



## Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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 22, 2012

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Courts: San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team Report of Recommendations	Information Only
Submitted by	Date of Report
Jody Patel, Interim Administrative Director of the Courts	June 7, 2012
San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team	Contact
	Maureen Dumas, 916-263-2290 Maureen.Dumas@jud.ca.gov
	Pam Reynolds, 916-263-1462 Pam.Reynolds@jud.ca.gov

---

### **Executive Summary**

The Judicial Council directed the Administrative Office of the Courts, Regional Office, to assist the Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin, to identify possible cost savings measures and opportunities to increase revenues. A team of experienced Court Executive Officers convened to participate as members of the San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team (CART). This informational report, submitted by the Regional Office, provides the council with options relating to CART recommendations and responses provided by the Superior Court of San Joaquin County regarding its operational and administrative activities and areas where the court might achieve additional cost savings and increase revenue to minimize future requests for emergency funding.

### **Previous Council Action**

At the December 13, 2011, meeting of the Judicial Council, the Superior Court of San Joaquin County presented a request for additional funding for budgetary shortfalls experienced in fiscal year 2011–2012. The council approved emergency funding of \$1.08 million and a loan of \$916,000. Along with this funding, the council requested the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Regional Office to assist the court in determining whether the court had identified all

possible cost-savings measures and ways to increase revenue and to report back to the council on its findings within six months to one year.

## **Methodology and Process**

### **CART Activities**

With the goal of creating a team of court experts who could use their experience and background in court administration and operations, Jody Patel, former AOC Regional Administrative Director and current Interim Administrative Director of the Courts, identified the following experienced court executive officers (CEOs) with specialized expertise in specific subject areas (e.g., California Court Case Management System [CCMS], labor, revenue and civil assessments, and court operations) and requested their involvement as members of the CART:

- Alan Carlson, Chief Executive Officer, Superior Court of Orange County
- Michael D. Planet, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Ventura County
- Kiri S. Torre, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Contra Costa County
- Kim Turner, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Marin County
- David H. Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Santa Clara County

To support the CART effort, the AOC also contributed specific subject-matter expertise from:

- Curt Soderlund, Interim Chief Deputy Director and Director, AOC Administrative Services Division
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Chief Financial Officer and Director, AOC Finance Division
- Althea Lowe-Thomas, Assistant Director, AOC Regional Office
- John Judnick, Senior Manager, Internal Audit Services Unit, AOC Finance Division
- Maureen Dumas, Manager, Reengineering Unit, AOC Regional Office
- Pam Reynolds, Manager, AOC Regional Office

The CART members developed a business plan as their guiding document. (See attachment D, CART Business Plan.) Included in the business plan were the charge of the CART and the expectations for its members. CART members were responsible for:

- Assembling a team of court subject-matter experts from each CEO's respective court for the assigned subject area (see attachment E, CART Subject-Matter Teams);
- Visiting the Superior Court of San Joaquin County to interview, observe, and meet with court staff, supervisors, management, executive staff, and judicial officers, reviewing external documents and reports pertaining to court operations as needed;
- Identifying potential areas for recommendations;
- Sharing these ideas with the CART team to determine what to recommend to the court; and
- Presenting final recommendations to the court and obtaining information from the court regarding whether they can and/or will implement the recommendations and, if so, the time frame for implementation.

The CART effort began with a meeting on February 9, 2012, attended by CART members and the CEO and management team of the Superior Court of San Joaquin County to initiate discussions and discuss the process that would be utilized. CART members and their team of subject-matter experts were then given the task of visiting the court and/or holding conference calls to learn about court operations and administrative activities. Court visits and conference calls spanned from February 28 through April 5, 2012 (see attachment F, San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team Activity Summary, for a more detailed listing of the exact dates and participants of visits and conference calls).

### **Recommendations Development**

Recommendations were developed by the individual subject-matter-specific review teams and submitted to the AOC Regional Office for compilation. The CART then met as a team on April 20, 2012, and reviewed the recommendations to identify which would result in the largest cost savings or revenue generation for the court and would be of interest for inclusion in the Judicial Council Report of Recommendations. The CART identified 74 recommendations that met these criteria. CART members identified a proposed implementation time frame (“short,” within six months; “medium,” from six months to one year; and “long,” longer than one year); an estimate regarding savings, efficiencies, or revenue; and an estimate of the associated cost for the respective recommendations. When practical, CART members calculated savings or costs for the respective recommendations based on their experience with similar activities.

The CART also identified many other recommendations they thought were appropriate to share with the court relating to best practices and process efficiency recommendations. These recommendations were provided as information only for the court and are included in attachment G, Recommendations for Consideration as Best Practices/Process Efficiencies.

On April 30, 2012, the CART forwarded the following information to the court:

- 74 recommendations in which the CART requested a response from the court regarding whether the court would be adopting the recommendations;
- 6 recommendations relating to best practices, and 60 recommendations relating to process efficiencies, submitted to the court as information only—no response required (attachment G); and
- 80 pages of attachments providing additional information (court forms, work sheets, etc.) for specific recommendations provided by CART members.

As the first bullet states, the CART requested that for each of the 74 recommendations, the court indicate whether it would be adopting the proposed recommendation. Further, the CART requested that if yes, the court provide an implementation time frame and if no, the court provide the business reasons for non-adoption.

The court reviewed the proposed recommendations and provided responses to the 74 recommendations on May 16, 2012. Attachments A, B, and C contain the proposed CART recommendations divided into three areas:

- Attachment A: recommendations that the court indicated it will be adopting outright or adopting with modifications;
- Attachment B: recommendations that the court indicated it had identified before the CART; and
- Attachment C: recommendations that the court indicated it will not be adopting.

### **Summary of Findings**

In attachments A, B, and C the court provided very thorough and thoughtful responses for each of the recommendations. It is apparent from the information provided that the court seriously considered each of the proposed CART recommendations and plans on adopting many of them. This willingness to accept the information provided by the CART was further demonstrated by court staff and management in meetings with CART members and their teams, who indicated that the court was eager and interested to learn about what other cost-saving measures the CART members had undertaken in their courts. Although the need for the court to return to the council for emergency funding may not be entirely eliminated in the short term by implementing recommendations of the CART, the council may want to use the attached recommendations and responses as a basis for documenting that the court is or will be taking the necessary steps to realize cost savings and efficiencies.

To summarize:

- Of the 74 recommendations that required a response, the court indicated that it would be adopting 51 recommendations (69 percent).
- The court indicated that 21 of the 74 recommendations (28 percent) were already identified and in the process of being implemented, were approved by the court's Executive Committee for implementation, or were implemented well before the CART effort.
- Finally, the court indicated that it would not be adopting two recommendations (3 percent).

The following provides high-level information about each of these categories. For more detailed information, please reference the appropriate attachments for each recommendation.

***Recommendations adopted.*** As indicated in attachment A, the court responded positively to the majority of the CART recommendations, indicating that it was going to evaluate or implement the recommendations as stated or with modifications. Although the court indicated that it would be *adopting* 51 recommendations, not all recommendations will necessarily be *implemented*. Of the 51 recommendations, the court responded that:

- It plans to implement 25 recommendations in the next 60 days to two to three years.

- In the next six months to one year or more, it plans to evaluate, assess, and review 19 recommendations for possible implementation.
- It plans to implement two recommendations in conjunction with changes to an overall civil assessment program.
- It will adopt two recommendations that it believes it is already following.
- The planning and potential implementation of three recommendations related to technology is pending until the new information technology manager is hired.

Many of the proposed recommendations that were adopted fall into the following four areas:

- **Collections**

In the area of collections, the court responded that it will be implementing several recommendations that should result in increased court revenue. These recommendations include conducting an analysis of current fine stay and installment fee assessments and collections related to Penal Code section 1463.007 (R14); designating cases as a new delinquent case type to negotiate sending them to an outside collector rather than to the county for collections within six months (R15); and conducting a 6- to 12-month evaluation to analyze the cost of automating the court's accounts receivable system or purchasing an outside system to allow for the collection of criminal installment payments (R16).

- **Court reporters**

The court responded that it will be adopting several recommendations that pertain to court reporters to realize cost and staff savings. These recommendations include implementing a word-count approach when determining the amount paid for each transcript (implement within 6 months) (R23); implementing electronic recordings in permissible proceedings (implement within 6 months) (R25); and requiring reporters to store court reporter notes electronically and discontinuing the purchase of paper for court reporters (effective July 1, 2012) (R26).

- **Records/filing/exhibits**

The court indicated that it plans to adopt many of the recommendations submitted by CART members regarding records/filing/exhibits to create staff savings, cost savings, and efficiencies. These recommendations include using paper sorting tools where needed when presorting items to be filed (R44.1); maintaining physical files in single numeric order based on numbering provided by the case management system rather than segmenting by case type for more efficient retrieval and reshelving of case files and to reduce misfiles (implement in six months to one year) (R44.2); and using bar code labels on every active file and creating bar codes for court locations to assist with file tracking (implement in six months to one year) (R44.4).

- **Information technology**

Finally, the court indicated that it would be:

- Adopting, but postponing decisions about implementation until an IT manager is hired (hiring currently taking place), the following recommendations:

- Moving IBM FileNet hosting and support to the AOC and the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) (R49);
  - Auditing software licenses to confirm that they are still in use, and eliminating maintenance renewals on unused software (R50);
  - Moving the hosting of the public access website to an AOC CCTC/CCMS secure portal, or replacing the current server that is locally hosting the website (R51); and
  - Evaluating the existing website for redesign, and updating it to make it easier to navigate and to ensure that it contains relevant and accurate information (R53).
- Meeting with law enforcement agencies (LEAs) in San Joaquin County to discuss efficiencies that the use of electronic traffic citations (e-citations) presents to both the LEAs and the court to encourage the LEAs to seek grant funding to implement this program, indicating that it may take up to one year or more to fully explore, apply, and implement an e-citation program (R52);
  - Implementing the “lift and shift” option to stabilize the court’s current criminal/traffic case management system within the next two years (R54);
  - Adding the juvenile delinquency case type content data to the court’s existing case management system within six months, and in the long term assessing whether the court should evaluate the vendor used by the San Joaquin County Probation Department (vendor assessment to be completed within one year) (R55); and
  - Conducting a return-on-investment analysis to determine specific savings versus the cost of expanding e-filing to other case types (R56), and dedicating positions to scanning paper documents (document imaging) as an investment in future efficiencies (analysis to be completed between 12 and 18 months) (R57).

***Recommendations identified prior to CART.*** In response to recommendations contained in attachment B, the court modified the standard response for these 21 recommendations to specify that:

- The court had implemented the recommendations well before the CART;
- The court had identified the recommendations before the CART and was in the process of implementing them; and
- The court had received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendations before receiving CART recommendations.

Although the court may have been in the process of receiving approval for or adopting certain proposed recommendations, the status of these activities was not relayed to CART members at the time of the CART visits and meetings. Hence, to ensure that these important recommendations were not overlooked, the proposed recommendations were included for court consideration.

Given that a large number of these recommendations related to fees, following are the court's responses to specific fee recommendations:

- The court responded that it was already assessing a \$10 administrative assessment on both Vehicle Code section 40508(a) and (b) violations (R30) and the \$15 warrant fee under section 40508.5 (R36) well before the CART provided these recommendations;
- During initial CART meetings, the court had raised the issue of revenue due to the court from the county (Veh. Code, § 16028; Pen. Code, § 1463.22) and will be contacting the county to obtain this revenue (anticipate completing this task by the close of fiscal year 2012–2013) (R34);
- The court had been in discussions with the AOC Audit Division about the court's desire to move away from the A87 cost allocation billing method with the county since this issue was identified in September 2009 and plans on working with the Audit Division to implement this recommendation in six months to one year (R37).
- The court had already identified the need to evaluate the business process for bail exoneration and refund checks to determine if staff can reduce workload related to generating and distributing bail exoneration and refund checks using the Phoenix Financial System and will be implementing this recommendation in six months to one year. (R38)
- Before receiving the CART recommendations, the court received court Executive Committee approval on May 1, 2012, to implement the following recommendations:
  - Increase civil assessment collections by including "failure to pay" traffic cases (R12.1);
  - Increase a returned-check fee from \$25 to \$50 (Gov. Code, § 71386) (implement within 30 days) (R31);
  - Increase the fee for Penal Code section 1395 bail bond forfeiture set-aside fees based on actual costs (implement within 60 days) (R32);
  - Impose a motion fee on criminal and traffic hearings in accordance with Government Code section 70617(c) (implement within 60 days) (R33);
  - Implement a Penal Code section 1205 stay fee on fines imposed in court (implement by July 1, 2012) (R35).

Additionally, in the area of technology were four recommendations that the court responded that it identified before the CART and is in the process of implementing:

- In response to a recommendation regarding the court's actively pursuing the filling of the vacant chief information officer/IT manager position (R46), the court had already been working on this activity for the previous couple of months, with the recruitment closing May 14, 2012, interviews taking place on May 17, 2012, and anticipated hiring by mid-June.
- In response to two recommendations regarding replacing servers and software (R47 and R48), the court indicated that it had previously recognized the recommendation to replace individual servers with three servers running VMWare virtualization as vital to ensuring continuity of its operations, that it had already obtained quotes for servers, and that the

quotes had been validated by CART members. Given that the court is close to hiring an IT manager, the court will be deferring both of these activities until the IT manager is hired to ensure his or her participation in the final decision. The court further indicated that the servers would be purchased in the next two months and that other activities will be completed in the next six months to one year where financially feasible.

- In response to a recommendation that the court review its existing telephone system and identify additional functionality or consider converting to Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) to increase customer service, the court indicated that it is currently reviewing its interactive voice response (IVR) process and recordings to identify functionality that may result in a more efficient processing of incoming calls. Additionally, the court indicated that it is currently working with a vendor to evaluate the possibility of hosted VOIP services. The court indicated that it may be prohibited from moving to a VOIP platform because of the age of the courthouse infrastructure but has planned for VOIP in the new Stockton courthouse (R58).

***Recommendations not adopted.*** In light of the total number of recommendations provided, the number of recommendations that the court responded it would not be adopting, as indicated in attachment C, was very small (two recommendations; three percent):

- In response to a recommendation that the court prepare Family Law Child Custody Recommending Counselor recommendations as Word documents and e-mail the Word documents to the clerk preparing orders (minute and orders after hearing) so that they can be copied and pasted into orders and typed only once, the court responded that it is in the best interest of the clients the court serves to use the Judicial Council forms to delineate the details of the custody agreements and/or orders rather than a pleading or free-flowing format offered by Word templates. (R4)
- In response to a recommendation that the court consider eliminating the Lodi and Manteca branch courts (three courtrooms) and using three vacant courtrooms in the Family Law Annex for proceedings that do not require holding cells (e.g., civil department proceedings), the court responded that it believes the branch courts provide important access to justice to the residents of those communities. The court explained that the Lodi courthouse serves not only the City of Lodi but also the communities of Thornton, Acampo, Victor, Lockeford, and Clements, many of which don't have public transportation to Stockton. The Tracy and Manteca courts (South County) service not only the City of Tracy and the City of Manteca, but also the cities and communities of Mountain House, Banta, Ripon, Escalon, and Lathrop, many of which also are without public transportation to Stockton. Some cities (areas) are as far as 45 minutes from the Stockton courthouse, and the lack of public transportation will certainly prohibit access to justice for these communities and residents. For additional information provided by the court in response to this recommendation, please see attachment C (R28).



## **Next Steps**

The CART submits this report for council consideration and recommends that the council consider the following options for how to use the information contained in the CART recommendations and the responses from the court:

- Use the attached CART recommendations and related court responses reflecting potential cost savings or revenue generation when determining whether to grant potential requests from the court for emergency funding (see attachments A, B, and C).
- Consider the timelines as provided by the court for adoption of these recommendations when determining whether to grant future emergency funding requests from the court.
- Require a follow-up from the court to the council in nine months, providing an update on implementation efforts for those recommendations that the court has indicated it will be adopting.

## **Attachments**

1. Attachment A: CART Recommendations/Court Responses – Recommendations Adopted/Adopted with Modifications
2. Attachment B: CART Recommendations/Court Responses – Recommendations Identified Prior to CART
3. Attachment C: CART Recommendations/Court Responses – Recommendations Not Adopted
4. Attachment D: CART Business Plan
5. Attachment E: CART Subject-Matter Teams
6. Attachment F: San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team Activity Summary
7. Attachment G: Recommendations for Consideration as Best Practices/Process Efficiencies



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R1	Trial by Declaration in Absentia Process	<p>It is recommended that the court evaluate other options for streamlining the processing of defendants in Traffic matters and minimizing the need to personally appear in court. Options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing a Trial by Declaration in Absentia process pursuant to VC 40903 for eligible traffic citations. This process expedites adjudication, reduces the number of cases returning to court, and enables the conversion to a money judgment for enhanced collections.</li> <li>• Eliminating open arraignment traffic court.</li> <li>• The court conducts open arraignment traffic three times per week. It is very burdensome on the clerk's office and the courtroom. The court could authorize clerks to handle all of the non-judicial duties that occur in open traffic and could develop a written declaration process to handle those requests that require a judicial officer's review.</li> <li>• Develop policies or standing orders that provide clerks authority to grant or approve certain actions to assist with streamlining and efficiencies in processing Traffic matters.</li> </ul> <p>See <b>Attachments 1 and 2</b> for information from Marin and Orange County Superior Courts.</p>	Short – CRITICAL	Efficiencies and Savings - Implementation of the trial in absentia process expedites adjudication of cases decreasing backlogs and the number of calendar settings. While this recommendation does not have a direct relationship to increasing fines or fees, the implementation of such a change would allow for a significant savings in the use of resources that are assigned to the processing of cases for trial and redirect staff towards mail processing and or the data entry of new citations. Early case entry has demonstrated reductions in telephone inquiries and courthouse visits due to the late generation of courtesy notices.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The court will evaluate and consider implementing this recommendation. If the court is unable to implement this recommendation, the court will consider an alternative program as has been suggested by Marin Superior Court. Judicial buy-in will be needed to fully implement this recommendation.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court estimates it will be able to finalize its evaluation and begin implementation in approximately 6 months.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R2	Outsourcing of Traffic Citation Data Entry	<p>Evaluate the cost/benefit of outsourcing Citation Processing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce the FTE resources required for Citation processing by eliminating the need for 'prepping' and data entry for a <u>large majority</u> of Traffic Citations</li> <li>Frees up Traffic staff resources currently focusing on Citation processing to work on other important customer service tasks</li> <li>Ensures the timely entry of Citations and issuance of Courtesy Notice to customers resulting in increased customer service and decrease in telephone calls, court visits, and letters to the Court inquiring as to whether a Citation had been received</li> <li>Better ability to monitor and track incoming Citation volumes and potential for creating specialized reporting working with the vendor</li> </ul> <p>Court would need to get buy-in from the County ISD to work with the vendor to accept the data and the resulting images from outsourcing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ability to accept the Citation data and images may not be as troubling as first thought given that the Court already has existing interfaces with the Stockton Police Department for RedFlex and Autocites and a vendor may be able to build on this existing functionality.</li> </ul>	Medium	Efficiencies and savings – Outsourcing could result in annualized savings to the court in staff and resources for Citations data entry.	Initial cost estimated at approximately \$128,000 in 2011.

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R2	Outsourcing of Traffic Citation Data Entry, continued	See above	See above	See above	See above
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	The Court will adopt the CART recommendations of evaluating the cost/benefit of outsourcing Citation Processing. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The Court estimates the timeframe for evaluating and implementing to be at least 6 months, but no more than 1 year.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R3	Return to Court Policy	It is recommended that the court implement a Return to Court Policy that prohibits defendants returning to court once adjudicated unless certain strict criteria are met (commitment by the court to a consistent policy by all bench officers).	Short	Efficiencies and savings.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	The court will evaluate and consider implementing this recommendation. Judicial buy-in will be needed to fully implement this recommendation. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court estimates it will be able to evaluate and implement in approximately 2 to 3 months.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R5	Traffic Correspondence	<p>It is recommended that the court no longer respond to letters from traffic defendants with customized letter responses and instead institute a standardized letter advising defendants to pay or appear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The court has dedicated staff resources to respond to traffic correspondence received from the public. The court should discontinue this practice and/or use check-box templates to respond to standard questions. Responses should advise the public to pay or appear, as required and only respond to correspondence that includes payments or other case-related documents (e.g., TVS certificates). All other correspondence should be returned with a letter stating that it has not been read and advising the defendant to pay or appear.</li> </ul> <p>See Attachment 3 for a sample return letter from Marin Superior Court.</p>	Short	Savings - between one and two clerical FTEs currently handle this correspondence. These staff could be deployed to other important duties.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<p>The Court will adopt the recommendation as stated. We will provide the necessary information on our website for those defendants who feel they have been a victim of identity theft.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> This new process will be in place on or before July 1, 2012.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R6	Appeals Transcripts	It is recommended the Court look into the feasibility of contracting out the copying of Appeals clerks' transcripts rather than utilizing court staff for this activity.	Short	Savings and efficiencies - Potential costs savings and enhanced staff productivity.	Contract costs with outside vendor.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopt Recommendation as stated (if adopting recommendations, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	A cost analysis was performed comparing the Court's costs versus our County's Duplicating costs. We save 2.2% by utilizing our court staff for this activity. However, we may have to use our County Duplicating, if layoffs occur due to next year's budget. It should be noted that the court already uses the County print shop for large jobs. We researched outside vendors (Office Depot, Office Max, Staples) only to find they no longer offer this service. There are no other local businesses close to our court.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R7	Forms	It is recommended the Court discontinue the practice of automatically providing forms to attorneys with every filing.  Forms are available on-line and can also be provided upon request, for example the ADR packet.	Short	Savings - Reduced printing and postage costs; staff time savings	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	The Court will discontinue the current practice and will review and implement a new process involving the distribution of forms to public and law partners. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation within the next 30 days.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R9	Juvenile Delinquency and Dependency Confirmation Hearings	Assess value of "confirmation hearings." These appear to create more appearances and there may be better ways to manage the cases.	Short	Savings and efficiencies	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopt Recommendation as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b> We have assessed the value of confirmation hearings. Confirmation hearings in both juvenile dependency and delinquency are set on a case-by-case basis. Generally, if a confirmation hearing is scheduled it is done to expedite the disposition of the pending issue. Our judges are very aware of staff's time and generally do not set court dates without a specific reason.				



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R10	Family Law Case Management	<p>Evaluate the courts efforts to ensure the implementation of case management to assist the Court and litigants to efficiently conclude their family law proceedings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without family law case management thousands of cases do not reach disposition because the cases are not given future dates. At the time of filing and at subsequent hearings, all litigants should be given future dates for case progress conferences.</li> </ul>	Short	<p>Efficiencies - There would be significant efficiencies derived from implementing case management, even though the court may see it as more work initially.</p> <p>By using modern case management principles, many more cases could reach full disposition. Implementing this program would really benefit court users and bring the court into compliance with current law.</p>	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The Family Law judges along with local Family Law Bar members will continue to follow the current practice of setting CMC hearings on a case-by-case basis. Our court believes and the local bar agrees that setting CMC hearings on all cases will cause additional backlog, long calendars, and more cost to its customers as their hearings would be further delayed due to the vast number of CMC hearings that would need to be set.</p> <p>Instead, our court will continue to set CMC hearings on a case-by-case basis. All attorneys who request a CMC will be provided one and the Court on its own motion will set CMC hearings as necessary in Pro Per cases.</p> <p>The court will adopt a process to setting CMC hearings as a tracking mechanism to ensure proper adjudication of FL cases.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court can begin scheduling CMC dates by July 1, 2012.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R11	Family Law - Department of Child Support Services Stipulation Process	<p>It is recommended that the court stop preparing minute orders and orders after hearing for DCSS stipulated matters that do not have court hearings. The court should cease using the judges' signature stamps to sign such orders. By creating minute orders and OAHs, the registers of action incorrectly reflect that hearings were held. It is recommended that these matters are dropped from calendar and that staff only enter stipulated orders in CMS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presently, the court prepares minute orders and orders after hearing for hundreds of DCSS cases where the parties never appear in court. The parties work out stipulations with DCSS, but these are treated like court appearances, even though judicial officers never preside over hearings. Once agreements between the parties are reached, the matters should be dropped from calendar and the stipulations should be entered in the CMS.</li> </ul>	Short	<p>Savings - This change would save hundreds of hours of court staff time in preparing minute orders and OAHs for cases that never appear in court. Court staff note that about 90% of the DCSS cases settle without court appearances, yet minute orders and OAHs are prepared on all of these cases. In a recent month, 450 cases were set on the DCSS calendar and only 68 of them made an appearance. The rest were settled by stipulation.</p>	None - the court responded that they believe there is an associated cost.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>Programmatic changes will need to be made to the court's case management system and discussions will need to be held with our local DCSS partners to discuss alternatives to the current process. The estimated cost of 16 hours of program time at \$68.01 hourly rate is \$1,088.16.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> We believe this could take place by August 1, 2012.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R12.2	Civil Assessment Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require all Petitions to Vacate civil assessment be filed ex-parte and not addressed at subsequent court hearings.</li> </ul>	Short CRITICAL	See R12.1 Attachment B	The court would need to work with the county on any programming changes to CJIS (criminal/traffic system).
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R12.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u></b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation of the recommendation would be in conjunction with the changes to the overall Civil Assessment Program.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R12.3	Civil Assessment Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify the process for re-evaluating the reduction civil assessments by limiting petitions to be in writing and to allow reductions only when extenuating circumstances have been demonstrated. Under San Joaquin’s current process wherein the Court imposes a sanction pursuant to VC 40508(A) and (B), the defendant is actually assessed a higher penalty amount and the addition of a new charge. The cost to the defendant is actually, \$419 (\$80 Base Fine + 240 PA + \$30 Conviction fee + \$40 SECA + \$4 EMAT + \$10 DMV + \$15 AWS as compared to \$300 in a civil assessment with Court retaining the revenue.</li> </ul>	Short	See R12.1 Attachment B	See R12.1 Attachment B
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R12.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</u></b>				
	<p>The first part of this recommendation will require judicial by-in.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation of the recommendation would be in conjunction with the changes to the overall Civil Assessment Program.</p> <p>The second part of the recommendation is not the court’s current practice. We do not assess or impose bail/fine on 40508(a)s and 40508(b)s. We add the Civil Assessment of \$315.00, which includes the \$15.00 for the Local Warrant System.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R12.4	Civil Assessment Program	Implement Civil Assessment on select criminal misdemeanor failure to pay cases. Under San Joaquin's current process wherein the Court imposes a sanction pursuant to VC 40508(A) and (B), the defendant is actually assessed a higher penalty amount and the addition of a new charge. The cost to the defendant is actually, \$419 (\$80 Base Fine + 240 PA + \$30 Conviction fee + \$40 SECA + \$4 EMAT + \$10 DMV + \$15 AWS as compared to \$300 in a civil assessment with Court retaining the revenue.	Short - CRITICAL	Issuing warrants for failure to pay fines on misdemeanors has been estimated to cost approximately \$400 per case. Adjudicating cases where an individual is incarcerated on a post disposition warrant frequently involves a reduction in an outstanding fine with credit granted for time served with no actual financial sanction imposed. Furthermore, a majority of defendants arrested and cited released for failing to pay often fail to appear for their subsequent hearings. This creates a repeating cycle of failure to comply with court orders and reissuing of warrants.	See above
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R12.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u></b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	This recommendation will require judicial by-in. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Before implementing this new procedure, we need to notify the Probation Department and train our staff on the change. We could implement this no later than July 1, 2012.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R13	Installment Payments	<p>It is recommended that the court discontinue its current practice of setting up new distributions for every charged offense against which fines and forfeitures are assessed, according to the date of sentencing. This is confusing and duplicative and is not in accordance with requirements or standard business practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Court is under the misconception that installment payments received by the county are held in trust until fines are paid in full so that these amounts can be distributed at one time, using the distribution rules that were in effect on the date of sentencing. The county has confirmed that is, in fact, not doing this and remits the money it collects each month to the State Controller’s Office and other recipient agencies (counties and cities primarily). This issue was addressed with the court in the last internal audit. The county is distributing collections timely, but the court continues to expend staff resources updating the bail schedule every time a change in law is made that affects court distributions.</li> <li>• Changes in distribution in CJIS should be made to assessment tables, fine allocation tables, fund agency tables, and distribution code tables; they should not be made to every individual charge in the bail schedule.</li> </ul>	short	Efficiency – this would save countless staff hours on a task that can be handled more globally through CJIS table maintenance.	There is no cost to do this. The court would benefit from less time and effort spent managing the bail schedule.

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R13	Installment Payments, continued	See above	See above	See above	See above

COURT RESPONSE					
R13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	We believe there is a misunderstanding with how we set up our distributions – we use the following tables to set up our distributions: Fund Agency, Fine Allocation, Receiver Code, Bail Schedule, etc. We already follow the recommendation and have done so since the inception of CJIS (1988).				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R14	Collections Program	It is recommended that the court conduct an analysis of its current fine stay and installment fee assessment and collections efforts related to PC 1463.007 Enhanced/Civil Assessment Collections. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The court needs to determine what model will provide the most revenue for the court (county collections, court collections, outside collection agency).</li> </ul>	Medium-Long	Revenue – There is a potential for increased cost recovery related to Enhanced/Civil Assessment collections related to the FTA Civil Assessment Program.	None

COURT RESPONSE					
R14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> At a minimum 1 year.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R15	Collections	Deem cases as new delinquent case type in order to negotiate sending them to an outside collector rather than the county for collections.	Short	Revenue	Increased resource need for court staff with costs to be offset by the county.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation within 6 months.				



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R16	Accounts Receivable System	<p>It is recommended that the court evaluate its current Accounts Receivable system to automate the AR system or purchase an outside system that can interface with the existing system to allow for the collection of criminal installment payments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The court has no criminal installment payment system in CJIS. Defendants who pay in installments have to go to the County collections office to make payments. This creates confusion between the court and county and makes the monthly distributions more cumbersome.</li> <li>Santa Clara and Marin Superior Courts both have AR systems that can be models for an AR system for San Joaquin.</li> </ul>	Medium	Revenue – for the monies that can be collected directly by the court if they are able to accept criminal installment payments.	For the AR system used by Santa Clara there is a license fee of \$8,000.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b> Evaluation and analysis of this recommendation will have to be fully investigated to determine the full costs of implementation. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The Court estimates that it will take between 6 months to 1 year for evaluation and potential implementation.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R17	County Justice Partners	<p>It is recommended that the court stop performing DOJ audits of CLETS records for protective orders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For many years, the court has validated CLETS lists from DOJ against criminal protective orders and other restraining orders. This work should be performed by the County, as the County makes the CLETS entries.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings - Many hours of staff time per month will be saved from eliminating this task.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation by July 1, 2012.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R18	County Justice Partners	<p>It is recommended that the court advise the District Attorney (DA) to either fix the interface for electronically filed complaints or the court will stop accepting electronic filings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the last two years, the DA has stopped using CJIS and has deployed its own CMS, called CYBER. The interface from CYBER to CJIS has not ever worked properly, except for single defendant/single charge cases. When there are multiple defendants or multiple charges, allegations, etc., the complaints and informations transmitted by the DA contain many critical errors which the court has manually been fixing on most felony cases. This is extremely time consuming and always requires the court to compare the paper complaint against the corrected complaint in CJIS.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings - While there may not be time savings, this change will mitigate risk for the court. Because so many complaints are incorrect, the court has assumed responsibility for validating that the electronic complaint matches the paper complaint. This is not a good use of court time and may lead to charging errors which should be the responsibility of the DA.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> We anticipate it will take 6 months to implement this recommendation.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R19	County Justice Partners	<p>It is recommended that the court stop making a copy of each transfer-in case file for DA's Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presently the DA has asked for a complete copy of every transfer-in file, whether or not they are on calendar. The court has been copying these files for the DA at no charge.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings - By terminating this practice, hours of staff time and the cost of paper and toner will be saved..	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications</u> (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b> We would provide the District Attorney's office with the Court's copy of the Notice of Hearing and Motion for Jurisdictional Transfer (PC 1203.9) after review by our PJ, to use as a guide to check CJIS for transferred in cases. Once a transfer case is received by the court and entered into CJIS, all necessary information be obtained and printed at the District Attorney's Office, thereby eliminating the copying of the entire case file. Should the District Attorney's Office still request a copy of the file then copy charges would apply. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation on or before July 1, 2012.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R20	County Justice Partners	<p>It is recommended that the court either stop making copies of prior records for local criminal justice agencies or charge for the copies and certifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The court makes certified copies of priors for local criminal justice partners at no charge. The court can either charge for the copies and certifications (as authorized in GC 70633) or just send the case files into court so that the judge can take judicial notice on the first day of trial.</li> </ul>	Short	Revenue and savings - If the court charges for the priors, the revenue could be significant, unless the DA stops requesting these priors because of the cost. If the court sends the files into court, there would be significant staff savings because the files would not have to be disassembled to copy and certify documents.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications</u> (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The Court is in the process of centralizing all copy requests to our Records Management Division. By centralizing the copy requests, the court will save staff time by not transporting the files to the main courthouse for copying. Under GC 70633, we will charge for all copy requests.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation by July 1, 2012.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R21	County Justice Partners	<p>It is recommended that the court stop providing copies of minute orders to county criminal justice agencies and request that they review the minute orders online.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court produces extra copies of minute orders and sends them to criminal justice partners even though the information is available in CJIS and much of the information populates other criminal justice CMS's.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings - Hours of staff time, form costs, paper and toner would be saved by eliminating this practice.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The Court will discontinue providing copies of minute orders to the majority of county criminal justice agencies. However, the court will continue providing copies of minute orders to the jail regarding defendants in custody, released from custody, remanded, or sentenced as the jail will need to know the status of these defendants immediately. Case information in CJIS is not updated immediately, thereby the need to continue providing copies of minute orders to the jail. The Juvenile Justice Center will continue providing copies until a case management system is implemented.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Eliminating the distribution of copies to most law and justice agencies will begin immediately. Please see Recommendation 55 for information regarding juvenile case management system.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R22	Court Reporters – Transcript Reimbursement	<p>It is recommended that the court ensure that it is complying with Penal Code 869 to reduce reporters’ transcript reimbursement by 50% if transcripts are not submitted timely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add information to the reporter claim form to indicate the date the defendant was held to answer. On that date, the 10 day clock starts running and transcripts must be completed timely or the court is authorized to pay only 50% of the cost.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings- Savings may be significant if many reporters are out of compliance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u></b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<p>The court has always been in compliance with Penal Code Section 869. All transcripts are submitted to the Senior Office Coordinator for verification of timeliness. If transcripts are not submitted timely, the reimbursement for the reporter is reduced by 50%. This is then reflected on the reporter’s claim form.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court will follow-up with CART members to obtain samples of billing and claim forms.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R23	Court Reporters – utilization of word count versus folio rate	<p>GC 69950 governs how much court reporters may charge per word for transcripts and GC 27360.5 defines the word “folio” to mean 100 words. In addition, CRC 8.130 mandates that court reporters charge the statutory rate for transcripts on appeal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many courts have an established standard that sets a fixed number of folios per page. The standard varies court to court. These standards were developed at a time when it was impractical for court reporters to actually count the actual number of words in their transcripts.</li> <li>• Technology has made it possible to provide an actual word count for every transcript so the existing practice of using a folio multiplier standard is not in compliance with the statutory rate mandated by the Government Code.</li> <li>• It is recommended that an actual word count be implemented for determining the amount paid for each transcript. The Marin Superior Court model has been provided to San Joaquin Court for review.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings – 30% savings estimated at \$150,000	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b> <p>The court understands that there are perhaps a handful of courts that currently use the word count methodology. The issue of folio vs. word count is one that courts throughout the state are currently analyzing. Once uniformity or legislation has been established that clarifies the word count issue, then the court will conform to new policy or legislation. In the meantime, the court will move forward with the word count methodology.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation will take place within 6 months.</p>				



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R24	Court Reporters – Court reporter fees	<p>Recommend that the court validate that it is charging civil parties for every hearing longer than one hour, and that the rate charge is commensurate with the full cost of salaries and benefits for reporters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Last year, the court only collected \$186,000 in civil court reporter fees from parties. The court has 5 reporters that work in assignments where the parties must pay for hearings lasting more than one hour. The court needs to implement courtroom procedures to ensure that the clerk is collecting reporter fees from parties for evidentiary hearings or trials and needs to review the half day and full day rates charged for staff reporters to ensure all costs are covered.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings - If the average cost of a staff reporter is approximately \$75,000, then the court should be collecting much more than \$61,000 per year	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The court agrees with the recommendation that we validate we are charging for civil reporters in every evidentiary hearing and trial longer than one hour and that the current half day and full day rates charged are reflective of current reporter costs. We will do so by reviewing courtroom procedures to make sure clerks are collecting reporter fees from parties when appropriate. We will also review and validate that full day and half day rates are reflective of current salary and benefit costs to ensure full cost recovery. Finally, we will work with our Presiding Judge to include this process in our local rules to ensure parties are aware of their requirement to pay.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court will review and implement any necessary changes in regards to procedures and rate analysis within 60 days. However, local rule changes are an annual process that would not be fully implemented until January 1, 2013.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R25	Court Reporters Resources	<p>It is recommended that the court review the utilization of court reporters to maximize court reporter resources by considering: pooling court reporters and reducing the ratio of staff reporters to judicial officers; implementing a policy of having parties and attorneys in civil cases bring their own reporters to civil proceedings; and ensuring that the court is using Electronic Recording (ER) in all permissible proceedings (misdemeanors, infractions and limited civil) in lieu of court reporters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presently, the court uses ER in some misdemeanor trials but does not use it in other permissible areas. By expanding ER to all authorized areas, the number of staff reporters can be reduced.</li> </ul>	Short	<p>Savings – reduction in the number of court reporters resources needed. Many courts have experienced substantial savings from pooling Court Reporters and utilizing Court Reporters only in proceedings required by law.</p> <p>One-time ER equipment cost is nominal but there are benefits to using ER, and if needed, a proprietary transcription service. For internal appellate proceedings, the judges can elect to listen to ER proceeding rather than read a transcript which can save even more money.</p>	Costs for Electronic Recording equipment is approximately \$1,000 per courtroom.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The court currently has a practice of pooling court reporters; however, we will review the utilization of court reporters to determine if we are maximizing our court reporter resources. The court will also review its current practice of court reporters in some civil proceedings. We will implement electronic recording in permissible proceedings. Cost of additional electronic recording equipment or software will be a consideration.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation within 6 months.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R26	Court Reporters – notes storage	<p>Recommend that the court require court reporters to store their notes electronically (e.g., ACORN) and direct court reporters to either destroy their own paper notes or take them home to store.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presently, all court reporters give their paper notes to the court for storage for 10 years until they are eligible to be destroyed. The court has hundreds of boxes of notes and is quickly running out of storage space.</li> <li>• The court should engage in impact bargaining and then require reporters to use modern technology to store their notes electronically.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings - The benefits of not having to store, move, destroy and track hundreds of boxes of reporter notes would be significant. Once the reporters get used to the new system, they will find it easy to use and accessible from home or work.	Small cost - the one-time cost to purchase ACORN is less than \$5,000. The annual service fee is approximately \$500 per month.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u></b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Effective July 1, 2012.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R27	Court reporters – supplies	In tandem with recommendation R29, recommend that the court discontinue purchasing paper for Court reporters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court reporter note paper is a consumable supply that is used in their personal steno machines. The court should not pay for these supplies.</li> </ul>	Short	Savings - would be \$10,000 - \$20,000 per year.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u></b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Effective July 1, 2012.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R29	Relocation of Juvenile Dependency to Juvenile Justice Center	Explore the ability to move dependency matters to the Juvenile Justice Center.	Short	Efficiencies	Cost to relocate staff.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R29	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</u></b> We have explored the recommendation and have concluded that such a move at this time is not feasible.  There are no courtrooms available at the Juvenile Justice Center (JJC) to handle the dependency matters. In fact, the delinquency matters consume the courtroom time for both J1 and J2 such that the traffic hearings have to be heard in a closet by a volunteer attorney. Even when the 3rd courtroom is completed at JJC (SB1407 project), there will still not be enough courtroom time to accommodate the dependency hearings at JJC. That would require adding a fourth courtroom at JJC for which no funding has been appropriated. Dependency cases involve other law and justice partners who are located within walking distance of the Stockton courthouse. Moving this case type to JJC located in French Camp, a 15 to 20 minute drive, will impact these other agencies. Moving the dependency cases to JJC would limit the accessibility for some of the parents because of the lack of public transportation to JJC. Furthermore, the JJC facility is connected to the Juvenile Hall detention facility. Minors are escorted directly to the courtrooms through a secure passage. There is only one room that is used as a temporary holding and cannot be considered a holding cell. If dependency matters were heard at JJC and either parent is incarcerated and transported to the hearing, there would be a problem for the sheriff in separating juveniles and adults, both sight and sound separation.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R39	Grant Funding	It is recommended that the court ask the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to have the DCSS grant cover the prorated cost of the family law manager who directly oversees the processing of DCSS documents for the court.	Short	Savings - savings to baseline budget for personnel. Actual dollar estimations should be prepared by court in preparation for negotiations with DCSS for next cycle.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R39	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	The Court will adopt the CART team recommendations and review our Plan of Cooperation with Department of Child Support Services (DCSS). <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Our review will be completed by July 1, 2012.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R43	Copiers, and Fax Machines and Transition to Duplex Printing and Scanning and Emailing of Documents	It is recommended that the court review the number and types of copiers currently provided throughout the organization to see if the number of devices can be reduced. In addition, it is recommended that the court transition to duplex printing and copying and to scanning and emailing of documents where feasible (paperless transactions instead of hard copy distribution). The court should also consider changing the default font used in printing and place limitations on color printing.	Short	Potential baseline budget savings in copier lease and maintenance cost if the number of devices is reduced. In addition, the per copy costs charged by the copier vendor and paper costs will be reduced upon transition to duplex printing and copying.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R43	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>  The Court has evaluated its copier fleet and finds that it is more cost effective to reduce the number printers and network copiers. The Court has 21 copiers. Of the 21, only three have a lease payment associated. All other copiers are on maintenance agreements that the Court pays less than a penny a copy, except for the Court's one color copier which is billed at .094 per copy. The maintenance agreements include toner and staples. We have issued a notice to staff to duplex when feasible to reduce paper cost, and will continue this effort. Color copiers have access codes which restricts usage thus limiting cost. The Court has limited scanning ability, but has implemented scanning and emailing with our Juvenile Dependency calendars. We will continue to seek avenues to reduce paper usage through scanning & emailing. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> This is an ongoing process that is dependent on funding for additional scanners and new copiers and available resources to implement copier networking.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.1	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize paper sorting tools where needed when pre-sorting items to be filed.</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court will follow through with the examples provided by Orange County and will also look into other alternatives that may be available. Court will also need to research which option will be less costly to implement.</p>				



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.2	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Across the court, maintain physical file in single numeric order based on numbering provided by the case management system rather than segmenting by case type for more efficient retrieval and re-shelving of case files and to reduce misfiles. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presently, case files are identified by branch court in the case number (e.g. Lodi cases start with an “L”). Case number formats are also different from courthouse to courthouse, except all V3 cases use one uniform, sequential numbering scheme. For all V3 case types, develop and implement one case number format for each major case type (e.g. criminal, traffic) and use sequential case numbers for all newly filed cases.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b> <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court is already working on the file merge with the CCMS filing groups and we will be researching the possibility of creating a single sequential file numbering system with our criminal files to achieve the file merge of all criminal felony and misdemeanor files. The file merge project for CCMS is expected to be completed by June 1, 2012. The criminal file numbering merge will take 6 months to 1 year to draft and implement.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.3	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider process re: stipulation to return exhibits (applicable to other case types as well) to reduce processing workload of exhibit management (i.e., storage, noticing for destruction, etc.).</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court already has a stipulation regarding exhibits in place for small claims. The court will look the use of a stipulation in all other case types. Research and possible implementation between 6 months to 1 year.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.4	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize bar code labels on every active file and create bar codes for court locations to assist with file tracking. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presently, the court manually enters the name, case number and destination of every pulled file into an Access database. By adding a bar code to the file folder and bar codes for court locations (courtrooms, branch courts, etc.) to the Access database, the court could dispense with manually entering all of the data each time a file leaves or is returned to the storage area. An even better alternative is to purchase an off-the-shelf file tracking system, designed for this specific purpose.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation between 6 months to 1 year.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.6	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize the front of case file folders to clearly identify pertinent information on large labels to assist staff with quickly pulling calendars and re-shelving case files. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Currently, court files have very small labels on the jackets which cannot be read without getting very close to the folder. No information other than name and number are on the label. The file folder can be a great place to put static information that is useful in categorizing cases, year of disposition, future dates for court appearances, whether interpreters are needed, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court will research the ability of expanding the current fields in the existing label formatting. We will also look into the possibility of adopting new case labels for criminal cases. Implementation 6 months to 1 year.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.7	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Segregate cases in warrant status from disposed cases in the records storage areas to make identification of warrant cases more straightforward and to assist with making purge process more efficient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The court has upwards of 500,000 criminal files in the storage area. Many are in warrant status but they are interfiled with disposed cases. There is no way to determine whether they are in warrant status without pulling and opening these files. This intermingling of files makes purge projects more challenging.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The Court had a system of segregating cases in warrant status from disposed cases in the records storage areas to make identification of warrant cases more straightforward and to assist with making the purge process more efficient; however, over time the system previously used no longer works.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The Court will research possible methods to clearly identify warrant status from disposed cases. Implementation between 6 months to 1 year.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.9	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both an index of cases filed and cases destroyed should be maintained and accessible to juvenile staff. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sealed cases are kept on location and destroyed; other case files are sent to general records unit. Destruction status of other case files is unknown by the staff at the juvenile justice center.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u></b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation between 6 months to 1 year.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.10	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore opportunity to organize files in more consistent manner. In some instances the side pocket of a file was used as an interim holding place for documents and reports that the judge might need. This caused an additional workload when the documents need to be re-filed in chronological order. Explore use of target sheets to more easily find documents.</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u></b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court will explore additional possibilities of file organization and plans to have this research completed and in place in 2-3 months.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.11	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Order file folders with pockets (staff are manually creating pocket by cutting card stock and taping it to the file folder)</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None

COURT RESPONSE					
R44.11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court will look into the possibility of purchasing different supplies for the department to discontinue the practice currently in place. Implementation should be completed no later than 3-6 months depending on current stock of supplies.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.13	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target sheets in files may provide easier access to certain documents and more consistency in how files are maintained (Juvenile Dependency).</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None

COURT RESPONSE					
R44.13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation within 6 months.				



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R45	Staff Savings	It is recommended the court eliminate two-person mail opening teams by implementing video camera recording of the mail processing work area to ensure direct observation of the handling of mail. If implemented by the Court, the Administrative Office of the Courts' Internal Audit Services will provide approval for this alternate process.	Short	Staff savings by reducing two person mail opening team to one person in each location that has teams that open the mail.	Small cost to purchase and maintain video camera system.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R45	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</u></b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court Does not Adopt Recommendation (Provide reason(s) for not adopting Recommendation)</u></b>				
	<p><u>Stockton Court (Adopts with Modifications):</u> We currently do not have a two-person mail opening team. Our mail is opened on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors (Traffic &amp; Civil) which require a total of three clerks, with an estimated time of 4 hours per day. It is anticipated that by centralizing the mail opening process, we could eliminate one (1) clerk and also fulfill the AOC Audit requirement of a two person mail opening team.</p> <p>We will evaluate and determine for cost and efficiency purposes the implementation of either centralizing the mail opening process or pursuing approval for the video camera recording.</p> <p><u>Branch Courts – Lodi, Manteca &amp; JJC (Does not Adopt):</u> No resources available for purchase of video camera, monitoring, or maintenance. Currently in the branch courts, opening of the mail can be observed by multiple staff, at any given time in all court locations.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Stockton Court - Between 30 and 90 days.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R49	Infrastructure	Move IBM Filenet Hosting and Support to the AOC / CCTC	Short - CRITICAL	<p>Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems – Savings to the Court of approximately \$36,000 in server costs along with the costs of any required Filenet software licensing charges, plus the significant savings associated with <u>not</u> having to acquire and / or train staff with a highly specialized (and expensive) technical skill-set.</p> <p>The San Joaquin Court uses CCMS-V3 (hosted at the CCTC) for management of Civil, Small Claims, Mental Health, and Probate case types. The Court uses IBM Filenet software as the Document Management System (DMS) for their CCMS-V3 environment. The version of Filenet the Court uses is outdated, and IBM support for the product ended September, 2010. If the Court does not upgrade Filenet, it will hinder the ability of the San Joaquin Court (and possibly all CCTC hosted Courts) to maintain and enhance document imaging capabilities of CCMS-V3.</p>	Unknown

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R49	Infrastructure, continued	Move IBM Filenet Hosting and Support to the AOC / CCTC	See above	<p>If the San Joaquin Court attempted to upgrade their Filenet environment, they first would have to acquire two servers at an approximate cost of \$18,000 each (hardware only.)</p> <p>In addition, the San Joaquin Court IT unit is not sufficiently staffed or trained to maintain a Filenet environment, and would need outside resources to support and maintain the needed upgraded environment.</p> <p>Note: The Court is obtaining quotes to replace some of this equipment.</p>	See above
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R49	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The court recognizes that this recommendation is important. However, the court will wait until its IT manager is in place so a final decision and recommendation can be made with that person's input.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation of this recommendation or any modification of this recommendation may take a few months of planning.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R50	Software Licenses	Audit software licenses to confirm that they are still being used. Eliminate maintenance renewals on unused software.	Short - CRITICAL	Savings - Unknown but likely under \$10K of savings.	Most expensive software maintenance is just under \$54K per year for IBM which is over 50% of the court's maintenance cost.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R50	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	Once our new IT manager is hired, he or she will ensure an audit of all software licenses is completed. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Completion is estimated to be within the next 6 months.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R51	Infrastructure	<p>Move Hosting of Public Access Website to AOC CCTC / CCMS Secure Portal, or replace the Current Server that is locally Hosting the Website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The San Joaquin Court has one legacy IBM AS400 server that hosts the Court's web pages for public access / on-line case information searches for criminal and family law case types. The server also processes nightly database extracts from the Court's case management systems to keep on-line accessible case information current. The IBM AS400 server very old, long out of maintenance coverage, and virtually unrecoverable if it fails.</li> <li>If the Court's current public access website server fails, the Court's internet presence will no longer exist. If that happens, there will be no on-line way for the public to look-up case information, and this may result in more people waiting in line at the Courthouse.</li> </ul>	Short - CRITICAL	Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems Prevents a possible disruption in the Court's on-line services, plus the Court will gain new capabilities through the use of more current internet-based technologies.	The cost of moving public access / on-line case information searches to the CCTC Secure Portal is unknown; however, purchasing a new server to locally host the Court's Public Access Website would cost approximately \$13,000 (includes hardware and software.)
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R51	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications</u> (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The court recognizes that this recommendation is important. However, the court will wait until its IT manager is in place so a final decision and recommendation can be made with that person's input.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Several months of planning for this recommendation or any modification of this recommendation may be necessary prior to implementation.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R52	Electronic Traffic Citations	<p>Identify cost for further implementation of electronic Traffic citations and seek out grant funding. Sources could include Department of Transportation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E-citations are not broadly implemented. There is interest from the Tracy Police Department but they have no funding to implement.</li> <li>E-citations eliminate manual processing and data entry for traffic citations. According to 2011 extrapolated JBSIS data, San Joaquin processed almost 74,000 traffic infractions which is 50% of the Court's entire case filings.</li> <li>E-citations also save time in the courtroom since the judicial officer will always have a legible citation.</li> </ul>	Medium	Efficiencies	Cost for implementation could be \$100K but may be covered by grant funding sources.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R52	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</u></b>				
	<p>The court recognizes the efficiencies e-citations bring to the court. The court already has the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest law enforcement agency (LEA) in San Joaquin County using e-citations. As soon as is practical, the court will meet with LEA's to discuss the efficiencies this program presents to both LEA's and the Court and will encourage LEA's to seek out grant funding to implement this program. When time permits, the court may assign staff to investigate funding opportunities.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court expects it may take up to 1 year or more to fully explore, apply and implement a program of this nature.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R53	Website	<p>It is recommended that the court conduct an evaluation of its existing website for redesign and updating to make it easier to navigate and to ensure that it contains relevant and accurate information. Ideas for redesign include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide ability to translate to Spanish (or other language) by utilizing Google Translate.</li> <li>• Insert search feature on front page of website. Include information page with answers to common questions (FAQs).</li> <li>• Adding a 'juvenile' button to top of the home page</li> <li>• Provide links to basic filing forms.</li> <li>• Provide self-help information and/or links to AOC self-help information</li> <li>• Add links to other courts, agencies and/or local legal aid services.</li> </ul>	Medium/ Long Term	Customer Service, Efficiencies – potential for reduction in the number of calls and requests for information from court staff.	Cost to upgrade website.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R53	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The court recognizes that this recommendation is important. However, the court will wait until its IT manager is in place so a final decision and recommendation can be made with that person's input.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> A project of this magnitude, given the courts diminished staff and financial resources, may take a year or more to fully implement.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R54	Criminal, Traffic, Case Management System	<p>It is recommended that the court consider the following options for the CJIS Criminal/Traffic case management system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1: It is recommended that the court investigate and migrate to alternative “off the shelf” case management system for Criminal and Traffic. The existing Crim/Traffic case management system is a 30-year old COBOL application running on an IBM mainframe managed and maintained by the County. The Court is the primary user as most other agencies have moved off the platform. There is a single programmer who is in her mid-late 80’s. The Court is billed by transaction. The Court spends \$1.5M per year on CJIS.</li> <li>• Option 2: It is also recommended that the court consider cost savings and risk avoidance derived from CJIS “lift and shift” from IBM mainframe to SQL platform. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Moving the CJIS CMS to SQL has one distinct advantage over getting a new system – the change would not require any retraining of staff. In fact, staff would not see any difference in the screens, data entry or work processes following the lift and shift of CJIS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Long-term	<p>Option 1: New case management system could result in reduction of yearly maintenance cost from \$1.5M per year to \$60K per year.</p> <p>Option 2: the long-term savings and greater control of the database are significant.</p>	<p>Option 1: Initial costs potentially up to \$550K one time for software licenses, hardware and implementation. Detailed ROI analysis would need to be performed to determine specific savings.</p> <p>Option 2: By moving CJIS to a SQL platform, the transition would take about nine months to complete, would cost between \$1.5 and \$2 million, but would be recouped in less than 2 years from the savings generated from moving off the mainframe. The annual cost of the SQL environment is approximately \$100,000.</p>



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R54	Criminal, Traffic, Case Management System, continued	See above	See above	See above	See above
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R54	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Adopts Recommendations as stated</u> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b> The court agrees with this recommendation, however, is more interested in implementing Option 2 – “Lift and Shift” as a short term solution. This option would stabilize the courts current case management system and could generate ongoing savings for the court, which would then give us the ability to save money to use for Option 1 – replacement of the legacy case management system. The long term solution for the court or Option 1 would be to investigate the purchase of a case management system to replace its 30 year old legacy system. Timeframe for implementation: Option 2 may take up to 2 years. Option 1 may take 3 to 5 years.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R55	Juvenile Delinquency Case Management System	<p>It is recommended that the court consider options for implementing a Juvenile delinquency case management system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the short-term, utilize the ShowMe Case management system currently utilized by family law and juvenile dependency.</li> <li>In the long-term there may be value in assessing the CMS vendor that the Probation department uses. The Probation Department currently scans the court's minute orders and these are available for court staff to view.</li> </ul>	<p>Short – for ShowMe option</p> <p>Long – for Probation option.</p>	Savings – very significant staff resources could be saved by automating juvenile delinquency case processing.	Costs to move to ShowMe CMS or contract with Probation vendor.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R55	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated</b> (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	<p>Our short-term approach will be to add the Juvenile Delinquency case type content data to our existing CMS, then assess the CMS vendor used by the Probation Department, long term.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation can be completed within six months for the short-term recommendation. For the long-term recommendation, assessment can be completed within 1 year.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R56	E-filing	<p>Expand e-filing to other case types. The Court is using CCMS V3 and may be able to leverage some technical work that Orange County and San Diego have done to integrate e-filing service providers with CCMS V3. The Court can leverage the existing Document Management System to facilitate the storage of e-filed documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will reduce workload for clerk staff for processing incoming paperwork. E-filing and electronic document management are 2 areas identified by the AOC Grant Thornton CCMS analysis for major efficiency gains.</li> <li>• Contingent on hiring Chief Information Officer and resolving issues with other pressing IT issues (replacement of servers).</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings - Detailed ROI analysis would need to be performed to determine specific savings.	Initial investment of approximately \$150K one time for implementation.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R56	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>A detailed Return on Investment analysis would need to be performed to determine specific savings versus an estimated one-time cost of \$150K for implementation of this recommendation. Until such an analysis can be completed, we cannot definitively respond how the court will proceed.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The analysis to be completed between 12 and 18 months.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R57	Document Imaging	<p>It is recommended that once E-filing and E-Citations are implemented, the court can dedicate positions to begin scanning paper documents as an investment in future efficiencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document imaging is not currently implemented. A Document Management System (DMS) is in place. Only documents generated by CCMS V3 are stored in the DMS. No documents are scanned into the DMS. No resources available to perform scanning.</li> <li>E-filing and electronic document management are 2 areas identified by the AOC Grant Thornton CCMS analysis for major efficiency gains.</li> <li>Document Imaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces file maintenance (i.e., putting documents in files, pulling/returning to file shelves)</li> <li>Provides access to a file by numerous individuals simultaneously</li> <li>Eliminates lost files or documents</li> <li>Reduces file storage needs</li> <li>Provides the ability to work with agency filers to “e-deliver”</li> <li>Possibility of utilizing navigation tools developed by other courts (e.g., Orange County’s electronic legal file (“ELF”).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium	Savings and Efficiencies - Detailed ROI analysis would need to be performed to determine specific savings. Based on workload estimates at Santa Clara, document scanning could result in a net reduction of up to 57% of the effort required to process and manage paper documents (this savings includes staff required to perform scanning).	Since DMS is already in place, cost would only be for document scanners - potentially \$20K.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R57	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>A detailed Return on Investment analysis would need to be performed to determine specific savings. Until such an analysis can be completed, we cannot definitively respond how the court will proceed.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The analysis to be completed between 12 and 18 months.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R59	Juvenile Dependency Technology Infrastructure	<p>Assess antiquated technical environment which prohibits staff from working efficiently (e.g., printer unplug/plug in for every minute order prepared during calendar preparation process).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also, outdated e-mail system which did not allow staff the ability to quickly access information provided to the agencies</li> </ul>	Short	Efficiencies	Cost to upgrade technical environment.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R59	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</b>				
	<p>The issue identified is a result of a failing network print server. We agree a more reliable alternative can be found.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> An assessment can be completed within 30 days of the project start date.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R8	Juvenile Traffic Infraction Processing	<p>Explore shifting some juvenile infraction citations to adult traffic processing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This should eliminate the setting of cases 5 months out and the numerous phone calls from the public regarding the status of their juvenile traffic matter.</li> </ul>	Short	Efficiencies	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b> <p>In 2007, our court eliminated the requirement for infraction and some misdemeanor juvenile traffic citations to be mandatory court appearance. These citations are processed in the same manner as adult citations.</p> <p>For those juvenile infraction citations that still require a mandatory appearance, we currently do not have an open calendar or courtroom in Stockton to hear juvenile matters. Shifting any case type from JJC to Stockton would have a significant impact of any adult calendar. Juvenile matters, including juvenile traffic, are closed proceedings. People present on other cases and the public are not allowed in the courtroom while a juvenile case is underway. Consequently, the cases move more slowly and cannot be mixed with other cases.</p> <p>In April 2012, our Presiding Juvenile Judge on changed our truancy citations to non-mandatory, reducing the number of truancy cases on calendar by 1,176 annually (98 monthly). With 98 fewer truancy cases a month, we will be in a better position to set hearings in a timely manner.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R12.1	Civil Assessment Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase Civil Assessment collections by including "failure to pay" traffic cases.</li> </ul>	Short	<p>Potential significant increased civil assessment and warrant fee revenues for the court's baseline budget. In addition, there will be additional collections for traffic cases that will benefit both the state budget and local agencies.</p> <p>Based on the number of citations filed, and in comparison to Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, adding civil assessment for failure to pay on traffic cases would increase the number of civil assessment cases by approximately 8900 X \$300 = \$2,670,000 annually.</p>	The court would need to work with the county on any programming changes to CJIS (criminal/traffic system).

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R12.1	Civil Assessment Program, continued	See above	Short	With a 30% collection rate and a commission rate of approximately 15% this change has the potential of generating approximately \$700K. The maximum benefit would be derived if this recommendation were implemented in conjunction with the Return to Court Policy recommendation (see <i>Attachment A - R3</i> ).	See above
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R12.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u></b> The court has been working on this program since September of 2011. The CEO had just received the Executive Committees approval to move forward on May 1, 2012. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court need to work with the county ISD to have program changes made to its case management system. Implementation of program could take up to 6 months.				



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R30	Fees	VC 40508 allows for administrative assessments, not to exceed \$10, to be charged for clerical and administrative costs for (a) recording and maintaining a record of a defendant's prior convictions and (b) notifying DMV of the attachment or restriction of a license or registration.  It is recommended that the court charge the \$10 for both sections (a) and (b). At this time the Court is only charging the \$10 pursuant to (b) above.	Short	Revenue - Potential significant additional revenue by charging an additional \$10 fee on every subsequent violation pursuant to VC 40508(a).	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R30	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b>			
We do assess the \$10.00 Administrative Assessment to both the 40508(a)s and 40508(b)s, whether the FTAs/FTP's are added electronically or manually.					

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R31	Fees	Increase GC71386 Returned Check Fee \$25 (or Based on Cost) to \$50 based on actual clerical processing costs.	Short	Revenue - Annual increase \$6,000.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b><u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u></b>			
The court's CEO received approval from the Executive Committee on May 1, 2012 to increase the fee. Timeframe for implementation: Programming changes will need to be made; however, the court believes it can implement within 30 days.					

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R32	Fees	<p>Ensure judicial officers are imposing PC1305 Bail Bond Forfeiture Set Aside Fee. Consider increasing fee based on cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Imposed by judicial officer if Bail Agent brings defendant back to court and request that Bail Bond Forfeiture be set aside.</li> <li>San Joaquin -\$126. Santa Clara charges \$150 for Court and \$30 for Agency.</li> <li>San Joaquin will review to determine if it is still being imposed.</li> <li>Staff indicated they may not be imposing the fee because statute states bail is automatically exonerated if defendant is brought back into court.</li> <li>Santa Clara has concluded that the judicial officer could still impose the fee. In addition, the disposition of the case/bail would likely be at a future hearing, but should not impact imposing the fee. In addition to ensuring the fee is imposed; the court can consider an increase to the fee based on cost.</li> </ul>	Short	Revenue - Annual increase = \$20-\$30K	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R32	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u></b> The court's CEO received approval from the Executive Committee on May 1, 2012 to increase the fee based on actual costs. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Amount of fee to be determined. We estimate that once fee is determined, programming changes will take place within 60 days.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R33	Fees	Impose GC70617(c) Motion Fee on criminal and traffic hearings. Santa Clara imposes the fee when Bond Agents and Others request a hearing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to imposing the fee on civil cases when a hearing is requested; Santa Clara imposes the fee when Bond Agents and Others request a hearing (\$40).</li> </ul>	Short	Revenue - Annual increase = \$10K	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R33	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b><u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u></b>			
		The court's CEO received approval from the Executive Committee on May 1, 2012 to impose this fee. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Programming changes will need to be completed. It is estimated this could take up 60 days to implement.			

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R34	Fees	<p>Notify County re: VC16028/PC1463.22 Financial Responsibility (\$17.50) revenue due to the Court.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC 1463.22 states: "of the money deposited with the county treasurer pursuant to section 1463, \$17.50 for each conviction of a violation of section 16028 of the vehicle code shall be deposited by the county treasurer in a special account and allocated to defray costs of municipal and superior courts incurred in administering sections 16028, 16030 and 16031 of the vehicle code. Any moneys in the special account in excess of the amount required to defray those costs shall be re-deposited and distributed by the county treasurer pursuant to section penal code section 1463".</li> <li>The Court administers the above referenced sections. The County is currently retaining the \$17.50 per conviction earmarked for cost recovery on administering vehicle code sections 16028, 16030 and 16031.</li> </ul>	Short	<p>Revenue - Court staff have identified revenues of \$1.2 million and expenditures of \$1.6 million dating back to 2001. The County is currently holding \$300K in a special fund related to these collections. The Court incurs the cost related to the above mentioned sections; not the County.</p> <p>Annual increase = \$70,000</p>	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R34	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b>				
	<p>This recommendation is one the courts own staff brought to the attention of CART. The court will be contacting the county to obtain this revenue to offset the court's costs for implementation of this program.</p> <p><b>Timeframe for implementation:</b> It is anticipated the court will complete by the close of Fiscal Year 2012-2013.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R35	Fees	Impose PC1205 Stay Fee on fines imposed in Court.	Short	Revenue – San Joaquin will look into imposing the fee on stay fines in their court. Annual Fees: \$80,000.	None

COURT RESPONSE					
R35	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u></b> The court's CEO received approval on implementation of this fee from the Executive Committee on May 1, 2012. The fee will be imposed and collected upon the defendant's request for a one-time 30 day extension to pay his/her fine. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court anticipates programming changes and training of staff could be completed and implemented no later than July 1, 2012.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R36	Fees	Imposition of \$15 warrant fee pursuant to VC 40508.5.	Short	Revenue	None

COURT RESPONSE					
R36	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b> We do assess the \$15.00 for the Local Warrant System, which is part of the Civil Assessment. The \$15.00 is retained by the County.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R37	County Costs	It is recommended that the court audit all county charges currently being paid by the court to the county and move away from the A87 Plan and instead establish a plan wherein the County must bill the court for actual costs.	Medium	Savings	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R37	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b>				
	<p>The Court will adopt the CART Team recommendations of having all county charges currently being paid by the court to the county audited.</p> <p>On September 11, 2009, at our AOC Audit kick off meeting, we asked the AOC Audit Division to audit our CJIS county charges as it appeared that the county had been overcharging us for years.</p> <p>Over the last several months, we have had discussion with the AOC Audit Division about our desire to move away from the A87 cost allocation billing method, and establish a plan for the County to direct bill the Court for actual costs.</p> <p>The Court will work with the AOC's Audit Division on the County audit, and will provide all of the necessary assistance the Division's staff requires.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court estimates it will be able implement the recommendation in 6 months to 1 year.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R38	Bail Exoneration and Refund Checks Processing	<p>Evaluate business process for bail exoneration and refund checks to determine if staff can reduce the workload related to generating and distributing bail exoneration and refund checks. An upload process is available using Phoenix. Have checks mailed by County or AOC depending on system utilized to generate checks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Joaquin staff set up a vendor for each payee (criminal/traffic) in the County system. Then complete a claim form for each bail exoneration/refund in which they enter the payee name and address and amount. The form is approved and then submitted to the County to be entered in the County Financial system. The County then refers each case back to the Court for some further processing and ultimately the County sends the checks back to the Court. Court staff updates the case and mail out the check.</li> <li>• Manually updating the upload file (Santa Clara traffic/civil) is probably equivalent to San Joaquin updating the vendor name. However, staff at San Joaquin agrees their process has many more steps which make it labor intensive. Court staff is required to create the vendor in the county system for each payee; then complete the claim form; go through an approval process between the county and court; then receive and distribute the check and further updating of CJIS (Criminal/Traffic</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings - The reduction in hours was not quantified, but it may be as high as 20-25% for staff involved in bail exoneration/refund process.	None

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R38	Bail Exoneration and Refund Checks Processing, continued	System). At a minimum; having the County mail the check would reduce the workload. However, it may be more efficient to have the whole process done within the Court utilizing Phoenix.	See above	See above	See above
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R38	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b> The Court will evaluate our current business process for bail exoneration and refund checks to determine if staff can reduce the workload related to generating and distributing bail exoneration and refund checks, including the utilization of the Phoenix financial system. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Implementation could be 6 months to 1 year.				



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R40	Passport Processing	<p>It is recommended that the court review passport processing to determine whether revenue earned is worth the effort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the Court receives \$25 for each passport application processed, the court should analyze whether the staff time and other processing costs make this worthwhile. Also, since the court states that it does not have time to meet all statutory mandates for court case processing, it may not make sense to perform this discretionary work, given the severe budget constraints and staffing shortages.</li> </ul>	Short	Efficiency – this change would free up court staff to process court filings and other court work required by law.	If the court terminates this service, some revenue will be forfeited, but this should not be the only determining factor in this analysis.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R40	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b>				
	<p>The Court has been reviewing our passport processing to determine whether revenue earned is worth the effort.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Review within 6 months.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R41	Office Supply and Equipment Ordering	It is recommended that the court review the office supplies and equipment provided to determine which discretionary items should be removed to reduce costs. It is also recommended that the court review the policy regarding ordering of custom or non-standard items to eliminate non-essential purchases.	Short	Potential baseline budget savings in office supplies and equipment.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R41	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b> As an ongoing process, the Court routinely reviews office supplies and equipment to determine what may be discretionary in efforts to reduce the Courts cost and unnecessary/non-essential purchases.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R42	Office Supply and Equipment Ordering	Generic laser printer toner is not being used. Products from Innovera and Greenbox have been evaluated but have not met quality requirements. It is recommended that the court Pilot the use of Sustainable Earth Brand remanufactured toner from Staples. Many courts are using this toner and have had very good results.	Short	Savings - potential 30% reduction in cost for toner purchases. Current budget for toner is \$19,600. Savings could be \$5,880 per year.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R42	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b> The Court does use generic toner. The court had been purchasing the Innovera brand, but finds as mentioned by the CART team, the product is not adequate. The Court currently purchases Image Master from Unitone (A California based company). We are pleased with the recycled product. Unitone is ISO9001 certified and holds the STMC certification from the International Imaging Technology Counsel. Furthermore cost for the Image Master toner is less than Staples sustainable earth brand.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.5	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop records destruction and purging program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The court has more than 1.2 million records in the disposed records storage area in the basement of the Family Law Annex. The court is running out of room and is now erecting file shelving in a vacant courtroom. The court needs to initiate a records purge program to destroy hundreds of thousands of files that have been kept beyond the requirements in GC 68152.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b> The court already has a purging program in place for all lower jurisdiction records which account for nearly 60% of records currently stored in the Records Facility. The purging program cannot move forward as there are not enough staff resources in records to proceed with the current purging plan. The records department has historically been under staffed since its inception in 2000 and it continues to be understaffed. The current financial crisis facing this court has forced it to remove critical staff in Records to more critical functioning areas of the organization. In the future should the department be restored to minimum staffing, purging of files will be resumed.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.8	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The noticing and destruction of exhibits and corresponding processes may also need to be refined.</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b> The court already has a simplified process for noticing and destroying exhibits. The current back log is due to insufficient staffing.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44.12	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	<p>Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices.</p> <p>Specific recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore opportunities to improve requests for files. Give records staff access to directly view cases on calendar so they may provide cases to courtroom or calendar prep staff. Currently case processing staff is preparing requests in the system and emailing the Records Unit with their file requests.</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R44.12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u></b>				
	<p>Access is already provided to Records Management staff to view any pending calendars. Only those files that are needed as a last minute urgent request are ordered via E-mail or phone call.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R46	Chief Information Officer	It is recommended that the court actively pursue filling the vacant Chief Information Officer position to assist the court with developing and maintaining a long-term technology and infrastructure plan.	Short - CRITICAL	Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems.	Cost to fill position which will allow for substantial savings overall to the court.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R46	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b> This recommendation is one the court had already been working on for the past couple of months. In fact, the recruitment closed on May 4, 2012 and interviews will take place on May 17, 2012. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> We anticipate having the successful candidate hired by mid-June.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R47	Infrastructure	<p>It is recommended that the court replace 15 individual servers with 3 servers running VMWare virtualization.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Server virtualization technology is not being used.</li> <li>• Server virtualization allows one computer to act as multiple computers. This reduces the number of servers that needs to be purchased and provides a way to have backup computers available if one crashes.</li> <li>• VMWare software, which enables server virtualization, is being tested but has not yet been implemented.</li> <li>• Server virtualization will enable better use of server resources and faster application recovery in case of a failure.</li> </ul>	Short - CRITICAL	Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems.	Cost for implementation approximately \$15,000 per server and \$12,000 per VMWare license = (3x \$15K + 3x \$12K = \$81,000)
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R47	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b> <p>The court had previously recognized that this recommendation is vital to ensure continuity of its operations. We had already obtained quotes for servers and had those quotes validated by CART members. As we are so close to hiring an IT manager, we will be waiting until the IT manager is selected and will have that person involved in the final decision making process for this major purchase.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The servers will be purchased within the next 2 months.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R48	Infrastructure	Replace key servers and software. Review AOC audit report from 2011 audit to determine additional areas where there may be additional business exposure.	Short - CRITICAL	<p>Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems. All Servers are currently past manufacturer warranty and have no extended warranty contracts. Key IT infrastructure software is running on products that Microsoft stopped supporting 8 years ago (2004). Court case management systems, jury system, email system, and primary computer login control system are all at risk of failure.</p> <p>The San Joaquin Court utilizes Microsoft NT 4.0 for domain services on the Court data network, and this should be replaced (not upgraded) to the current Version of Microsoft Active Directory as soon as possible. NT 4.0 is more than 15 years old. Microsoft ended all support for the product in December, 2005, and there is no longer a reliable upgrade path available. In addition, NT 4.0 is so old that is not supported by any new servers the Court</p>	Minimal investment should be to replace 7 key servers. Potential cost \$125,000. If server virtualization recommendation R51 above is implemented, cost is estimated to be \$81,000.



#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R48	Infrastructure, continued	See above	See above	<p>might purchase. If the Court's NT 4.0 server fails, no-one at the Court will be able to login to the Court computer network, access Court case management systems, access E-mail, print, or access the internet. Although there is an initial cost with the recommendation, the investment is necessary to avoid a much more costly loss of Court system and employee productivity, and a major disruption in the Court's ability to provide public services, in the event that the NT 4.0 server fails. In addition, with this recommendation the resulting Active Directory environment will enable the Court's information technology staff to use Active Directory Group</p>	See above

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R48	Infrastructure, continued	See above	See above	Policies to perform centralized and highly efficient personal computer software and system management throughout the Court.	See above
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R48	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b> The court recognizes that this recommendation is critical to its overall infrastructure. Once our new IT manager is hired, we will be sharing both this report and our 2011 audit report with him/her so that all IT related deficiencies can be remedied. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The court expects, where financially feasible, to complete all items within the next 6 months to 1 year.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R58	Telephone System	<p>It is recommended that the court review its existing telephone system and identify additional functionality or consider converting to Voice Over IP (VOIP) to assist with increasing customer service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All in-coming calls (including calls from multiple departments when queues are full – criminal, family law, jury, etc. in addition to civil and small claims) are directed to one receptionist who is frequently away from her desk for long periods of time handling other duties.</li> <li>The current system does not include a way for the calls to roll back to a back-up system, resulting in a number of calls ringing for long periods of time or going unanswered. (Identified in the civil area).</li> </ul>	Long-Term	Savings and efficiencies	May include initial costs that may be required to ultimately realize savings.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R58	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u></b> <p>The Court is currently dependent on the County for its phone systems. Because of the age of the County’s system adding additional functionality is not cost effective; however, the Court is reviewing its IVR process and recordings in an effort to identify functionality that may result in a more efficient processing of incoming calls. In addition, the Court is currently working with a vendor to evaluate the possibility of hosted VoIP services. The primary issue that may prohibit the Court from moving to a VoIP platform is the age of the Courthouse infrastructure. The Court has planned for VoIP infrastructure in the new Stockton Courthouse.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R4	Family Law Case Processing	<p>It is recommended that the court prepare mediator recommendations as Word documents and email the Word document to the clerk preparing orders (minute and OAH's) so that they can be copied and pasted into orders and only typed once.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presently, the mediators manually write the recommendations. By typing them in Word templates, these recommendations can easily be reformatted into tentative rulings or orders, thereby eliminating the need for staff to type them later.</li> </ul>	Short	Efficiencies and savings	None
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Court Does not Adopt Recommendation (Provide reason(s) for not adopting Recommendation)</b> <p>San Joaquin County's Child Custody Recommendation Counseling sessions are not conducted by appointment. They are conducted on the day of the court hearing. The stipulations and recommendations are written during the session with both parents. Stipulations are reached in over 80% of the cases. Recommendations are often changed by the judicial officers. San Joaquin does not have tentative rulings in custody cases.</p> <p>It is in the best interest of the clients we serve to use the Judicial Council Forms to delineate the details of the custody agreements and/or orders versus a pleading or free flowing format offered by Word templates.</p> <p>The Child Custody Recommending Counselors (CCRC) already assist in preparing the Order After Hearing and will continue to do so. The CCRCs spend most mornings mediating non-stop and do not have time to add clerical duties. To do so would reduce the number of mediations, increase court (judicial) time, and increase the time clients would wait to have their cases mediated and heard. Changing the current practice in San Joaquin will require more clerical time from CCRCs during the sessions, thereby reducing the number of mediations they can conduct each day. Additional consequences would be the reduction in the number of mediations held each day and an increase the amount of time clients have to wait to have their cases heard. Although the court will not adopt this specific recommendation, we will continue to look for other ways to streamline this process.</p>				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R28	Facilities	<p>It is recommended that the court consider eliminating the Lodi and Manteca branch courts (3 courtrooms) and use 3 vacant courtrooms in Family Law Annex for proceedings that do not require holding cells (e.g. civil departments).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lodi and Manteca are located within 15 minutes of the main courthouse in Stockton.</li> <li>• These branch courts could be consolidated into the Stockton courthouse without adding more office space or courtrooms.</li> <li>• There are three courtrooms in the Family Law Annex that can be used for civil proceedings.</li> <li>• Lodi and Manteca courtrooms can move to the main courthouse, since holding cells may be needed while 3 civil departments move to the Family Law Annex.</li> </ul>	Medium	Savings and efficiency - Savings from closing branch courts would be immediate and would help the court manage its diminished staff resources. The courier service between courthouses would stop, branch court staff would be consolidated with main courthouse staff to ease coverage issues, disparate practices in the branch courts would be eliminated. Many time-consuming practices could be eliminated and workflow processes could be streamlined and made uniform.	Cost of moving staff and equipment.
<b>COURT RESPONSE</b>					
R28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><u>Court Does not Adopt Recommendation (Provide reason(s) for not adopting Recommendation)</u></b> We believe the branch courts provide an important access to justice to the residents of those communities. The Lodi courthouse serves not only the City of Lodi but also the communities of Thornton, Acampo, Victor, Lockeford and Clements, many of which don't have public transportation to Stockton. The Tracy and Manteca courts (South County) service not only the City of Tracy and the City of Manteca, but also serve the cities and communities of Mountain House, Banta, Ripon, Escalon and Lathrop, many of which don't have public transportation to Stockton as well. Some cities (areas) are as far as 45 minutes from the Stockton courthouse and the lack of public transportation will certainly prohibit access to justice for these communities and residents.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMP. TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
	Facilities, continued	It is recommended that the court consider eliminating the Lodi and Manteca branch courts (3 courtrooms) and use 3 vacant courtrooms in Family Law Annex for proceedings that do not require holding cells (e.g. civil departments).	See above	See above	See above
R28		<p>The majority of residents in San Joaquin County live outside the City of Stockton. South county residents represent nearly 35% of the county's total population. There are seven law enforcement agencies representing six cities in south county alone. The Lodi court is housed in the Lodi police facility where the Lodi jail is also located. Inmates are brought directly from the Lodi jail to the Lodi courtroom for arraignment.</p> <p>Another important impact of closing the Lodi and Manteca courts is the lack of holding cells in the Stockton courthouse. Every day, the numbers of inmates exceed the maximum capacity for holding. Cell space is insufficient for the growing number of "keep separate from's" and the number of holding cell incidences (fights among inmates) continue to grow. This problem would be exacerbated by closing Lodi and Manteca and bringing those in-custody defendants to Stockton.</p> <p>Furthermore, with the planning of the new Stockton Courthouse, there were assurances made to Stockton city officials that the branch courts would remain open to prevent the significant additional impacts on city services, including transportation and parking, created by additional defendants, victims, jurors and other litigants having business at the Stockton courthouse</p> <p>The 540 Family Law Annex, located 4 blocks from the main Stockton courthouse, has three family law courtrooms on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The court was able to lease the 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the building using SB56 funds when the court received 3 new judicial positions. In anticipation of receiving 3 additional judicial positions under AB159 (positions which were authorized but not funded) we were able to have tenant improvements made on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor providing 3 additional courtrooms. However, the courtrooms have never been finished with audience seating, jury box seating, counsel tables and all other furnishings. Another factor that may prohibit our use of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of 540 is our inability to support the lease costs. The court cannot pay for the lease costs associated with leasing the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor or the 1<sup>st</sup> floor.</p> <p>Consequently, if we closed the Lodi and Manteca courts and brought in the three remaining judges, we would have no chambers or courtrooms for those judges in either the 540 Family Law Annex or the main Stockton Courthouse.</p>			

**SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY  
COURT ASSISTANCE REVIEW TEAM (CART)  
BUSINESS PLAN**

**I. Background**

At the December 13, 2011 meeting of the Judicial Council (JC), the San Joaquin Superior Court (court) presented a request for additional funding for budgetary shortfalls experienced by the court in fiscal year 2011-12. The JC ultimately approved a package for the court which included both emergency funding of \$1.08 million and a loan of \$916,000. Along with this emergency funding, the JC requested the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Regional Office provide assistance to San Joaquin Superior Court to evaluate current operational and administrative activities. The goal of this assistance is to identify additional cost savings and increase revenue to minimize future requests for emergency funding.

The Regional Administrative Director was charged with assembling a team for this purpose and pulled together an experienced team of Court Executive Officers to participate as members of the San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team (CART).

**II. Charge**

It is imperative that the CART Team work in a positive and collaborative manner with the court to ensure that the resulting recommendations will be presented to the JC jointly. The goal for the CART review is to provide productive recommendations without criticism of the court and its activities.

**III. Court Assistance Review Team (CART) Members**

The CART Team is comprised of the following members:

- Jody Patel, Regional Administrative Director, Regional Office, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
- Alan Carlson, Court Executive Officer, Orange Superior Court
- Mike Planet, Court Executive Officer, Ventura Superior Court
- Kim Turner, Court Executive Officer, Marin Superior Court
- Kiri Torre, Court Executive Officer, Contra Costa Superior Court
- David Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer, Santa Clara Superior Court
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Finance Director, Finance Division, AOC
- Curt Soderlund, Director, Trial Court Administrative Services Division, AOC
- Althea Lowe-Thomas, Assistant Director, Regional Office, AOC
- John Judnick, Senior Manager, Finance Division Internal Audit Services, AOC
- Maureen Dumas, Manager, Regional Office Reengineering Unit, AOC
- Pam Reynolds, Manager, Regional Office, AOC

#### IV. CART Team Members Participation

The CART Team represents a group of Court Executive Officers and their staff subject matter experts that have been brought together under the direction of the AOC Regional Administrative Director at the request of the JC for a designated time period to review and identify cost savings and efficiencies for the San Joaquin Superior Court.

The following outlines some of the activities of the CART members including but not limited to:

- Assembling a team of court subject matter experts from each CEO's respective court for the assigned subject area;
- Visiting San Joaquin Superior Court to interview, observe, and meet with court staff, supervisors, management, Executive staff, and judicial officers;
- Reviewing external documents and reports pertaining to San Joaquin operations as needed including past audit reports;
- Identifying potential areas for recommendations;
- Sharing these ideas with the CART team as a means of identifying what recommendations should be recommended to the court;
- Presenting final recommendations to the court and obtaining information from the court as to whether they can and or will be implementing the recommendations and if so, the timeframe for implementing;
- Participating in weekly progress status calls with CART team members;
- Utilizing a structured reporting method to document court visits and the outcomes of these visits for inclusion in CART progress reports and the final report due to the JC in June of 2012.

#### V. Assigned Subject Areas for Review

CART Team Member	Role	Assigned Subject Areas for Review
Jody Patel	Liaison to the Judicial Council and Management/Oversight of Review Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management of the activities of CART team members and CART project</li> </ul>
Alan Carlson	Team Lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Probate and Juvenile analysis and review</li> <li>• Orange County Superior Court V3 SME staff</li> </ul>
Mike Planet	Team Lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civil (excluding Family Law)/V3 analysis and review</li> </ul>
Kim Turner	Team Lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal/CJIS analysis and review</li> <li>• Family Law analysis and review</li> </ul>
Kiri Torre	Team Lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance and Administration analysis and review</li> </ul>
David Yamasaki	Team Lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court Revenue/Civil Assessment</li> </ul>



		analysis and review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Technology analysis and review</li> </ul>
Zlatko Theodorovic	Team Member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance and Administration analysis and review</li> </ul>
Curt Soderlund	Team Member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance and Administration analysis and review</li> </ul>
John Judnick	Team Member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance-related analysis and review</li> </ul>
Althea Lowe-Thomas Maureen Dumas Pam Reynolds	Team Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assistance to Regional Administrative Director and coordination of CART team activities</li> <li>• Development of Progress Reports and Final Report to the Judicial Council</li> </ul>

## VI. Timeline and Milestones

Activity or Milestone	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial Meeting of CART Team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• December 19, 2011</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CART Team leads assemble subject matter expert teams from their respective courts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• December 19, 2011 – December 30, 2011</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CART Team identify documentation/information needed for review activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Month of January 2012</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CART Team and court kickoff meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• February 9, 2012</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CART Team members visit court for interviews, observations, and meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beginning 3rd week of February 2012</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CART Progress Team Meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly beginning February 20, 2012</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial Findings Reported to CART Team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing – presented to CART Team at weekly Progress Meetings</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations Provided to court</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing – once vetted through CART Team</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress Report to Judicial Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• April 2012(?)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Judicial Council Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• June 22, 2012</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Judicial Council Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• July xx, 2012</li> </ul>

## VII. CART Protocol

Because the activities of CART will be reported to the JC in a final report, it is imperative that all steps involved with CART be fully documented. As such, the following protocol provides CART Team members with the expectations as to their role with this review:

- CART Team leads will assemble their respective teams based on the areas of assignment and expertise noted above.
- Working through the San Joaquin Court Executive Officer, the CART Team lead will coordinate timely visits to the court.
- Each visit to the court will be documented through a structured *Visit Summary* template (*Attachment A- Visit Summary*) which requests the following information:
  - Date of visit
  - Area observed
  - Party interviewed or observed
  - Whether there was a initial recommendation identified
- If CART Team members identify an area that may be appropriate for a potential recommendation for the court, the team member should complete the *Findings Worksheet* that explains the recommendation and the potential cost savings or efficiencies (See *Attachment B – Findings Worksheet*).
- If CART Team members identify an issue that is resulting in inefficiencies for the court but are unable to identify a recommendation, the *Findings Worksheet* should be updated to reflect this information so that these issues can be discussed by the entire CART Team for input.
- Regional Office staff will compile all of the information in the *Findings Worksheets* and potential recommendations will be presented to the CART Team at its weekly Progress Meetings.
- Potential recommendations will be vetted through the CART Team and those recommendations that the CART Team identifies as appropriate for possible inclusion in the JC Report will be communicated to the court by the CART Team during regularly scheduled meetings.
- The CART Team will record the outcome of this communication using the *Findings Worksheet* and identify the following:
  - Whether the court adopted the recommendation;
  - The anticipated timeframe for implementation for those recommendations adopted; and
  - Reasons why the court is not adopting the suggested recommendation(s).
- Activities and recommendations reported in the *Visit Summary* document and *Findings Worksheet* will be utilized to prepare Progress Reports and the final report to the JC.

## VIII. CART Ground Rules

- CART Team members should schedule visits and meetings with the court that minimize disruption to the court.

- CART Team members should remain circumspect and maintain a neutral, non-judgmental demeanor when working with the court and identifying potential recommendations.
- CART Team members must bring any ideas for potential recommendations back to the CART Team for discussion prior to sharing with the court.
- CART Team members must maintain confidentiality on the issues or areas identified and any resulting recommendations from this review.
- CART Team members will continually communicate and document the activities relating to the review and the resulting recommendations with the Regional Office to ensure that what is presented to the JC is both accurate and timely.
- CART Team members must provide the necessary resources to conduct timely review of activities in the timeframes noted above so that the resulting recommendations will be included in the report due to the JC at the June 2012 meeting.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**COURT ASSISTANCE REVIEW TEAM (CART) VISIT SUMMARY**

**Court Assistance Review Team Member Name(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION A: SUMMARY OF VISITS**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>SUBJECT AREA OBSERVED</b>	<b>COURT STAFF NAMES/ POSITIONS VISITED</b>	<b>POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION/ISSUE IDENTIFIED? (Yes or No) If Yes, complete <i>Findings Worksheet</i> for each recommendation.</b>



**ATTACHMENT B**

**COURT ASSISTANCE REVIEW TEAM (CART) FINDINGS WORKSHEET**

**Court Assistance Review Team Member Name(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Section A: RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY - for those areas where recommendation(s) have been identified please complete the following for each recommendation:**

**1. Subject Area for Recommendation:**

{Description of subject area related to the recommendation (i.e., collections, case management system, county contracts, etc.)}

---

---

---

---

**2. Description of Recommendation:**

{Description of issue observed and the potential recommendation.}

---

---

---

---

---

**3. Potential Cost Savings or Efficiencies Description:**

{Description of estimated savings for the court. May include initial costs that may be required to ultimately realize savings.}

---

---

---

---

---

**4. Date Reviewed by CART Team:** \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Decision of CART Team:**

- Check One:
  - Present to Court: . Please complete Section 7 below.
  - Do not Present to Court:

- Reason Not Presented to Court:

---



---

**6. Date Presented to the Court:** \_\_\_\_\_

**7. Court Response:**

- Did Court adopt Recommendation?

- Check One:

- Court adopts Recommendation as stated:
- Court adopts Recommendation with modifications: ;
- Please explain what the modifications involve:

---



---



---

- Court does not adopt Recommendation:

- Please provide court’s reasoning for not adopting the Recommendation:

---



---



---



---

- For Recommendation that is adopted, what is planned implementation timeframe?

- Insert courts estimated timeframe for implementing the recommendation:

\_\_\_\_\_.

**Section B: ISSUES SUMMARY - for those areas where issue(s) have been identified but there has been no recommendation suggested, please complete the following:**

**1. Issue Identified:**

{Description of issue identified.}

---



---



---



---

**2. Date Issue Reviewed by CART Team:** \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Decision of CART Team:**

- Check One:

- No recommendation identified: .

- Reason no recommendation has been identified:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.
- Recommendation Identified to be presented to the court:  Please complete Section 7 above.
  - Recommendation is as follows:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

**CART Subject-Matter Teams**

<b>Team</b>	<b>Members</b>
Probate and Juvenile	<p><u>Team Lead:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alan Carlson, Court Executive Officer, Orange Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>Team Members for Orange Superior Court:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teresa Risi, Chief Operations Officer</li> <li>• Mary Malk, Unit Manager, Probate/Mental Health</li> <li>• Marla Cairns, Supervising Probate Examiner</li> <li>• Susan Mills, Probate Program/Coordinator Specialist</li> <li>• Anaruth Gonzalez, Unit Manager, Juvenile</li> <li>• Blanca Escobedo, Manager, Juvenile Delinquency Conversion Project</li> <li>• Cynthia Solis, Courtroom Operations Supervisor, Juvenile</li> </ul>
Civil/V3	<p><u>Team Lead:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mike Planet, Court Executive Officer, Ventura Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>Team Members from Ventura Superior Court:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheryl Kanatzar, Deputy Executive Officer – Operations</li> <li>• Brenda McCormick, General Counsel</li> <li>• Pat Patterson, Deputy Executive Officer – Chief Information Officer</li> <li>• Julie Camacho, Manager – Civil and Family Law</li> </ul>
Finance and Administration	<p><u>Team Lead:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kiri Torre, Court Executive Officer, Contra Costa Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>Team Members from Contra Costa Superior Court:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Executive Officer</li> <li>• Brandy Sanborn, Financial Services Manager</li> </ul> <p><u>Team Members from AOC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curt Soderlund, Interim Chief Deputy</li> <li>• Zlatko Theodorovic, Finance Director</li> <li>• John Judnick, Senior Manager, Internal Audit Services</li> </ul>
Criminal and Family Law	<p><u>Team Lead:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kim Turner, Court Executive Officer, Marin Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>Team Members from Marin Superior Court:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheri Brannon, Assistant Court Executive Officer</li> <li>• Janet Minkiewicz, Court Operations Manager</li> <li>• Alexandra Quam-Rios, Family Law Facilitator and Legal Self-Help Services Manager</li> <li>• Dorothy McCarthy, Information Technology Manager</li> </ul>
Revenue/ Civil Assessments	<p><u>Team Lead:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Yamasaki, Court Executive Officer, Santa Clara Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>Team Members from Santa Clara Superior Court:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer</li> <li>• Marvin Bell, Director of Finance</li> <li>• Vella Sindayen, Deputy Fiscal Officer</li> <li>• Terri Cain, Director of Criminal and Traffic</li> <li>• Dawn Saindon, Assistant Director, Criminal and Traffic</li> </ul>



San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team  
Activity Summary

During the course of this review, the CART members participated in the following activities to accomplish its charge.

Date	Activity (meeting, conference call, court visit)	Participants
2/9/12	Kick-off Meeting – general meeting to meet participants and break out into teams by subject area	CART members, San Joaquin Superior Court Management Team
2/28/12	Probate/Mental Health Team Conference Call	<p><u>CART Probate/Mental Health Team participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teresa Risi, Chief Operations Officer, Orange County Superior Court</li> <li>• Mary Malk, Unit Manager, Probate/Mental Health, Orange County Superior Court</li> <li>• Marla Cairns, Supervising Probate Examiner, Orange County Superior Court</li> <li>• Susan Mills, Probate Program/Coordinator Specialist, Orange County Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>San Joaquin Superior Court participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diana Landmann, Court Manager</li> <li>• Camey Joerke, Court Manager</li> <li>• Angie Krueg, Probate Legal Processing Clerk (LPC) Supervisor</li> <li>• Gail Sanders, Courtroom Clerk LPC Supervisor</li> <li>• Marilyn Green, Courtroom Clerk LPC Supervisor</li> <li>• Letty Mosqueda, Probate Courtroom Clerk</li> <li>• Julie Watts, Probate Examiner</li> <li>• Cecilia Alemendarez, Probate Clerk</li> <li>• Laureen Brown, Probate Legal Process Clerk</li> <li>• Gayle Elledge, Probate Legal Process Clerk</li> <li>• Delfina Alcocer, Probate Legal Process Clerk</li> </ul>

Date	Activity (meeting, conference call, court visit)	Participants
3/1/12	Finance/Administration Team Court Visit/Meeting	<p><u>CART Finance/Administration Team participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kiri Torre, Court Executive Officer (CEO), Contra Costa Superior Court</li> <li>• Zlatko Theodorovic, Finance Director, Finance Division, AOC</li> <li>• John Judnick, Senior Manager, Finance Division Internal Audit Services, AOC</li> <li>• Linda Sebastiani, Manager, Trial Court Administrative Services Division, AOC</li> <li>• Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Executive Officer, Contra Costa Superior Court</li> <li>• Brandy Sanborn, Financial Services Manager, Contra Costa Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>San Joaquin Superior Court participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosa Junquero, Court Executive Officer</li> <li>• Linda Courtright, Chief Financial Officer</li> <li>• Denise Hill, Human Resources Court Manager</li> <li>• James Flohrschutz, Business Services Director</li> <li>• De Ette Goni, Management Analyst</li> <li>• Suzanne Schleder, Case Management System Coordinator</li> </ul>

Date	Activity (meeting, conference call, court visit)	Participants
3/6/12	Civil/V3 Court Visit/Meeting	<p><u>CART Civil/V3 Team participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michael Planet, CEO, Ventura Superior Court</li> <li>• Cheryl Kanatzar, Deputy Executive Officer – Operations, Ventura Superior Court</li> <li>• Brenda McCormick, General Counsel, Ventura Superior Court</li> <li>• Pat Patterson, Deputy Executive Officer – CIO, Ventura Superior Court</li> <li>• Julie Camacho, Manager – Civil and Family Law, Ventura Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>San Joaquin Court participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civil Case Management, Legal Research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rosa Junqueiro, CEO</li> <li>○ Judge David Warner, Presiding Judge</li> <li>○ Judge Leslie Holland, Civil Presiding Judge</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Civil and Small Claims Processing Units, Civil Records Department, Judicial Secretaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Judge Barbara Kronlund, Civil</li> <li>○ Sharon Morris, Assistant CEO</li> <li>○ Diana Landmann, Court Manager</li> <li>○ Carney Joerke, Court Manager</li> <li>○ Suzanne Schleder, Case Management System Coordinator</li> <li>○ Grace Healy, Case Management System Coordinator</li> <li>○ Terry Costa, Senior Judicial Secretary</li> <li>○ Appeals staff, Small Claims staff, Civil/UD staff, Records staff, Receptionist</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3/7/12	Probate/Mental Health Court Visit/Meeting	<p><u>CART Probate/Mental Health Team participants:</u> see participants for 2/28/12 entry above.</p>

Date	Activity (meeting, conference call, court visit)	Participants
3/9/12	Information Technology Conference Call	<u>CART Revenue/Civil Assessment Team participant:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robert Oyung, Chief Information Officer, Santa Clara Superior Court</li> </ul> <u>San Joaquin Court participants:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bea Gin, Deputy Court Executive Officer</li> <li>• Gil Castillo, IT Supervisor</li> <li>• Stephen Correa, IT Systems Programming Analyst</li> </ul>
3/20/12	Revenue/Civil Assessment Court Visit/Meeting	<u>CART Revenue/Civil Assessment Team participants:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marvin Bell, Director of Finance, Santa Clara Superior Court</li> <li>• Vella Sindayen, Deputy Fiscal Officer, Santa Clara Superior Court</li> <li>• Terri Cain, Director of Criminal and Traffic, Santa Clara Superior Court</li> <li>• Dawn Saindon, Assistant Director, Criminal and Traffic, Santa Clara Superior Court</li> </ul> <u>San Joaquin Court participants:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rosa Junqueiro, CEO</li> <li>○ Bea Gin, Deputy Court Executive Officer</li> <li>○ Linda Courtright, Chief Financial Officer</li> <li>○ De Ette Goni, Management Analyst</li> <li>○ Joann Allen, Court Manager</li> <li>○ Suzanne Schleder, Case Management System Coordinator</li> </ul>

Date	Activity (meeting, conference call, court visit)	Participants
3/22/12 and 3/23/12	Family Law Court Visit/Meeting	<p><u>CART Family Law Team participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kim Turner, CEO, Marin Superior Court</li> <li>• Cheri Brannon, Assistant CEO, Marin Superior Court</li> <li>• Janet Minkiewicz, Court Operations Manager, Marin Superior Court</li> <li>• Alexandria Quam-Rios, Family Law Facilitator and Legal Self Help Services Manager, Marin Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>San Joaquin Court participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosa Junqueiro, CEO</li> <li>• Stephanie Bohrer, Court Management Analyst</li> <li>• Erica Ochoa, Court Manager of Family Law and Records</li> <li>• Gregoria Ramirez, Family and Children’s Services Director</li> <li>• Sheila Ballin, Family Law Facilitator</li> <li>• Maria Lewis, LPC Supervisor</li> </ul>
3/22/12	Juvenile Conference Call	<p><u>CART Juvenile Team participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teresa Risi, Chief Operations Officer, Orange County Superior Court</li> <li>• Anaruth Gonzalez, Unit Manager, Juvenile, Orange County Superior Court</li> <li>• Blanca Escobedo, Manager, Juvenile Delinquency Conversion Project, Orange County Superior Court</li> <li>• Cynthia Solis, Courtroom Operations Supervisor, Juvenile, Orange County Superior Court</li> </ul> <p><u>San Joaquin Court participants:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diana Landmann, Court Manager</li> <li>• Camey Joerke, Court Manager</li> <li>• Joann Allen, Court Manager</li> <li>• Emily Herrera, LPC Supervisor</li> </ul>
3/28/12	Juvenile Court Visit/Meeting	<u>CART Juvenile Team participation:</u> see participants for 3/22/12 entry above.
3/29/12	Conference Call – status update with CART members	CART Team – CART members

Date	Activity (meeting, conference call, court visit)	Participants
4/4/12 and 4/5/12	Criminal Court Visit/Meeting	<u>CART Criminal Team participants:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kim Turner, Court Executive Officer</li> <li>• Cheri Brannon, Assistant Court Executive Officer</li> <li>• Janet Minkiewicz, Court Operations Manager</li> <li>• Dorothy McCarthy, Information Technology Manager</li> </ul> <u>San Joaquin Court participants:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosa Junqueiro, CEO</li> <li>• Stephanie Bohrer, Court Management Analyst</li> <li>• Suzanne Schleder, Case Management System Coordinator</li> <li>• Joann Allen, Court Manager</li> <li>• Lisa Smith, LPC Supervisor</li> <li>• Lisa Teicheira, LPC Supervisor</li> </ul>
4/18/12	Conference Call - status update with CART members	CART Team – CART members
4/20/12	Meeting – in- person meeting to discuss observations and identify recommendations to share with court.	CART Team – CART members

Attachment G: Recommendations for Consideration as Best Practices/Process Efficiencies

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AS BEST PRACTICES:**

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION
BP1	Juror Fees	CCP 215 governs the fees and mileage to be paid to jurors. It is recommended that signs be posted in all jury assembly rooms and direction to jury staff to actively ask prospective jurors to waive their per diem fees.
BP2	Grant Review	It is recommended the court review all grants and special funding to confirm that no baseline budget contribution and/or other non-monetary match is included.
BP3	Partnerships/ Collaboration	Institute a regional probate group with other courts to share information and exchange ideas, solutions (e.g., reciprocal investigations, fees, etc.).
		Institute regular meetings with neighboring Courts to resolve issues of common concern and share 'best practices'.
		Explore partnerships with other agencies (such as Legal Aid) that can apply for grant monies with which to institute, manage and conduct free clinics for unrepresented parties.
		Institute regular justice partner meetings with high level department heads to revolve systemic problems (juvenile delinquency).
BP4	Certification Review Hearings	Explore reducing time spent by courtroom team hearing mental health matters at facilities, by potentially utilizing the County rather than the Court for work and costs related to Certification Review Hearings pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) 5256.1 and/or consider contracting for services of attorneys as Riese Hearing Officers for hearings pursuant to WIC 5332 to eliminate the need for bailiff, clerk or reporter services.
BP5	Local Rules	It is recommended that the court update its local rules and establish an annual review cycle.
BP6	Minor Signing Disposition Document	<p>While it is not mandated for a minor to sign the disposition document imposing terms of probation and it is acknowledged as part of the record in the minutes, it may be a good practice to explore having the minor sign the terms of probation to potentially reduce probation violations and/or to remove the issue of notice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The terms of probation are captured as part of the NCR minutes and a copy is provided to several parties, including the minor.</li> <li>• Despite that this is an NCR form, additional copies are made to distribute to all parties listed for distribution.</li> <li>• We learned that in some instances these copies are shrunk to fit an 8 ½ x 11 page size, but it was not clear if this was done by Probation or Court staff.</li> <li>• In addition, it was not clear if there is an additional form that allows for the minor to sign acknowledging an understanding of the terms imposed or if there is an orientation occurring by Probation or counsel to ensure this process is occurring.</li> </ul>

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROCESS EFFICIENCIES

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE1	Across Case Types	Business Process Workflows	Develop a work plan to create and/or evaluate document workflows to identify duplication, overlapping resources, and potential reduction of “number of hands” touching documents for more efficient processing.	Medium-Long
PE2	Across Case Types (identified during Probate review)	Case Processing	Evaluate all log/spreadsheets and determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue as is - still needed and used</li> <li>• Continue but modify – still needed and used but not all data collected was relevant/used</li> <li>• Discontinue – no longer used/needed</li> </ul>	Short
PE3	Civil/Probate	Case Processing	Remove or reduce the automatic fee generation in CCMS V3 and instead enter a fee manually for efficiency purposes. CCMS V3 fee generation functionality has limitations and parties do not always identify the correct document when filing resulting in potential need to change/correct fees generated through automatic fee generation.	Short
PE4		Case Processing	Implement V3 macros for more efficient and consistent minute order entry.	Short
PE5	Criminal	Case Processing	Require defendants to complete financial screening prior to providing them with expungement orders.	Short
PE6	Family Law	Case Processing	Review process for all Orders After Hearings to eliminate staff time spent typing orders, especially in cases where there are attorneys who can prepare the orders.	Short
PE7		Case Processing	Allow clerks to use Judge’s signature stamps to set Order to Show Cause Hearings that do not include Temporary Orders.	Short
PE8	Family Law/Probate	Case Processing	Implement mandated notification to Department of Justice re firearms prohibition/relief from prohibition.	Short



#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE9	Juvenile Delinquency	Case Processing	<p>If an updated CMS is not possible for Juvenile Delinquency, it is recommended that the court eliminate NCR forms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace with word processing templates (if staff is unable to convert the forms, hire a vendor to convert forms);</li> <li>• NCR forms are expensive. The information on the forms may be outdated and in need of updating.</li> <li>• Staff expressed that many of the checkboxes are not used therefore these may not meet the current business needs.</li> <li>• If Minute Order forms are converted from NCR to word processing forms, they could be updated with relevant information and multiple copies printed for the parties in the courtroom.</li> <li>• Furthermore, if word processing forms were used instead of NCR minute orders, the calendar preparation of minute orders could be more efficient.</li> </ul>	Short
PE10			<p>If an updated CMS is not possible for Juvenile Delinquency, it is recommended that in lieu of maintaining the 'black book' of calendared cases and typing calendars, explore the use of maintaining this information in Word or Excel to allow for easier filtering of information and the ability to use 'cut and paste' functionality.</p>	Short
PE11			<p>If an updated CMS is not possible for Juvenile Delinquency, it is recommended that the court retrain staff on probation's CMS (staff has query access). It seemed that this system could be a valuable resource to the Court while waiting for a CMS.</p>	Short
PE12			<p>If an updated CMS is not possible for Juvenile Delinquency, it is recommended that the court maintain basket of delinquency conformed copies for DA and deliver once per day rather than throughout the day.</p>	Short
PE13			<p>If an updated CMS is not possible for Juvenile Delinquency, it is recommended that the court maintain an index of delinquency cases (should not be relying on other agencies for this).</p>	Short
PE14			<p>DMV abstracts appear to be done manually. Explore opportunities to upload directly with DMV or other methods to improve this process.</p>	Short

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE15	Juvenile Dependency	Case Processing	Sign/stamp original petition only (don't need to handwrite case # and other information on conformed copies). Doing this numerous times on the same case provides opportunity for error and is time consuming.	short
PE16			Establish shared email box for case processing. This will provide adequate coverage for absences.	short
PE17			"Show Me" should generate calendar pages that contain the information currently handwritten into the 'At a Glance' worksheet. Information is contained in the system.	short
PE18			Explore updating and converting minute orders to Word Processing forms for easier maintenance and use (information on the minute order form is out of date and not used by courtroom clerks). Staff expressed that many of the checkboxes are not used therefore these may not meet the current business needs.	short
PE19			Explore eliminating making updates and recommendations to the filed HSA report and instead include the final orders in the minutes or explore adopting stipulation and order forms for findings and orders. This will help preserve integrity of the document filed with the court. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed on changes by counsel and judge are made on the record. Judge and attorneys individually annotate their copies with the changes. Should explore a method that captures the court's orders without annotating individual copies of the agency report.</li> </ul>	short
PE20	Probate	Case Processing	Give all 'amended petitions' new hearing dates rather than allowing an earlier date on calendar which does not provide the time needed for a full new examination.	Short

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE21	Probate	Case Processing	Set one event per document eliminating excessive data entry and maintenance of that data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: A concern was raised re: JBSIS compliance. As it relates to probate matters, JBSIS specifically states: "Report only one subsequent petition even though the petition may be requesting multiple court actions" and that hearings are "Formal judicial proceedings held to decide issues of fact or law arising in the course of a court action" such as a motion hearing. It does not indicate that issues should be set separately and/or counted separately, such as is done in Family Law. Orange County's interpretation (and supported by AOC contact Chris Belloli) has been to schedule a single event per document.</li> </ul>	Short
PE22			Discontinue providing "extra copies" of documents for investigators given that the entire file is provided to the investigator.	Short
PE23			Enter wills/estate planning documents lodged for safekeeping as new cases rather than using the Will/Estate Planning functionality in V3 in order to maximize full case management functionality as needed, including full indexing capabilities.	Short
PE24			Recommend the following process steps regarding requests for temporary appointments of guardianship: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require underlying petition be filed and hearing set in conjunction with request for temporary</li> <li>Require a 'noticed' ex parte hearing and appearance</li> <li>Request CAR (Child Abuse Registry) report on minors and proposed guardians prior to ex parte hearing and have available with case documents for judicial review</li> <li>If denied, file for the record; if granted, include expiration date of no more than 30 days and set another hearing on temporary in 30 days if the underlying petition is set more than 30 days out.</li> </ul>	Short
PE25			Use V3 clocks and work queues to track filings requiring investigations rather than a spreadsheet.	Short

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE26	Probate	Case Processing	Explore further processes involved for “order to pay investigation fees.” Potential to reduce mailing preparation costs/postage by handling matter at the hearing.	Short
PE27			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize generic email contact only for examiner and eliminate phone contact for more efficient communication.</li> <li>Implement continuance email address with appropriate guidelines.</li> </ul>	Short
PE28			Enter dispositions and appointments using MOCS functionality, providing more efficient and immediate updates in the system by clerk doing minute order in V3 and reducing the necessity for additional data entry by another resource outside of the courtroom.	Short
PE29			Explore the potential of using “Finalize Only” vs. “Finalize” in MOCS where attachments to minute orders are incorporated by reference so that the minute order is a comprehensive single document in the record and eliminating the need to go to the file for the attachments.	Short
PE30			When ordering transfers, include orders re: fees after negotiating acceptance of fee orders by other jurisdictions and set follow up hearings to ensure cases have been successfully transferred with receipt from other court recorded.	Short
PE31			Consider eliminating practice of call/reserving dates. Parties will get notice of hearing.	Short
PE32			Explore using CCMS calendars for a “clerk’s office internal calendar” with no appearances by parties to manage workflows that are not driven by document filings.	Short
PE33			Implement required notices re expiration/reappointment of LPS conservatorship.	Short
PE34			Develop Conservatorship clinic to help reduce continuances on the appointment of conservator calendar.	Medium
PE35			Unlawful Detainer	Case Processing

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE36	Criminal	Courtroom	Stop providing new DMV printouts to judicial officers on every DUI appearance.	Short
PE37			Consider staggering start times of courtrooms to optimize use of reporters, interpreters and clerks.	Short
PE38			Allow late arrival of defendants to court hearings to avoid the issuance and processing of bench warrants.	Short
PE39	Juvenile Delinquency	Courtroom	For Delinquency matters serve Notice of Hearing and Petition to minor in courtroom when minor is detained rather than mailing.	Short
PE40			Explore with partner agencies the ability to assign attorneys to one courtroom to avoid delays while waiting for attorney in other courtroom. Or, in the alternative, explore the ability to combine the workload/calendars into one courtroom.	Short
PE41			The in-courtroom calendaring methods are a bit antiquated and there may be duplication in what the clerk does and how the bench officer sets/tracks cases for hearings. If not resolved through a new CMS, a shared calendar on Word may assist in noting what has been set each day. The clerks can enter their calendar information into a shared calendar and provide access to case processing.	Short
PE42			There appears to be some downtime for courtroom clerks during hearings. By adding a computer in the courtroom, clerks may be able to assist with the processing of high level clerical work to reduce backlogs.	Short
PE43	Probate	Courtroom	Allow a 1st continuance on a matter without an appearance, with all subsequent continuances requiring an appearance to make any subsequent request.	Short
PE44			After an appointment is made, set a "review hearing" including an order that all documents must be filed by a date certain and an order requiring all parties to return unless the documents have been filed at which time the matter may be recommended to be taken off calendar. If documents are not timely filed and there are no appearances as ordered, continue the matter including an order that a bench warrant be issued and held until that new date. Service of the minute order by mail will suffice and is more efficient than issuing and serving an OSC.	Short

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE45	Probate	Courtroom	Process orders after hearing outside of the courtroom where they can be reviewed and processed more efficiently and in a consistent manner whether submitted prior to or after the hearing. Orders can be returned for correction as needed and/or signed/conformed and returned using a self-addressed, stamped envelope that can be deposited with the order as it is received.	Short
PE46			Institute and enforce a 5 court day filing deadline for documents pertaining to matters on calendar.	Short
PE47	Across case types	Customer Service	Explore alternative methods for improving public information thereby reducing staff's time answering phone calls (i.e., information on public website, recorded information/phone scripts, etc.).	Short
PE48	Probate	Customer Service	Expand the "Tips and Tricks" presentation to additional, targeted community groups (e.g., document typing services).	Short
PE49	Across case types	Exhibits	Review exhibit processes/procedures (some exhibits may be stored in case files.) In general the chain of custody regarding exhibit handling should be explored	Short
PE50	Juvenile Delinquency	Interpreters	It is recommended that the court explore eliminating the e-mailing requirement to schedule the on-site Spanish interpreter.	Short
PE51	Across case types	Interpreters	Explore possible scheduling efficiencies for non-Spanish interpreter needs (i.e., maintaining a shared calendar for clerks to post day/time/language needed so when scheduling dates for defendants with other language needs, the ability to schedule like languages on the same day could be accomplished.	Short
PE52	Juvenile Dependency	Justice Partner Communication	Assess alternate methods to providing users/partners information to reduce time spent on phone calls by staff. When asked, staff noted that most of the phone calls are usually from partner agencies "confirming hearing dates". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide PD and HSA inquiry access to hearing information.</li> </ul>	Short
PE53	Across Case Types	Organizational Review	Review and evaluate the current organizational structure including reporting responsibilities, mgr/supervisor to staff ratios, and assigned duties for various units/staff and develop an org. structure that maximizes the use of staff in an efficient and effective manner.	Medium-Long

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE54	Across Case Types	Staff Assignments	<p>Review level of staff performing tasks to align resources and consolidate work more appropriately.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend that the court utilize the Examiner or court clerk rather than legal processing clerk for generating notes and recommendation to judicial officer on minor compromise cases.</li> <li>• Recommend that the court reduce resources in the courtroom to one rather than three, keeping either the probate clerk or court clerk only, allowing the other clerk and the examiner to spend time on other work.</li> <li>• For case files/documents kept within the units, consolidate filing duties under one position at the appropriate level that will own the filing responsibilities and maintain the records in order, thus reducing the time spent by higher paid staff levels currently performing basic filing duties.</li> <li>• In Civil, It is recommended the Court replace the “Pod” team approach by establishing specific desk assignments for getting the work processed. Examples include desks for Judgments, Orders, Writs/Abstracts, New Filings, etc.</li> <li>• It is recommended that the court assign staff to cover the front counter in full day cycles rather than for short period of time each day (specifically identified in civil).</li> <li>• It is recommended that the court realign the duties and responsibilities of the legal research staff to provide additional support for civil judges.</li> <li>• It is recommended that the court assign an existing ‘rover’ position to the mail desk in civil so that the Supervisors and Managers can be removed from the rotation pool for processing and distributing mail.</li> <li>• It is recommended that the court reevaluate the receptionist position and its duties housed in the administration office.</li> <li>• It is recommended that the court realign the duties and responsibilities of the secretarial staff (identified in Civil).</li> </ul>	Medium-Long

#	CASE TYPE/ COURT AREA	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME
PE55	Across Case Types	Tools, Training, Staff Development	Develop, or obtain, or modify from other sources, procedures and training materials to assist with cross-training and enhance consistency in practices. Document and maintain procedural manuals to ensure consistent processing.	Medium-Long
PE56	Across Case Types	Tools, Training, Staff Development	Explore feasibility of dedicated training/procedure positions to ensure manuals and training materials are up to date, staff are consistently trained, work evaluated and staff are re-trained as deemed necessary. This is a proactive approach which should reduce errors and other back end corrections and it ensures correct information is before the bench.	Medium-Long
PE57	Across Case Types	Tools, Training, Staff Development	Develop and provide 'cheat sheets' to staff to enhance efficiencies and reduce inconsistencies in data entry.	Medium-long
PE58	Family Law	Tools, Training, Staff Development	Create checklists for dissolution judgments to assist the court, pro per litigants, and attorneys.	Short
PE59	Across Case Types	Tools, Training, Staff Development	Expand the use of PIN Network access to managers (and supervisors) so they can more easily communicate with other Courts throughout the state.	Short
PE60	Across Case Types	Tools, Training, Staff Development	It is recommended that the court develop basic management reports pertaining to workload for managers and supervisors to better manage the work, to ensure resources are utilized and to ensure the timely processing of the work.	Medium