | 2,521,751,261 | 2,514,205,435 | 2,506,285,161 |
| 20 | Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Program 30 (0140) - Expenditures/Allocations | 19,718,918 | 15,990,132 | 3,041,000 | 3,084,000 | 3,053,000 | 3,053,000 | 3,053,000 |
| 22 | Program 30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council (Staff) | 4,095,938 | 3,620,851 | 3,041,000 | 3,084,000 | 3,053,000 | 3,053,000 | 3,053,000 |
| 23 | Program 30.15 (0140019) - Trial Court Operations | 15,622,980 | 12,369,281 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 24 | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | Program 45 (0150) - Expenditures/Allocations | 2,333,437,799 | 2,393,944,116 | 2,487,281,206 | 2,493,189,025 | 2,492,281,819 | 2,492,656,266 | 2,492,331,266 |
| 26 | Program 45.10 (0150010) - Support for Trial Court Operations | 1,883,174,214 | 1,816,242,767 | 1,886,975,880 | 1,889,406,729 | 1,890,836,787 | 1,890,561,234 | 1,890,886,234 |
| 27 | Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel | - | 114,387,117 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 | 114,700,000 |
| 28 | Program 45.25 (0150019) - Comp. of Superior Court Judges | 319,803,869 | 330,369,783 | 338,431,000 | 338,431,000 | 338,431,000 | 338,431,000 | 338,431,000 |
| 29 | Program 45.35 (0150028) - Assigned Judges | 24,792,538 | 25,199,733 | 27,005,000 | 27,005,000 | 27,005,000 | 27,005,000 | 27,005,000 |
| 30 | Program 45.45 (0150037) - Court Interpreters | 96,802,928 | 99,598,715 | 101,266,326 | 103,677,000 | 103,677,000 | 103,677,000 | 103,677,000 |
| 31 | Program 45.55 (0150046) - Grants | 8,864,250 | 8,146,000 | 8,147,000 | 8,973,119 | 8,366,653 | 8,366,653 | 8,366,653 |
| 32 | Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts | - | - | 10,756,000 | 10,996,177 | 9,265,380 | 9,915,380 | 9,265,380 |
| 33 | Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements | 704,280 | 291,169 | 108,368 | - | - | - | - |
| 34 | Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations | 2,353,860,997 | 2,410,225,417 | 2,490,430,574 | 2,496,273,025 | 2,495,334,819 | 2,495,709,266 | 2,495,384,266 |
| 35 | Ending Fund Balance | 6,614,017 | 34,829,875 | 44,515,289 | 33,962,269 | 26,416,442 | 18,496,169 | 10,900,895 |
| 36 | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | Fund Balance Detail | | | | | | | |
| 38 | Restricted Fund Balance | 16,294,708 | 13,769,783 | 23,080,120 | 20,396,556 | 20,446,003 | 20,446,003 | 20,446,003 |
| 39 | <i>Emergency Needs Reserve</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>10,000,000</i> | <i>10,000,000</i> | <i>10,000,000</i> | <i>10,000,000</i> | <i>10,000,000</i> |
| 40 | <i>Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>1,097,992</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| 41 | <i>Court Interpreter Program</i> | <i>10,917,600</i> | <i>9,043,514</i> | <i>8,819,479</i> | <i>8,819,479</i> | <i>8,819,479</i> | <i>8,819,479</i> | <i>8,819,479</i> |
| 42 | <i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i> | <i>1,574,692</i> | <i>2,186,060</i> | <i>1,195,032</i> | <i>1,048,776</i> | <i>1,098,224</i> | <i>1,098,224</i> | <i>1,098,224</i> |
| 43 | <i>Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements</i> | <i>927,837</i> | <i>636,668</i> | <i>528,300</i> | <i>528,300</i> | <i>528,300</i> | <i>528,300</i> | <i>528,300</i> |
| 44 | <i>Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services</i> | <i>380,151</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| 45 | <i>Equal Access Fund</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>454,039</i> | <i>698,494</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> |
| 46 | <i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel</i> | <i>2,494,429</i> | <i>1,449,503</i> | <i>740,823</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> |
| 47 | Unrestricted Fund Balance | (9,680,691) | 21,060,092 | 21,435,168 | 13,565,713 | 5,970,439 | (1,949,834) | (9,545,108) |
| 48 | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit) | (20,229,013) | 21,007,397 | 9,032,127 | (10,553,020) | (7,545,826) | (7,920,274) | (7,595,274) |