



## 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 August 22, 2014

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Budget: Fiscal Year 2015–2016 Budget Requests for Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Judicial Council, and Judicial Branch Facilities Program	Action Required
	Effective Date
	August 22, 2014
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
None	August 19, 2014
Recommended by	Contact
Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch	Zlatko Theodorovic, 916-263-1397 <a href="mailto:zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov">zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov</a>
Hon. Richard D. Huffman, Chair	
Judicial Council staff	
Mr. Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer	
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Chief Financial Officer, Director of Finance	

---

### Executive Summary

The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch recommends approving the proposed fiscal year 2015–2016 budget requests for the Judicial Council, including the Judicial Branch Facilities Program. In addition, the Judicial Council staff recommends approving the proposed fiscal year 2015–2016 budget requests for the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal and delegating authority to the Administrative Director to make technical changes to any budget proposals, as necessary. Submittal of budget change proposals (BCPs) is the standard process for proposing funding adjustments in the State Budget. This year, BCPs are to be submitted to the state Department of Finance by September 2, 2014.

## **Recommendation**

Effective August 22, 2014:

1. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch recommends that the Judicial Council approve the proposed fiscal year 2015–2016 budget requests for the Judicial Council and the Judicial Branch Facilities Program for submission to the state Department of Finance; and
2. The Judicial Council staff recommends that the Judicial Council:
  - a. Approve the submission of budget change proposals to the state Department of Finance for fiscal year 2015–2016, which would communicate funding needs for the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal as identified in this report;
  - b. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director to develop budget proposals for submission to the state Department of Finance; and
  - c. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director to make technical changes to budget proposals, as necessary.

## **Previous Council Action**

The Judicial Council has statutory authority to approve budget requests on behalf of the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Judicial Council, and Judicial Branch Facilities Program. The recommendations in this report are consistent with the council's past practice under this authority.

## **Rationale for Recommendation**

Each year, the Judicial Council staff presents budget concepts for review by the council. Budget concepts approved by the council will be developed into full BCPs. The current estimated need is indicated in parentheses after the titles of programs described below.

## **Delegation of authority to make technical changes**

To the extent that council staff receives additional information that requires technical changes to the funding requests identified in this report, there may be a need to modify the BCPs being submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF). For some of the proposals included in this report, the actual amounts may change as updated information is received. Rather than requesting that council staff return to the Judicial Council to seek authority to make minor adjustments to these proposals, having authority delegated to the Administrative Director to do so in advance will facilitate a dynamic budget process. In addition, each year during the course of developing the State Budget, issues arise that may need to be addressed on short notice. This possibility makes it advisable for the Administrative Director to have the ability to update and add funding proposals in an efficient and flexible manner. If the BCPs that are submitted to the DOF contain changes from the proposals contained in this report, council staff will report to the Judicial Council on these revisions.

## **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

An alternative to recommendations 2(b) and (c) is for the council staff to return to the Judicial Council before submission of the BCPs any time technical adjustments are necessary or unanticipated issues arise. This approach could cause delays in timely updating and submitting proposals, and for this reason, this alternative is not recommended. Council staff will report to the Judicial Council on changes made to the proposals in this report.

### **Judicial branch budget proposals**

Judicial Council approval is requested to proceed with the development of the following fiscal year 2015–2016 BCPs to address baseline resources for the state judiciary, as part of more global budget requests for the judicial branch. At the June 27, 2014, Judicial Council business meeting, the council approved the submittal of trial court proposals consistent with the Chief Justice’s *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*, including reinvestment and cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) for employees.

***Judicial Branch Reinvestment (\$TBD)***. Proposed General Fund augmentation for reinvestment in the entire branch, including the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Judicial Council, and Habeas Corpus Resource Center, for the restoration of services to the public and access to justice. The branch has seen substantial reductions over the past several years, and despite some reinvestment over the past two fiscal years, additional reinvestment is necessary to ensure that the branch meets its constitutional and statutory mandates. All parts of the branch require additional resources to fulfill the branch’s mandates. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Judicial Branch Cost of Living Adjustments (\$TBD)***. Proposed augmentation of the General Fund and various special funds to provide funding for a 4.5 percent COLA consistent with funding approved for the executive branch for all branch employees. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

### **Judicial branch technology proposals**

A predominantly paper-based court system in California is costly and inefficient. It inhibits access to justice and thwarts the public’s growing expectations for online access for filings, payments, and other court services—expectations that can be mitigated by e-filing and a variety of other solutions. The branch continues to support initiatives that address immediate needs (such as maintaining current operating systems and continuing deployment of technologies such as the California Courts Protective Order Registry), while developing a technology plan for the courts. The strategic plan for judicial branch technology will be finalized in 2014 and will provide a structure, roadmap, and process for managing technology initiatives for which additional funding will be sought. In the interim, the proposals described below are necessary to ensure that the branch is moving forward to address critical technology needs.

At the June 27, 2014, Judicial Council business meeting, the Judicial Council approved the submittal of technology proposals for development of the fiscal year 2015–2016 budget. Following are the technology budget proposals that have been developed. Two of the proposals are “placeholders,” which are under development at this time and may be considered for submittal to the California Department of Finance as spring finance letters.

***Telecommunications Trial Court Local Area Network/Wide Area Network (LAN/WAN) Architecture Program (\$5.509 million)***. Proposed ongoing General Fund augmentation for the statewide telecommunications trial court LAN/WAN program to support all 58 courts. The network and security infrastructure at all trial courts must be replaced consistent with a judicial branchwide technology refresh schedule to maintain a secure, robust, reliable, and flexible computing environment for all court operations. Funding will address the hardware refresh, ongoing training for court staff, and maintenance and security of the judicial branch network. This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice’s *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Judicial Branch Information Systems Security Framework Implementation—Placeholder (\$TBD)***. Proposed General Fund augmentation for the initial implementation of a court information security program, which is required to ensure the security and reliability of court data. With the Judicial Branch Contract Law, enacted in 2011, the branch is now subject to biennial audits under which court procurement activities are inspected by the California State Auditor (Pub. Contract Code, § 19210). The auditors may also perform a “general systems” audit to assess the security and reliability of local court information technology infrastructure and the data hosted on that infrastructure. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Statewide Partner Data Exchange – Placeholder (\$TBD)***. Proposed ongoing General Fund augmentation for the statewide partner interface effort to support all 58 courts. Funding will address data exchange development, single portal solutions development, and outreach training, configuration, and implementation between case management systems and justice partners. Development of interface standards to meet a single exchange solution will need to be adopted between the courts and business partners. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Appellate Courts Document Management System (\$2.348 million)***. Proposed General Fund augmentation for the first year’s one-time costs to implement an electronic document management system (DMS) for the Supreme Court and the Courts of Appeal. The DMS will enable the appellate courts to capture, manage, store, share, and preserve essential case documents and administrative records. The DMS is necessary to improve efficiency, reduce costs

associated with record storage/retrieval, and improve customer service to the public. This project would be a phased-in deployment.

The Judicial Council Technology Committee will make a recommendation to the council for the approval of the proposal for the Appellate Courts Document Management System. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

### **Judicial branch facilities program proposals**

At the June 27, 2014, Judicial Council business meeting, the council approved the submittal of facilities program proposals (nonstaff proposals) for development of the fiscal year 2015–2016 budget. Staffing requirements have been identified for two of the proposals and are reflected below.

***Ongoing Increase to Facility Modifications (\$12.625 million for transfer to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund)***. Proposed General Fund augmentation, including four positions and \$625,000 for staff costs, to support an ongoing increase to the facility modification program. The increase to the modification program will address major repairs, system life-cycle replacements, and renovation projects in existing courthouses to provide safe and secure facilities. The requested staff resources will enable effective and timely delivery of projects and oversight of the work related to the \$12 million and will ensure that contracts are processed and awarded in a timely manner. This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice’s *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Increased Operations Costs for New/Renovated Courthouses (\$7.2 million)***. Proposed increased ongoing General Fund appropriation authority (for transfer to the Court Facilities Trust Fund) to address increased facility operating costs (operations and maintenance, utilities, and insurance) for 19 new or renovated court facilities (Plumas-Sierra, Contra Costa, Fresno-Sisk, Mono, Lassen, San Benito, Tulare, Calaveras, Riverside–Mid-County, San Bernardino, Solano, San Joaquin–Juvenile Justice Center, Madera, Butte, Sutter, Yolo, Kings, Santa Clara, and Merced). This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice’s *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Facilities Operations Costs Adjustment (\$27.605 million: \$27.0 million for transfer to the Court Facilities Trust Fund and \$605,000 for transfer to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund)***. Proposed General Fund augmentation, including four positions and \$605,000 for staff costs, to maintain trial court facilities at industry-standard levels using the Building Owners and Managers Association average. Includes funding for ongoing baseline

adjustment to offset inflationary cost increases and adjustment to maintain trial court facilities at industry-standard levels. The requested staff resources will be necessary to address the increased operations and maintenance workload that will require additional oversight. This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice's *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Judicial Branch Risk Management Program—Trial Courts (\$1.721 million)***. Proposed increased ongoing General Fund appropriation authority for transfer to the Court Facilities Trust Fund for facilities-related insurance premiums for effective risk management of trial court facilities. County facility payments provide \$2.862 million for insurance. Total property and liability costs associated with court facility operations are estimated at \$4.583 million. This request addresses the unfunded need. This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice's *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

#### **Judicial council proposal**

***Trial Court Security System Maintenance and Replacement (\$1.892 million)***. Proposed ongoing State Court Facilities Construction Fund augmentation to maintain and replace camera, electronic access, and duress alarm and intrusion alarm systems in state trial court facilities. Existing systems will be maintained for the duration of their life cycle and replaced on either a 5- or a 10-year schedule depending on the system type. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

#### **Other state judiciary proposals**

***State Judiciary Rent Increases for Appellate Courts, Judicial Council, and Judicial Branch Facilities Program (\$TBD)***. Proposed General Fund augmentation to fund 2015–2016 increased rent costs for state-owned and non-state-owned facilities. Increased costs are based on the Department of General Services estimates for state-owned facilities and lease rates for non-state-owned facilities. This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice's *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*. The Advisory Committee on Financial Accountability and Efficiency for the Judicial Branch reviewed this request as it pertains to Judicial Council funding and supports the submission of this BCP.

***Supreme Court Workload (\$1.2 million)***. General Fund augmentation to provide the Supreme Court with additional resources to address required workload. This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice's *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*.

***California Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Habeas Corpus Resource Center Print and Online Subscriptions (\$TBD)***. General Fund augmentation to address the increased costs of law

library print and online resources for the California Judicial Center Library and the law libraries of the Courts of Appeal. The amount requested represents observed and predicted increases in the costs of supplying library, judicial chambers, and staff collections in all court libraries and contractually required increases in the costs of providing access to the major online legal research services.

***New Appellate Court Justices (\$2.4 million).*** Request for two additional appellate court justices and their necessary chambers staff for Division Two of the Fourth Appellate District to meet substantial and growing workload demands. As a result of changes in criminal and civil law over the years that increased the complexity of the court's caseload, when the council sought and the Legislature and Governor authorized 12 new justices in 2000, the optimal number of case weights per justice was revised from 98 to 89. Division Two has an annual average of 1,132 appeals becoming fully briefed, resulting in a case weight of 115 cases per justice, far exceeding all of the other divisions. Addition of the two justices would reduce the weighted workload to the optimal number of 89 cases per justice and will prevent cases from being transferred from one district to another, which poses a hardship for litigants who bear the expense and burden of traveling to a distant district. It will also allow local issues to be decided in the geographic area in which the dispute arose. This proposal is consistent with the Chief Justice's *Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch*.

### **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

Not applicable.

### **Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives**

The funding proposals requested for the appellate courts, Judicial Council, and Judicial Branch Facilities Program will address the strategic plan goals of Access, Fairness, and Diversity (Goal I); Modernization of Management and Administration (Goal III); and Quality of Justice and Service to the Public (Goal IV).

### **Attachments and Links**

1. Department of Finance 2015–16 Budget Policy Letter #14-12, issued July 15, 2014

# BUDGET LETTER

	<b>NUMBER:</b> 14-12
<b>SUBJECT:</b> 2015-16 BUDGET POLICY	<b>DATE ISSUED:</b> July 15, 2014
<b>REFERENCES:</b> BL14-05, BL14-07	<b>SUPERSEDES:</b> 13-14

TO: Agency Secretaries  
Department Directors  
Department Chief Counsels  
Department Budget and Accounting Officers  
Department of Finance Budget and Accounting Staff

FROM: DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

This Budget Letter sets forth the Governor's policy direction for his proposed 2015-16 Budget. As a reminder, BL14-05, issued April 14, 2014, outlines the technical and procedural requirements for preparation of the 2015-16 Governor's Budget.

## Priorities

The Administration's primary budget focus continues to be maintaining a structurally balanced budget that preserves critical state services and pays down debt and obligations. Departments must continue to control costs, increase efficiency, and refrain from creating new—or expanding existing—programs. Also, this year we will be making a major transition from our legacy information technology systems to Financial Information System for California (FI\$Cal), which will require all departments to technically modify the format of budget submissions to adjust to the new requirements of FI\$Cal.

## Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) and Enrollment/Caseload/Population (ECP) Policy

To maintain a structurally balanced budget, departments' ability to submit BCPs or ECP policy changes for the 2015-16 Budget remains limited, regardless of the funding source.

Accordingly, departments (including those not under the Governor's direct authority) should submit BCPs or ECP policy changes for the 2015-16 Budget only in the following circumstances:

- a. Statutory changes necessary for departments to manage within their budgets.
- b. Expected changes in programs' ECPs.
- c. Paying down state debts and liabilities.
- d. Reducing deferred maintenance.
- e. Existing or ongoing Information Technology (IT) projects.
- f. Existing or ongoing Capital Outlay projects.
- g. New Capital Outlay projects, if critical, such as fire, life, safety, or court-ordered projects.
- h. Cost-cutting measures or authorizing efficiencies to offset unavoidable costs.
- i. Improved budgeting practices related to zero-base budgeting, performance measures, and other efforts as directed by Executive Order B-13-11.

In the event there is a critical need that does not meet the criteria outlined above and the agency secretary believes a new BCP is needed to prevent adverse consequences, or to address adverse problems a department is already encountering, contact your Finance Program Budget Manager before the due date.



All other BCP requests that do not fit into the categories listed above will be returned to departments without review.

Departments should assess whether statutory changes (including budget bill language) are necessary to effectuate any BCP that is submitted. If statutory changes are necessary, the department's BCP must include a copy of the proposed legislation. This requirement is necessary for Finance to comply with its obligations under Government Code §13308 to submit proposed statutory changes to the Legislature, through the Legislative Counsel. BCPs, including requests for Budget Bill language changes, must be submitted to Finance no later than **September 2, 2014**. (This is a change from the due date stated in BL14-05.)

FI\$Cal Wave 1 departments will enter information directly into the new FI\$Cal System for 2015-16 BCPs and all non-Wave 1 departments will use the BCP template to be provided separately.

### **BCP Confidentiality**

Information contained in BCPs is an integral part of the Governor's deliberation process. Accordingly, every BCP must be treated as privileged and confidential until and unless the BCP is released to the Legislature as part of the Governor's Budget, the April 1 Finance Letter process, or the May Revision. Disapproved, unapproved, and draft BCPs (i.e., BCPs not released to the Legislature) remain confidential indefinitely, and may not be released. Final BCPs are those that contain a Finance supervisor's signature/approval attesting that the BCP has been submitted to the Legislature.

Questions about Public Records Act or litigation discovery requests for budget documents should be directed to department legal staff and, if necessary, by department legal staff to Finance legal staff.

If you have any questions about this Budget Letter, please contact your Finance budget analyst.

/s/ Michael Cohen

MICHAEL COHEN  
Director



**Judicial Branch and  
Judicial Council  
FY 2015-2016 BCP Concepts  
as of August 5, 2014  
(in thousands)**

**ACTION**

		JUDICIAL BRANCH FACILITY PROGRAM BCP CONCEPT TITLE	OFFICE	DESCRIPTION	FUND SOURCE	Positions	Total Personal Services (includes Salary and Benefits)	OE&E	BCP Concept Total FY 15-16	BCP Concept Total FY 16-17
AP	1	<b>Ongong Increase to Facility Modifications</b> <i>Approved by Judicial Council June 27, 2014. A&amp;E approval required for positions only.</i>	REFM	Request 4.0 positions and funding to support an ongoing increase to the facility modification program from the General Fund (\$12.625 million). The increase to the facility modification program will address major repairs, system life-cycle replacements, and renovation projects in existing courthouses to provide safe and secure facilities. The requested staff resources will enable effective and timely delivery of projects. Ongoing request.	GF Trsf to SCFCF (\$12,625)	4.0	\$507	\$12,118	\$12,625	\$12,625
I	2	<b>Increased Operations Costs for New/Renovated Courthouses<sup>2</sup></b> <i>Approved by Judicial Council June 27, 2014.</i>	REFM	Request appropriation authority from the General Fund (for transfer to the Court Facilities Trust Fund) to address increased facility operating costs (operations and maintenance, utilities, and insurance) for 19 new/renovated court facilities (Plumas-Sierra, Contra Costa, Fresno-Sisk, Mono, Lassen, San Benito, Tulare, Calaveras, Riverside Mid-County, San Bernardino, Solano, San Joaquin-Juvenile Justice Center, Madera, Butte, Sutter, Yolo, Kings, Santa Clara, and Merced.) Ongoing request. (Pending final update)	GF Trsf to CFTF			\$7,200	\$7,200	\$7,700
AP	3	<b>Facilities Operations Costs Adjustment</b> <i>Approved by Judicial Council June 27, 2014. A&amp;E approval required for positions only.</i>	REFM	Request 4.0 positions and funding to support an ongoing increase in appropriation authority from the General Fund in the amount of \$27.605 million (for transfer to the Court Facilities Trust Fund) to maintain trial court facilities at industry standard levels using the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) average. In addition ongoing baseline adjustment to offset inflationary cost increases, and adjustment to maintain trial court facilities at industry standard levels.	GF Trsf to CFTF (\$27,000) GF Trsf to SCFCF (\$605)	4.0	\$475	\$27,130	\$27,605	\$27,605
I	4	<b>Judicial Branch Risk Management Program - Trial Courts<sup>1</sup></b> <i>Approved by Judicial Council June 27, 2014.</i>	CP	Request increased appropriation authority from the General Fund (for transfer to the Court Facilities Trust Fund) for facilities-related insurance premiums for effective risk management of trial court facilities. County Facility Payments provide \$2.862 million for insurance. Total property and liability costs associated with court facility operations is estimated at \$4.583 million, this request addresses the unfunded need. Ongoing request. (Pending update for FY 15-16 needs)	GF Trsf to CFTF			\$1,721	\$1,721	\$1,721
<b>Total FY 2015-2016 BCP Concepts, JB Facility Program</b>						<b>8.0</b>	<b>\$982</b>	<b>\$48,169</b>	<b>\$49,151</b>	<b>\$49,651</b>
<b>BCP Concepts By Fund:</b>										
<b>Total, General Fund Transfers to Court Facilities Trust Fund - BCP Concepts</b>						<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$35,921</b>	<b>\$35,921</b>	<b>\$36,421</b>
<b>Total, State Court Facilities Construction Fund - BCP Concepts</b>						<b>8.0</b>	<b>\$982</b>	<b>\$12,248</b>	<b>\$13,230</b>	<b>\$13,230</b>

Footnotes:

- 1) The cost estimate for the Risk Mangement concept is based upon FY 2014-2015 BCP Concept estimates. If this project is authorized to proceed, the cost estimates will be updated to reflect current information. The cost estimates are not anticipated to change substantially from last year's proposal.
- 2) The cost estimate for the Increased Operations Costs for New/Renovated Courthouses is pending further review.

Item Legend:

- A - Action Required
- AP - Action Required for Positions Only
- I - Information Only

**Judicial Branch and  
Judicial Council  
FY 2015-2016 BCP Concepts  
as of August 5, 2014  
(in thousands)**

**ACTION**

		JUDICIAL BRANCH/JUDICIAL COUNCIL BCP CONCEPT TITLE	OFFICE	DESCRIPTION	FUND SOURCE	Position	Total Personal Services (includes Salary and Benefits)	OE&E	BCP Concept Total FY 15-16	BCP Concept Total FY 16-17
		<b>JUDICIAL BRANCH</b>								
A, I	1	<b>Judicial Branch Reinvestment</b>	<b>FIN &amp; GA</b>	Reinvestment in the Judicial Branch is necessary to ensure the branch meets its constitutional and statutory mandates. The branch has taken substantial reductions over the past several years and while there has been some reinvestment over the past two fiscal years, additional reinvestment is necessary. All part of the branch required additional resources to fulfill the branch's mandates.	General Fund & Special Funds	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
A, I	2	<b>Judicial Branch COLAs</b>	<b>FIN &amp; HR</b>	Request for funding for 4.5% COLA, consistent with funding approved for the Executive Branch.	General Fund & Special Funds	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
A, I	3	<b>State Judiciary Rent Increases (Appellate Courts, JC/JBFP, HCRC)</b>		Request General Fund augmentation to fund 2015-16 increased rent costs for state-owned facilities. Increased costs based on DGS estimates for state-owned facilities; and lease rate as stated for non-state owned facilities.	General Fund & Special Funds	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
I		<b>Non BCP Issue - State Level Judiciary Merit Salary Adjustment</b>		The Chief Justice approved the continuation of the 3.5 percent merit salary adjustment for the state judiciary, inclusive of the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Judicial Council.						
		<b>JUDICIAL BRANCH TECHNOLOGY PROPOSALS</b>								
A	4	<b>Appellate Courts Document Management System</b> <i>The JCTC will make a recommendation to the Judicial Council at the August JC meeting.</i>	<b>IT</b>	Request for General Fund augmentation of \$2.348 million in one-time costs in FY 2015-2016; \$1.471 million in one-time costs in FY 2016-2017, \$200,000 in one-time costs in FY 2017-2018, and ongoing costs thereafter of \$817,000 per year to implement an electronic Document Management System (DMS) for the Supreme Court and the Courts of Appeal (Appellate Courts). By acquiring a DMS, the Appellate Courts will capture, manage, store, share and preserve essential case documents and administrative records. An Appellate Court DMS is necessary to improve efficiency, reduce costs associated with record storage/retrieval and improve customer service to the public. This project would be a phased-in deployment of the DMS application to all Appellate Courts throughout the state.	General Fund	0.0	\$0	\$2,348	\$2,348	\$1,471

Item Legend:

A - Action Required

AP - Action Required for Positions Only

I - Information Only

**Judicial Branch and  
Judicial Council  
FY 2015-2016 BCP Concepts  
as of August 5, 2014  
(in thousands)**

**ACTION**

		JUDICIAL BRANCH/JUDICIAL COUNCIL BCP CONCEPT TITLE	OFFICE	DESCRIPTION	FUND SOURCE	Position	Total Personal Services (includes Salary and Benefits)	OE&E	BCP Concept Total FY 15-16	BCP Concept Total FY 16-17
I	5	<b>Judicial Branch Information Systems Security Framework Implementation PLACEHOLDER</b>	IT	Funding is being requested for the initial implementation of a court information security program, which is required to ensure the security and reliability of court data. This implementation will include the assessment of court readiness for general and business process application control reviews, which may be conducted by the California State Auditor in conjunction with mandated procurement audits. With the Judicial Branch Contract Law enacted in 2011, the judicial branch is now subject to biennial audits under which court procurement activities are inspected by the California State Auditor (PCC 19210). It is critical to understand that these audits are not necessarily limited strictly to procurement activities, and auditors have the ability to perform a "general systems" audit to assess the security and reliability of local court information technology infrastructure and the data hosted on that infrastructure. A general systems audit will normally cover a number of fundamental areas:	General Fund	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
I	6	<b>Telecommunications Trial Court Local Area Network/Wide Area Network (LAN/WAN) Architecture Program</b>	IT	Request \$5.5 million in FY 2015-2016 and subsequent years for the statewide Telecommunications Trial Court LAN/WAN program to support all 58 courts. It is assumed that the FY 2014-2015 baseline for LAN/WAN of \$11.705 million will continue in subsequent years and the requested additional funding of \$5.5 million will be used to fully fund the LAN/WAN program for all 58 courts. The requested amount along with the baseline amount will fund the hardware refresh, ongoing training for court staff, and maintenance and security of the judicial branch network. The program will be administered for all trial courts in accordance to hardware end-of-life cycles. Additional consultants may be requested in future years depending upon the magnitude of that year's refresh cycle. The network and security infrastructure at all trial courts must be replaced consistently with a judicial branchwide technology refresh schedule in order to maintain a secure, robust, reliable and flexible computing environment for all court operations. It is assumed that any additional FTEs for the program will be funded internally.	General Fund	0.0	\$0	\$5,509	\$5,509	\$5,509
I	7	<b>Statewide Partner Data Exchange PLACEHOLDER</b>	IT	Request funding in FY 2015-2016 and subsequent years for the statewide partner interface effort to support all 58 courts. The amount to be requested will fund data exchange development, single portal solutions development, and outreach, training, configuration, and implementation between case management systems and justice partners. Development of interface standards to meet a single exchange solution will need to be adopted between the courts and business partners. Consultants for project initiation and phases will need to be hired as the roll out and adoption of exchanges are implemented.	General Fund	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Item Legend:

A - Action Required

AP - Action Required for Positions Only

I - Information Only

**Judicial Branch and  
Judicial Council  
FY 2015-2016 BCP Concepts  
as of August 5, 2014  
(in thousands)**

**ACTION**

		JUDICIAL BRANCH/JUDICIAL COUNCIL BCP CONCEPT TITLE	OFFICE	DESCRIPTION	FUND SOURCE	Position	Total Personal Services (includes Salary and Benefits)	OE&E	BCP Concept Total FY 15-16	BCP Concept Total FY 16-17
		<b>JUDICIAL COUNCIL</b>								
A	8	<b>Trial Court Security System Maintenance &amp; Replacement</b>	<b>COS- Security</b>	Requesting \$1.892 million ongoing, to maintain and replace camera, electronic access, duress alarm and intrusion alarm systems in State Trial Court facilities. Existing systems will be maintained for the duration of their life cycle and replaced on either a five or ten-year schedule depending on the system type.	SCFCF	0.0	\$0	\$1,892	\$1,892	\$0
		<b>Total FY 2015-2016 BCP Concepts, Judicial Branch/Judicial Council</b>				<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,749</b>	<b>\$9,749</b>	<b>\$6,980</b>
		<b>BCP Concepts By Fund:</b>								
		<b>Total, General Fund</b>				<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$7,857</b>	<b>\$7,857</b>	<b>\$6,980</b>
		<b>Total, Trial Court Trust Fund</b>				<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
		<b>Total, State Court Facilities Construction Fund</b>				<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,892</b>	<b>\$1,892</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Item Legend:

- A - Action Required
- AP - Action Required for Positions Only
- I - Information Only

**Trial Courts**  
**FY 2015-2016 BCP Concepts**  
**as of July 28, 2014**  
*(in thousands)*

8/5/2014

**INFORMATION ONLY - Trial Court BCPs approved by Judicial Council June 27, 2014.**

		TRIAL COURTS CONCEPT TITLE	BCP	OFFICE	DESCRIPTION	FUND SOURCE	Position	Total Personal Services (includes Salary and Benefits)	OE&E	BCP Concept Total FY 15-16	BCP Concept Total FY 16-17
I	1	<b>Trial Court Reinvestment - Closing the Funding Gap</b>		<b>FIN &amp; GA</b>	See "Judicial Branch Reinvestment" BCP concept description.	GF					
I	2	<b>Technology</b>		<b>IT</b>	See "Judicial Branch Technology Proposals."	GF					
I	3	<b>Judgeships (AB 159)</b>		<b>COS &amp; FIN</b>	This request would include funding for court support staff, both inside and outside the courtroom, for the second of three sets of judgeships authorized by the Legislature in in AB 159 (Stats. 2007, ch.722).	GF					
I	4	<b>Court Facilities</b>		<b>REFM &amp; CP</b>	See " <i>Judicial Branch Facility Program BCP Concept Summary</i> " for listing of BCPs and funding requested.	GF trsf to SCFCF GF trsf to CFTF					
I	5	<b>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel</b>		<b>CFCC</b>	This proposal would request funding to address costs for court-appointed dependency counsel for parents and children to reduce caseloads from the current rate of 250 clients per attorney to 188. An ongoing need of \$33.1 million was identified in the Chief Justice's <i>Three-Year Blueprint for a Fully Functioning Judicial Branch</i> .	GF				\$33,100	\$33,100
I	6	<b>Trial Court Trust Fund Backfill</b>		<b>FIN</b>	A shortfall in the TCTF for base allocations was identified. The 2014 Budget Act only addressed \$30.9 million of the issue with \$22.7 million as the remaining problem.	GF				\$22,700	\$22,700
I	7	<b>State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Negative Fund Balance</b>		<b>FIN</b>	A deficit of \$18 million is currently projected for the STCIMF in 2015-2016. If the DOF does not approve funding to address this deficit before 2015-2016, a proposal would be submitted to request this funding.	GF				\$18,000	\$18,000
		<b>Total FY 2015-2016 BCPs, Trial Courts</b>					<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$73,800</b>	<b>\$73,800</b>
		<b>BCPS By Fund:</b>									
		Total, General Fund					<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$73,800</b>	<b>\$73,800</b>
		Total, Trial Court Trust Fund					<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
		Total, State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund					<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Item Legend:

I - Information Only

