



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: February 26, 2013

Title

Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations: 2 Percent
State-Level Reserve

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

February 26, 2013

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

N/A

Date of Report

February 19, 2013

Recommended by

Administrative Office of the Courts
Curt Soderlund, Chief Administrative Officer
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Fiscal Services
Office
Judicial and Court Administrative Services
Division

Contact

Patrick Ballard, 818-558-3115
patrick.ballard@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Administrative Office of the Courts submits the following to the Judicial Council for its consideration: (1) Recommendations and options on two courts' applications for supplemental funding related to unanticipated expenses. The amount remaining in the 2 percent state-level reserve set-aside in the Trial Court Trust Fund for fiscal year 2012–2013 is \$27.7 million. By statute, the Judicial Council after October 31 and before March 15 of each fiscal year may distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from any trial courts for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs. (2) Allocations to all courts, to be distributed after March 15, of a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve.

Recommendation 1

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) suggests that the Judicial Council consider the following options for the supplemental funding request in the amount of \$2.11 million from the Superior Court of Kings County:

Option 1: Deny the court's request

Do not distribute any supplemental funding monies to the Kings County court.

Option 2: Grant the court's request

Allocate to the court up to \$2.11 million and consider making the distribution of funding contingent upon one or more of the following terms and conditions (or on other terms as the council determines):

- a. The court will use its best efforts to spread the cost of the project over the full five-year period so as to minimize each year's distribution from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve.
- b. The court is allocated \$733,000 from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve for fiscal year (FY) 2012–2013. Any unused distribution amount from the 2 percent state-level reserve in FY 2012–2013 should be used in FY 2013–2014.
- c. The funds will be distributed upon the submission of invoices for products and services necessary to acquire and deploy the court's case management system.
- d. Any allocations for FY 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 would come from that year's Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve.
- e. In order to receive a distribution from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve for FY 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 for the project, the court must provide a projection of all project costs, and detailed financial information demonstrating why it is unable to address those costs within existing resources, to the Judicial Council by no later than November 1 of each year.
- f. The Administrative Director of the Courts will monitor the project and costs (including invoices) submitted and the payments made to assure that the distributions are appropriate.

- g. The court will provide the Administrative Director of the Courts with access to all records necessary to evaluate and monitor the project and will cooperate fully with the efforts of the Trial Court Liaison Office to do so.

Recommendation 2

The AOC suggests that the Judicial Council consider the following options for the supplemental funding request in the amount of \$628,000 from the Superior Court of San Joaquin County:

Option 1: Deny the court's request

Do not distribute any supplemental funding monies to the San Joaquin County court. This option assumes the court will receive funding from the unexpended 2 percent state-level reserve of \$419,000 and the FY 2012–2013 trial court benefits allocation of \$571,000 (totaling \$990,000), which would eliminate the \$628,000 budget shortfall in the current fiscal year.

Option 2: Partially fund the court's request

Allocate partial funding of the court's request as a one-time supplemental funding distribution if the total received by the court in Option 1—the unexpended 2 percent state-level reserve and trial court benefit allocation—is less than the \$628,000 budget shortfall the court is estimating in the current fiscal year.

Option 3: Grant the court's request

Allocate a one-time supplemental funding distribution of \$628,000, the amount that the San Joaquin County court is requesting.

Recommendation 3

The AOC suggests that the Judicial Council consider making any allocation of funding contingent upon one or more of the following terms and conditions (or on other terms as the council determines):

- a. Any court that receives supplemental funding must submit a written report on the use of the funding it received and on its fiscal situation as of June 30, 2013, to the Judicial Council by no later than August 1, 2013.
- b. In addition to any amount the council distributes at this time, it may allocate more funding to the same court after October 31 and before March 15 of the fiscal year for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs.
- c. The supplemental funding for urgent needs received by the court must be used for the purposes addressed in the application, including keeping open a sufficient number of

courtrooms and providing other necessary services during FY 2012–2013 to meet the court’s obligation to adjudicate all matters, both civil and criminal, that come before the court.

- d. The Judicial Council may allocate any or all funding to the court in the form of a loan.

Recommendation 4

The AOC suggests that the Judicial Council allocate a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve to be distributed after March 15, 2013, to all trial courts.

Previous Council Action

Supplemental funding process and criteria

On June 27, 2012, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 1021, which repealed the provisions in Government Code section 77209 related to urgent needs funding from the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF) and added Government Code section 68502.5, which requires that the Judicial Council set aside as a reserve an amount equal to 2 percent of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) appropriation in Program 45.10. In response to this new statute, the council, at its August 31, 2012 meeting, approved the policy with regard to the process, criteria, and required information for requesting supplemental funding from the reserve. This process modified what was approved by the Judicial Council at its October 28, 2011 meeting as it related to requests for supplemental funding for urgent needs from the TCIF. (See Attachment A: Judicial Council–Approved Process for Supplemental Funding)

The council considered supplemental funding requests for unavoidable funding shortfalls submitted by trial courts as required by statute (Gov. Code, § 68502.5) at its October 26, 2012 business meeting. Courts submitting on or before October 1 can only receive up to the amount the court contributed to the 2 percent state-level reserve fund. Two courts—the Superior Courts of Kings and San Joaquin Counties—met the council-approved criterion of projecting a negative fund balance for the current fiscal year and each court’s request was considered separately by the council. Under the council policy, courts submitting on or before October 1 can only receive up to the amount the court contributed to the 2 percent state-level reserve fund. Therefore, the council could only approve a one-time amount of \$94,000 for the Kings County court even though the court had requested \$2.29 million, and only \$442,000 for the San Joaquin County court, which had requested \$2.21 million.

The Kings County court was facing a current year estimated negative ending fund balance of \$2.29 million, which comprised a budget shortfall of \$143,000 and an expenditure of \$2.152 million for a soon-to-be unsupported, antiquated county case management system. The presiding judge of the Kings County court presented the court’s request to the Judicial Council at its

October 26, 2012 business meeting. The Judicial Council approved allocating a one-time supplemental funding distribution of \$94,000, the amount that the court contributed to the 2 percent reserve in FY 2012–2013, on two conditions:

- a. The court must submit a written report on the use of the funding received and its fiscal situation as of June 30, 2013, to the Judicial Council by no later than August 1, 2013; and
- b. The supplemental funding for urgent needs received by the court must be used for the purposes addressed in the court’s application, including keeping open a sufficient number of courtrooms, and providing other necessary services during FY 2012–2013 to meet the court’s obligation to adjudicate all matters, both civil and criminal, that come before the court.

The San Joaquin County court’s supplemental funding request for \$2.21 million was for a budget shortfall of \$1.70 million and included an additional \$506,000 to rehire employees and end furloughs. The San Joaquin County court’s presiding judge and executive officer presented the court’s request to the Judicial Council at its October 26, 2012 business meeting. The Judicial Council voted, in a vote of 13 to 4, to defer the decision on allocating any one-time supplemental funding distribution until the court reports to the council on the use of the \$916,000 from the Trial Court Improvement Fund that the council approved as a five-year interest-free loan to the court on December 16, 2011, in response to the court’s emergency funding request.

Recommendation 1: Superior Court of Kings County

The AOC suggests that the Judicial Council consider the following options for the supplemental funding request in the amount of \$2.11 million from the Superior Court of Kings County:

- Option 1: Deny the court’s request
- Option 2: Grant the court’s request

Rationale for Recommendation 1

Judicial Council criteria for eligibility for supplemental funding

Under the policy adopted by the Judicial Council, the main criterion for determining whether a court may receive supplemental funding related to an urgent need is that the court is projecting a current year negative fund balance. The Kings County court is projecting a \$1.969 million (General Fund) negative fund balance for FY 2012–2013, and therefore submitted an application requesting supplemental funding on January 18, 2013. The court was projecting a funding shortfall of \$2.29 million earlier in the fiscal year and submitted an application on September 27, 2012. However, under the criteria adopted by the Judicial Council, the council can only allocate

to a court submitting on or before October 1 no more than the amount that court had contributed to the 2 percent reserve. The court's contribution to the 2 percent reserve for FY 2012–2013 was \$94,000. Thus, although the court requested \$2.29 million, under its current policy the council could only approve for distribution to the court no more than \$94,000 at the October 26, 2012 business meeting. Under the council's current policy, the court may request additional funding for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs after October 31. The council may allocate funding in response to such a request after October 31 and prior to March 15 of the fiscal year without taking into consideration the court's contribution to the 2 percent reserve limit. Therefore, the court is now requesting a total amount of \$2.11 million¹ for an unanticipated expense to be considered at the February 26, 2013 Judicial Council meeting. (See Attachments B-1 and B-2 for the application submitted by the Kings County court.)

Overview of the court's application for supplemental funding

AOC staff reviewed the completed application submitted by the Kings County court on January 30, 2013, which contained all of the required information. The application identifies the consequences to the public, access to justice, and court operations of not receiving urgent needs monies. In order to mitigate a deficit for FY 2012–2013, the court has already laid off 3 employees; imposed 27 unpaid furlough days on all subordinate judicial officers, management, and staff personnel; and directed the court executive officer (CEO) and assistant court executive officer (ACEO) to participate in a "job-sharing" program for 40 days each. The court has also reduced business hours at all locations and permanently closed the Lemoore Courthouse, effective September 11, 2012. In addition to measures already taken in FY 2012–2013 that have limited access to justice, in FY 2013–2014, the court will implement measures, including laying off 5 to 10 more employees, maintaining the 27 furlough days' requirement, continuing the reduced counter hours at all locations, increasing the number of CEO/ACEO job-sharing days, and possibly closing the remaining outlying court facilities to avoid a negative ending fund balance.

The Kings County court's current year estimated negative ending fund balance of \$1.969 million is a result of an unanticipated expenditure of \$2.11 million in the current fiscal year to replace a soon-to-be-unsupported, antiquated county CMS. The cost for the county CMS will increase in cost from \$284,000 in FY 2012–2013 to \$586,000 in FY 2014–2015, which includes mainframe costs for routine operation and maintenance and COBOL programming costs. If the new CMS expenditure of \$2.11 million is excluded, the court's budget shortfall has decreased from a negative fund balance of \$143,000 to a positive fund balance of \$142,000 from the time of the council's October meeting. This change from a negative fund balance to a current positive fund balance of \$142,000 is composed of: (1) an approved Judicial Council allocation of \$94,000 from the 2 percent reserve; (2) a \$60,000 reimbursement from the county for a traffic collection

¹ The court's original request, in October 2012, included \$2.23 million for a case management system. In the court's current request the case management cost is now \$2.11 million.

clerk (1.5 full-time equivalent) to keep the Avenal court facility open for proceedings one day every other week; and (3) the suspension of Phoenix financial services costs of \$43,000 in FY 2012–2013, approved by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on January 17, 2013; and (4) unanticipated salary savings.

The Kings County court’s application indicates there is a five-year payment plan option for implementation of a new CMS, in which the costs would be extended over that period. The concern with this approach is that under Government Code section 68502.5, subparagraph (B), and the current Judicial Council policy, urgent needs funding is only to be used for one-time unavoidable budget shortfalls, unforeseen emergencies, or unanticipated expenses and cannot be allocated on an ongoing basis. Additionally, under the current Judicial Council policy, a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent reserve is allocated to all trial courts after March 15, using courts’ current year Trial Court Trust Fund and General Fund base allocation. Thus, the 2 percent reserve is fully allocated by the end of each fiscal year and no unexpended monies can be rolled over to fund ongoing urgent needs requests in a subsequent year. A court, though, may apply in a subsequent year if there is “a clear and convincing showing” for supplemental funding. The other concern is if the Judicial Council approved a lump sum amount of \$2.11 million, the court may not be able to expend the funding in time to meet the 1 percent fund balance statute requirement beginning July 1, 2014, under Government Code section 77203.

AOC staff reviewed the Kings County court’s revenue and expenditure assumptions and related information provided in their application and concurs with the court’s estimate of its negative fund balance. AOC staff have also reviewed the court’s projections for fiscal years 2012–2013, 2013–2014, and 2014–2015, and with the exception of their inclusion of expenditures for a new CMS for which they currently have no funding, the projections are reasonable.

Discussion of options

Option 1: Deny the court’s request. Do not distribute any supplemental funding monies to the Kings County court.

The Kings County court indicates that this option would give the court no alternative but to continue on the antiquated county-developed mainframe CMS for traffic and criminal, as well as the currently installed ACS system which, by 2014, will no longer be supported by the county. The amount the county will charge the court to host the CMS on the county mainframe will increase from \$255,000 in FY 2012–2013 to an estimated \$430,000 per year by FY 2014–2015, because the court will be the only remaining entity on the system. In addition, because the primary county COBOL programming resource retired in January 2012, the court will need to provide and pay for all required system modifications to the CMS to ensure compliance with new statutes impacting the collection and proper distribution of fees and fines. The county has

agreed to contract on an as-needed and as-available basis with the retired resource. However, reliance upon a part-time resource provides the court with very limited services and has placed the court in an untenable position of being unable to make changes to the mainframe to conform to legislative and statutory changes as well as being unable to produce statistical and ad hoc reports in a timely manner.

The court could continue to use their existing CMS systems and processes and would not incur the cost of deploying a new case management system. However, the amount the county will charge the court to host the CMS on the county mainframe and to program all required CMS modifications to ensure compliance with new statutes impacting the collection and proper distribution of fees and fines is estimated to increase from \$284,000 (\$255,000 for routine operations and maintenance and \$29,000 in COBOL programming costs) in FY 2012–2013, to an estimated \$586,000 by FY 2014–2015 (\$430,000 for routine operations and maintenance and \$156,000 in COBOL programming costs). Additionally, the court would continue to incur the cost of \$63,000 per year for their ACS “Contexte” civil case management system. Table A below demonstrates that the costs of supporting and programming the county CMS are projected to total \$586,000 in fiscal year 2014–2015 and will cause a significant financial burden for the Kings County court even with all the additional cost-savings measures the court is proposing to implement in FY 2013–2014.

Table A: Projected Fund Condition Statement for the Kings County Court for Option 1
(Deny Funding)

	FY 2012–2013	FY 2013–2014	FY 2014–2015
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	141,151	(92,438)
Trial Court Revenue Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Trial Court Reimbursements	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Prior Year Revenue	456,276	456,276	456,276
Total Financing Sources	9,014,436	7,872,347	7,638,758
Personal Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operating Expenses and Equipment	2,954,091	3,025,591	3,200,591
Special Items of Expense	42,850	42,850	42,850
Prior Year Expense Adjustments			
Total Expenses*	8,873,285	7,964,785	8,007,785
Court Projected Ending Fund Balance (Remain on County CMS)	141,151	(92,438)	(369,027)
Estimated Allocation from Unexpended 2% State Level Reserve	88,914	88,914	88,914
Adjusted Projected Ending Fund Balance (Remain on County CMS)	230,065	(3,524)	(280,113)

*Expenditures exclude \$2.11 million for a new CMS in FY 2012–2013.

Option 2: Grant the court's request. Allocate to the court up to \$2.11 million and consider making the distribution of funding contingent upon one or more of the following terms and conditions (or on other terms as the council determines):

- a. The court will use its best efforts to spread the cost of the project over the full five-year period so as to minimize each year's distribution from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve.
- b. The court is allocated \$733,000 from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve for FY 2012–2013. Any unused distribution amount from the 2 percent state-level reserve in FY 2012–2013 should be used in FY 2013–2014.
- c. The funds will be distributed upon the submission of invoices for products and services necessary to acquire and deploy the court's case management system.
- d. Any allocations for FY 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 would come from that year's Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve.
- e. In order to receive a distribution from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve for FY 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 for the project, the court must provide a projection of all project costs, and detailed financial information demonstrating why it is unable to address those costs within existing resources, to the Judicial Council by no later than November 1 of each year.
- f. The Administrative Director of the Courts will monitor the project and costs (including invoices) submitted and the payments made to assure that the distributions are appropriate.
- g. The court will provide the Administrative Director of the Courts with access to all records necessary to evaluate and monitor the project and will co-operate fully with efforts of the Trial Court Liaison Office to do so.

The Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) recommends that the Judicial Council approve Option 2.

Option 2 provides for the allocation of up to \$2.11 million over a five-year period from the 2 percent state-level reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund to the Kings County court to assist with deployment of the vendor-hosted Tyler Technologies "Odyssey" case management system. The approval of up to \$2.11 million to implement the "Odyssey" case management system will provide the Kings County court with a single case management system for all case types. The

first-year costs, in FY 2012–2013, are estimated to be \$733,000. Subsequent fiscal year funding would be allocated from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2 percent state-level reserve pending the submission of projections of all project costs and detailed financial information demonstrating why the court is unable to address those costs within existing resources. This information would need to be submitted to the Judicial Council no later than November 1 of each year. The yearly allocation for the Kings County court would be considered at the Judicial Council’s December business meeting. The funds would be distributed upon the submission of invoices for product and services necessary to acquire and deploy the court’s case management system. Additionally, the Administrative Director of the Courts will monitor the project and costs (including invoices) submitted and the payments made to assure that the distributions are appropriate.

By deploying the “Odyssey” CMS, the court is provided with a long-term solution of a modern case management system, integrated across all case types, that includes features such as an integrated e-filing system and a document management system, which the Kings County court believes can be fully deployed within 13 to 18 months. The five-year cost projection of \$2.11 million had the lowest five-year cost projection of all options considered by the court. The Tyler Technologies vendor has offered the Kings County court a five-year structured payment plan (with the actual terms and conditions to be finalized as part of contract negotiations) and was the only vendor who offered a vendor-hosted solution that provides the court with cost savings from both a hardware and staffing perspective. There are some concerns since Tyler Technologies does not currently have the “Odyssey” system installed in a California trial court although there is a deployment currently under way in the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County. However, this will be the first time that a vendor-hosted case management system solution has been deployed in a California trial court. As such, there may be additional challenges encountered such as complying with DMV and DOJ interface requirements. Table B on the following page demonstrates the Kings County court costs and savings from replacement of the county CMS from FY 2012–2013 to FY 2016–2017 with Tyler Technologies “Odyssey” CMS.

Table B: Projected Costs and Savings for the Kings County Court for Option 2
(Allocating up to \$2.11 Million Over 5 Years)

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Total Costs Over 5 years
CMS Vendor Costs						
One-time Implementation Costs	181,500					181,500
Annual License and Maintenance	250,000	257,500	265,225	273,182	281,377	1,327,284
Subtotal CMS Vendor Cost	431,500	257,500	265,225	273,182	281,377	1,508,784
Court CMS Costs						
Project Manager (Temp)	47,414	41,488				88,902
Court Integration Technician (Temp)	47,414	41,488				88,902
COBOL Programmer	73,500					73,500
Infrastructure/Ti Installation	10,000					10,000
Annual T1 Costs - 5 years (DMV & Court)	29,838	29,838	29,838	29,838	29,838	149,190
Hardware Scanners	22,500					22,500
Server Hardware						-
Travel	29,333	25,667				55,000
Unfunded CMS Costs	41,249	72,074				113,323
Subtotal Court CMS Costs	301,248	210,555	29,838	29,838	29,838	601,317
Total Costs Per Year	732,748	468,055	295,063	303,020	311,215	2,110,101
CMS Savings versus remaining with County			146,500	586,000	586,000	1,318,500
Net Savings Over 5 Years	(732,748)	(468,055)	(148,563)	282,980	274,785	(791,601)

*Costs for the county CMS include COBOL programming costs to the court. Costs are based on court's timeline of complete transition off county CMS by March 2015.

Recommendation 2: Superior Court of San Joaquin County

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) suggests that the Judicial Council consider the following options for the supplemental funding request in the amount of \$628,000 from the Superior Court of San Joaquin County:

- Option 1: Deny the court's request
- Option 2: Partially Fund the Court's Request
- Option 3: Grant the Court's Request

Rationale for Recommendation 2

Judicial Council criteria for eligibility for supplemental funding

Under the policy adopted by the Judicial Council, the main criterion for determining whether a court may receive supplemental funding related to an urgent need is that the court is projecting a current year negative fund balance. The San Joaquin County court is projecting a \$628,000² (General Fund) negative fund balance for FY 2012–2013, and therefore submitted a completed

² The court estimates a net negative fund balance of \$433,000 for all funds as of December 31, 2012. In addition to this amount, \$194,000 is statutorily restricted and is unavailable for use in offsetting the court's operational shortfall.

application requesting supplemental funding on February 7, 2013, for unanticipated expenditures. The court was projecting a funding shortfall of \$1.70 million³ in the current fiscal year and submitted an application on October 1, 2012. However, under the criteria adopted by the Judicial Council, the council can only allocate to a court submitting on or before October 1 no more than the amount that court contributed to the 2 percent reserve. The court's contribution to the 2 percent reserve for FY 2012–2013 was \$442,000. Thus, although the court requested \$2.21 million, under its current policy the council could only approve for distribution to the court at the October 26, 2012 business meeting no more than \$442,000. Under the council's current policy, the court may request additional funding for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs after October 31. The council may allocate funding in response to such a request after October 31 and prior to March 15 of the fiscal year without taking into consideration the court's contribution to the 2 percent reserve limit. Therefore, the San Joaquin County court is now requesting a total amount of \$628,000 for unanticipated expenditures to be considered at the February 26, 2013 Judicial Council meeting. (See Attachments C-1 through C-3 for the application submitted by the San Joaquin County court.)

Overview of court's application for supplemental funding

AOC staff reviewed the completed application submitted by the San Joaquin County court on February 7. The court's application identifies the consequences to the public, access to justice, and court operations of not receiving urgent needs monies. Some of the major cost-savings measures the court has implemented to mitigate a deficit for FY 2012–2013 include: laying off 13 employees (August 1, 2012); imposing 12 days of mandatory furlough for all unrepresented employees (July 1, 2012); no longer setting hearings on new small claims filings (September 1, 2012); and no longer providing court reporters in all five civil courtrooms. In addition to measures already taken in FY 2012–2013, in the prior year the court closed one courtroom in a full-service two-courtroom courthouse in Lodi, closed a full-service two courtroom courthouse in Tracy, and laid off 42 staff. If funding is not received for the court's budget shortfall, the court will take additional measures, including laying off employees, which the court indicates "will have a direct impact in all case types for the citizens of San Joaquin County."

The San Joaquin County court's urgent need request would eliminate a budget shortfall of \$628,000 and allow the court to fully resume the processing of small claims. The court estimates the current fiscal year negative fund balance to be \$628,000 but does not include the allocations of unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve and the FY 2012–2013 trial court benefits also to be considered at the Judicial Council meeting on February 26. If both allocations being considered are approved at the council's February 26 business meeting, the court would no longer face a budget shortfall for FY 2012–2013. The court has been informed of these

³ At the Judicial Council meeting on October 26, 2012, the court estimated a net negative fund balance of \$1.512 million for all funds; in addition to this amount, \$194,000 was statutorily restricted and unavailable for use in offsetting the court's operational shortfall.

allocations; however, since the FY 2012–2013 benefits funding is currently still in the midst of a 30-day review by the Legislature, the court has decided to continue to pursue urgent needs funding.

The San Joaquin County court also points out in its application that the Judicial Council at its December 13, 2011 meeting, approved an allocation to the court of \$2.0 million from the Trial Court Improvement Fund’s “urgent needs” reserve—\$1.084 million that was not subject to repayment and \$916,000 in the form of a five-year interest-free loan. The court expended \$1.084 million in the prior year to address those budget reductions but currently still has the \$916,000 loan amount remaining and identified as a liability in its balance sheet. As stated previously, this is a future liability for the San Joaquin County court and is not reflected in the court’s fund balance. At the Judicial Council’s meeting on October 26, 2012, in which the prior request of \$2.21 million for urgent needs was being considered, the council directed the court to use the loan to implement the Court Assistance Review Team (C.A.R.T.) recommendations.⁴ One of the C.A.R.T. recommendations did identify that the court would eventually need to transition off of the county’s CMS mainframe to a new CMS. The court has since decided to apply the loan funds toward a purchase of a new CMS for criminal, traffic, and juvenile dependency case processing. Through the statewide CMS Request For Proposal (RFP) process, the court has been informed that the cost for a new CMS could range between \$1 million to \$2.6 million. However, until the statewide Master Service Agreement process has been completed, the court is unable to select a vendor and fully identify both the costs and savings. By transitioning off the current county CMS, the court estimates the costs savings to be around \$1 million a year. The court indicates in its application that although there is an ongoing need for funding, there are no more reductions that the court can entertain in this fiscal year. The court’s shortfall estimate has decreased from a negative fund balance of \$1.70 million in October 2012 to \$628,000 as of December 31, 2012, from unanticipated cost savings at the time of the council’s October meeting. This change in the negative fund balance amount comprises employee retirements, the suspension of Phoenix financial services costs in FY 2012–2013 (approved by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on January 17, 2013), reduced county CMS expenditures, and the negotiation of furloughs for represented employees. However even with these savings and if the entire request was approved by the Judicial Council, the court still faces a budget shortfall in FY 2013–2014 from the court’s projections. The court’s application identifies a plan for addressing the ongoing operational structural deficit for FY 2013–2014 that includes the implementation of cost-savings measures and the potential for increased revenues totaling \$4.5 million.

⁴ The Judicial Council directed the AOC to assist the San Joaquin County Court, to identify possible cost savings measures and opportunities to increase revenues. From February 28 through April 5, 2012 a team of experienced court executive officers (CEO) convened to participate as members of the San Joaquin Court Assistance Review Team (C.A.R.T.). Mr. Alan Carlson CEO of Orange Superior Court, Ms. Kim Turner CEO of Marin Superior Court, Ms. Kiri Torre CEO of Contra Costa Superior Court, Mr. Mike Planet CEO of Ventura Superior Court and Mr. David Yamasaki CEO of Santa Clara Superior Court, with assistance from then AOC Interim Administrative Director Jody Patel, provided the Judicial Council at its June 22, 2012 meeting, options relating to C.A.R.T. recommendations for the court 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.

The San Joaquin County court does state that it has implemented 78 percent of the C.A.R.T. recommendations (compared to the 47 percent implemented by October of 2012) and indicates in the C.A.R.T. attachment that they have begun implementing many of the new fee recommendations but are unsure of the level of revenues to project. However the court indicates, many of the new fee recommendations will have minimal impact on the court's revenues with the exception of civil assessment for failure to pay fine cases. The court has had to implement this fee using a manual process and expects it will realize a significant revenue (\$500,000) increase in FY 2013–2014. The C.A.R.T. also identified that the court should audit all county charges currently being paid to the county and move away from the A87 Cost Allocation Plan. The court has provided the county notice pursuant to Government Code section 77212 that it will no longer participate in the county's A87 billing methodology and is currently working with the county to implement this recommendation. In addition, the court's application also indicates that 80 percent of the fiscal issues identified in the last audit report, which was completed in January 2011, have been addressed and indicates that as of January 2013, there are 17 incomplete fiscal issues remaining from the court's last audit. The AOC Internal Audit Services (IAS) staff reviewed the information provided by the court and states that of the 17 issues, 12 are revenue-distribution calculation corrections that the court is working with the county to correct since the county maintains the court's CMS. The remaining 5 issues are either long-term issues that are not significant or are issues for which the court's response on the funding application indicates that they are taking appropriate planned corrective or mitigating action. The court's application does state that even with full implementation of both the outstanding C.A.R.T. recommendations and audit fiscal issues, the anticipated savings and revenues generated would be insufficient to address the ongoing funding shortfall the court is facing for current and future fiscal years.

AOC staff reviewed the San Joaquin County court's revenue and expenditure assumptions and related information provided in their application and concurs with the court's estimate of its negative fund balance. AOC staff also reviewed the court's projections for fiscal years 2012–2013, 2013–2014, and 2014–2015, concluding that the projections are reasonable with the exception of their inclusion of expenditures for additional funding to rehire 13 positions and eliminate furloughs for unrepresented staff in FY 2012–2013, for which the court currently has no funding.

Discussion of options

Option 1: Deny the court's request. Do not distribute any supplemental funding monies to the San Joaquin County court.

This option assumes the court will receive funding from the unexpended 2 percent funds and the FY 2012–2013 trial court benefits allocations, which would eliminate the \$628,000 budget shortfall. However, if funding is not approved, this option would require the court to address over the next four months, through layoffs, furloughs, court closures, and/or other measures, a projected negative \$628,000 (General Fund) fund balance by the end of the fiscal year. The court

indicates that this option would give the court no alternative but to continue not to process small claims cases. Additionally the court would have to take additional measures, including laying off employees, which the court indicates will have a direct impact on all case types. Table C below demonstrates the court’s estimated ending fund balance, and the estimated ending fund balance with the additional funding if the allocations (unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve and the FY 2012–2013 trial court benefits) are approved by the Judicial Council at its February 26, 2013 meeting.

Table C: Projected Fund Condition Statement for the San Joaquin County Court for Option 1 (Deny Funding)

	FY 2012–2013	FY 2013–2014	FY 2014–2015
Beginning Fund Balance	1,323,188	(628,049)	(4,510,917)
Trial Court Revenue Sources	26,142,133	24,643,740	24,643,740
Trial Court Reimbursements	4,571,769	4,571,769	4,571,769
Prior Year Revenue	25,013		
Total Financing Sources	32,062,103	28,587,460	24,704,592
Personal Services	25,423,670	25,677,727	25,677,727
Operating Expenses and Equipment	6,680,092	6,833,518	6,833,518
Special Items of Expense	393,528	393,528	393,528
Prior Year Expense Adjustments	(741)	-	-
Total Expenses	32,496,549	32,904,773	32,904,773
Court Projected Ending Fund Balance*	(434,446)	(4,317,313)	(8,200,181)
Restricted Funds	(193,603)	(193,603)	(193,603)
Court Projected Shortfall	(628,049)	(4,510,917)	(8,393,784)
Estimated Allocation from Unexpended 2% State Level Reserve	419,266	419,266	419,266
Estimated Allocation for 2012-2013 Benefits Funds	571,000	571,000	571,000
Projected Ending Fund Balance (Option 1)	362,217	(3,520,651)	(7,403,518)

*The court estimates a net negative fund balance of \$433,000 for all funds as of December 31, 2012, however this includes \$194,000 which is statutorily restricted and unavailable for use in offsetting the court’s operational shortfall..

Option 2: Partially fund the court’s request. Allocate partial funding of the court’s request as a one-time supplemental funding distribution if the total received by the court in Option 1—the unexpended 2 percent state-level reserve and trial court benefit allocation—is less than the \$628,000 budget shortfall the court is estimating in the current fiscal year.

Option 2 assumes the court would not receive the appropriate level of funding from the unexpended 2 percent funds and the FY 2012–2013 trial court benefits allocations mentioned in Option 1, which would then not fully eliminate the \$628,000 budget shortfall the court is estimating in the current fiscal year. With this option, the court could receive the difference in a supplemental funding distribution in order to avoid layoffs, furloughs, court closures, and/or other measures, to eliminate a projected negative \$628,000 (General Fund) fund balance by the end of the fiscal year.

Option 3: Grant the court’s request. Allocate a one-time supplemental funding distribution of \$628,000, the amount that the San Joaquin County court is requesting.

Option 3 provides for the allocation of up to \$628,000 from the 2 percent state-level reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund to the San Joaquin County court. This option would allow the court to avoid further layoffs, additional furloughs, court closures, and/or other measures, over the next four months, in order to mitigate a projected negative \$628,000 fund balance by the end of the fiscal year. However, this option may fund the San Joaquin County court in excess of the projected budget shortfall of \$628,000 in FY 2012–2013 if the court were to receive the pending allocations described in Option 1. Table D below demonstrates that the court with this option would still need to implement major cost-savings measures in the subsequent fiscal years 2013–2014 and 2014–2015.

Table D: Projected Fund Condition Statement for the San Joaquin County Court for Option 3
(Allocate Court’s Requested Amount of \$628,000)

	FY 2012–2013	FY 2013–2014	FY 2014–2015
Beginning Fund Balance	1,323,188	(628,049)	(4,510,916)
Trial Court Revenue Sources	26,142,133	24,643,740	24,643,740
Trial Court Reimbursements	4,571,769	4,571,769	4,571,769
Prior Year Revenue	25,013		
Total Financing Sources	32,062,103	28,587,460	24,704,593
Personal Services	25,423,670	25,677,727	25,677,727
Operating Expenses and Equipment	6,680,092	6,833,518	6,833,518
Special Items of Expense	393,528	393,528	393,528
Prior Year Expense Adjustments	(741)	-	-
Total Expenses	32,496,549	32,904,773	32,904,773
Court Projected Ending Fund Balance*	(434,446)	(4,317,313)	(8,200,180)
Restricted Funds	(193,603)	(193,603)	(193,603)
Court Projected Shortfall	(628,049)	(4,510,916)	(8,393,783)
Allocation from 2% State Level Reserve	628,049		
Projected Ending Fund Balance (Option 3)	-	(4,510,916)	(8,393,783)

*The court estimates a net negative fund balance of \$433,000 for all funds as of December 31, 2012, however this includes \$194,000 which is statutorily restricted and unavailable for use in offsetting the court’s operational shortfall..

Recommendation 3

The AOC suggests that the Judicial Council consider making any allocation of funding contingent upon one or more of the following terms and conditions (or on other terms as the council determines):

- a) Any court that receives supplemental funding must submit a written report on the use of the funding it received and on its fiscal situation as of June 30, 2013, to the Judicial Council by no later than August 1, 2013.

- b) In addition to any amount the council distributes at this time, it may allocate more funding to the same court after October 31 and before March 15 of the fiscal year for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs.
- c) The supplemental funding for urgent needs received by the court must be used for the purposes addressed in the application, including keeping open a sufficient number of courtrooms and providing other necessary services during FY 2012–2013 to meet the court’s obligation to adjudicate all matters, both civil and criminal, that come before the court.
- d) The Judicial Council may allocate any or all funding to the court in the form of a loan.

Rationale for Recommendation 3

Previous trial court supplemental funding requests approved by the Judicial Council have stipulated certain terms and conditions for receiving a loan or a one-time distribution for budget shortfalls, unforeseen emergencies, or unanticipated expenses for existing programs. These terms and conditions allow the court to know the Judicial Council’s expectations for the funds received.

Recommendation 4: Allocating Unexpended 2 Percent Reserve Funds

The AOC suggests that the Judicial Council allocate a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve to be distributed after March 15 to all trial courts.

Rationale for Recommendation 4

Approve allocations to all courts to be distributed after March 15, 2013, of a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve, as required by Judicial Council policy and by statute (Gov. Code, § 68502.5). The process for supplemental funding that was approved by the Judicial Council at its August 31, 2012, meeting states that:

Beginning in 2012–2013, after October 31 and by March 15 of each fiscal year, the Judicial Council shall allocate to all courts after March 15 a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve, regardless of whether the Judicial Council has allocated to a court supplemental funding for an urgent need in the current fiscal year, using courts’ current year Trial Court Trust Fund and General Fund base allocation.

Therefore, the council is required to allocate any remaining funding to all the trial courts as stated in its policy. The actual amount to be allocated among the courts will be based on the council’s decisions with regard to the options presented in this report.

Comments From Interested Parties

As required by the Judicial Council-adopted process for supplemental funding for unavoidable funding shortfalls, the Kings County and San Joaquin County courts were provided a preliminary version of the report for review and comment. The San Joaquin County court provided the following comment:

Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin

The Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin requests that the Judicial Council consider the following additional information in regards to its request:

The court recognizes that there may be budget actions and allocations made during the same meeting for which this supplemental funding request will also be considered by the Judicial Council. However, until the Council has taken action on those potential revenues and because there are statutory deadlines the court needed to comply with, the court believed it was necessary to go forward with its supplemental funding application at this time.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

The costs and operational impacts of granting or not granting the two courts' requests are discussed above in the appropriate section for each of the courts.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Judicial Council–Approved Process for Supplemental Funding
2. Attachments B-1 and B-2: Superior Court of California, County of Kings, Application for Supplemental Funding and other documents provided by the court
3. Attachments C-1 and C-2: Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin, Application for Supplemental Funding and other documents provided by the court

Judicial Council-Approved Process for Supplemental Funding

Below is the process for supplemental funding that was approved by the Judicial Council at its August 31, 2012, meeting.

- a. Supplemental funding for urgent needs is defined as unavoidable funding shortfalls, unforeseen emergencies, or unanticipated expenses for existing programs.
 - i. A request can be for either a loan or one-time funding that is not repaid, but not for ongoing funding.
- b. The submission, review, and approval process is:
 - i. All requests will be submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration;
 - ii. Requests will be submitted to the Administrative Director of the Courts by either the court's presiding judge or court executive officer;
 - iii. The Administrative Director of the Courts will forward the request to the AOC Director of Finance [now Fiscal Services Office].
 - iv. AOC Finance Division [Fiscal Services Office] budget staff will review the request, ask the court to provide any missing or incomplete information, draft a preliminary report, share the preliminary report with the court for its comments, revise as necessary, and issue a final report for the council;
 - v. The final report will be provided to the requesting court prior to the report being made publicly available on the California Courts website; and
 - vi. The court may send a representative to the Judicial Council meeting to present its request and respond to questions from the council.
- c. Beginning in 2012–2013, court requests for supplemental funding for urgent needs due to unavoidable budget shortfalls, must be submitted to the Administrative Director of the Courts, by no later than October 1. Courts are encouraged to submit supplemental funding requests for urgent needs before the October 1 deadline, but no earlier than 60 days after the Budget Act is enacted into law.
- d. Beginning in 2012–2013, the Judicial Council shall allocate up to 75 percent of the 2 percent state-level reserve fund by October 31 of each year to courts requesting supplemental funding for urgent needs due to unavoidable funding shortfalls.
- e. Beginning in 2012–2013, after October 31 and by March 15 of each fiscal year, the Judicial Council shall allocate the remaining funds if there has been an approved request from a trial court(s) requesting supplemental funding for urgent needs due to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.

- f. To be considered at a scheduled Judicial Council business meeting, requests submitted after October 31 for supplemental funding due to unforeseen emergencies and unanticipated expenses must be submitted to the Administrative Director of the Courts at least 25 business days prior to that business meeting.
- g. The Judicial Council would consider appropriate terms and conditions that courts must accept in order to receive supplemental funding for urgent needs.

Judicial Council-Approved Criteria for Eligibility for and Allocation of Supplemental Funding

Below are the criteria for eligibility for and allocation of supplemental funding for trial courts' urgent needs that were approved by the Judicial Council at its August 31, 2012, meeting.

- a. Only trial courts that are projecting a current-year negative fund balance can apply for supplemental funding related to urgent needs.
- b. Generally, no court may receive supplemental funding for urgent needs in successive fiscal years absent a clear and convincing showing.
- c. Courts submitting on or before October 1 can only receive up to the amount the court contributed to the 2 percent state-level reserve fund. If the requested amount is beyond the court's contribution to the 2 percent state-level reserve fund, the Judicial Council may distribute more funding to the court, after October 31 and prior to March 15 of the fiscal year.

More specifically, courts that submit by October 1 a request for an unavoidable funding shortfall, may apply with updated financial information for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses for existing programs distribution at a future Judicial Council business meeting prior to March 15.

- d. Allocate to all courts after March 15 a proportionate share of any unexpended funds from the 2 percent state-level reserve, regardless of whether the Judicial Council has allocated to a court supplemental funding for an urgent need in the current fiscal year, using courts' current year Trial Court Trust Fund and General Fund base allocation.
- e. If a court that is allocated supplemental funding determines during the fiscal year that some or all of the allocation is no longer needed due to changes in revenues and/or expenditures, [it] is required to return the amount that is not needed.

Judicial Council-Approved Information Required to be Provided by Trial Courts for Supplemental Funding

Below is the information required to be provided by trial courts for supplemental funding for urgent needs that were approved by the Judicial Council at its August 31, 2012, meeting.

- a. A description of what factors caused or are causing the need for funding;
- b. If requesting a one-time distribution, an explanation of why a loan would not be appropriate;
- c. Current status of court fund balance;
- d. Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures;
- e. Current detailed budget projections for the current fiscal year (e.g., FY 2012–2013), budget year (e.g., FY 2013–2014), and budget year plus 1 (e.g., FY 2014–2015);
- f. Measures the court has taken in the last three years regarding revenue enhancement and/or expenditure reduction, including layoffs, furloughs, reduced hours, and court closures;
- g. Employee compensation practices (e.g., cost-of-living adjustments) and staffing levels in the past five years;
- h. Description of the consequences to the court's operations if the court does not receive funding;
- i. Description of the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court does not receive funding;
- j. What measures the court will take to mitigate the consequences to court operations, the public, and access to justice if funding is not approved;
- k. Five years of filing and termination numbers;
- l. Most recent audit history and remediation measures;
- m. If supplemental funding was received in prior year, please identify amount received and explain why additional funding is again needed in the current fiscal year; and

- n. If the request for supplemental funding is not for a one-time concern, the court must include an expenditure/revenue enhancement plan that identifies how the court will resolve its ongoing funding issue.



Superior Court of the State of California
County of Kings

Chambers of Presiding Judge Thomas DeSantos

January 18, 2013

Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council
350 McAllister St.
San Francisco, CA. 94102

Dear Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye,

Enclosed, please find our updated application for supplemental funding for a new CMS, submitted for consideration by the California Judicial Council during its scheduled February 25-26, 2013 meeting. This funding request revises our December 20, 2012 draft, subsequent to the feedback we received from Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff.

If you have any questions, please contact Chief Deputy Court Executive Officer Jeff Lewis at 559-582-1010, ext. 5001, jlewis@kings.courts.ca.gov; Presiding Judge Thomas DeSantos at 559-582-1010, ext. 4010, tdesantos@kings.courts.ca.gov; Assistant Presiding Judge Steve Barnes at 559-582-1010, ext. 4020, sbarnes@kings.courts.ca.gov; or our immediate past Presiding Judge James LaPorte at 559-582-1010, ext. 4040, jlaporte@kings.courts.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Thomas DeSantos
Presiding Judge

Avenal Division
501 E. Kings Street
Avenal, CA 93204
(559)582-1010, ext. 4094

Corcoran Division
1000 Chiltenden Ave.
Corcoran, CA 93212
(559)582-1010, ext. 3003

Hanford Division
1426 South Drive
Hanford, CA 93230
(559)582-1010, ext.5002

APPLICATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FORM

Please check the type of funding that is being requested:

- CASH ADVANCE** (Complete Section I only.)
- URGENT NEEDS** (Complete Sections I through IV.)
- ONE-TIME DISTRIBUTION**
- LOAN**

**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION****SUPERIOR COURT:**

Kings County

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

Honorable Thomas DeSantos, Presiding Judge 2013-2014
 Honorable Steven Barnes, Assistant Presiding Judge 2013-2014
 Honorable James LaPorte, Presiding Judge 2011-2012
 Jeffrey Lewis, Chief Deputy Court Executive Officer

CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:**DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

JANUARY 18, 2013

DATE FUNDING IS NEEDED BY:

March 1, 2013

REQUESTED AMOUNT:

\$2.11M

REASON FOR REQUEST

(Please briefly summarize the reason for this funding request, including the factors that contributed to the need for funding. If your court is applying for a cash advance, please submit a cash flow statement when submitting this application. Please use attachments if additional space is needed.)

ISSUE

Kings County Superior Court, pursuant to California Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2) and due to unplanned expenditures, is requesting one-time urgent funding for a successor Case Management System (CMS). Such an acquisition, pragmatically projected to cost at least \$2.11 million dollars [See Exhibit 1], will replace the Court's three (3) current legacy CMS [for Criminal, Traffic and A/R processing, all programmed in Common Business Oriented Language ("COBOL"), a 1959-developed technology and hosted on the County mainframe], as well as the Court's internally hosted, server-based Civil CMS product.

CURRENT OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS

The Kings Superior Court utilizes its three (3) antiquated mainframe legacy systems ("CORTS", "CIMS" and "TCAMS") to process Felony, Misdemeanor, Traffic, Juvenile Delinquency cases and all Accounts Receivable [A/R] other than those administered by our Civil CMS solution.

The Court uses the ACS "Contexte" CMS to process its general Civil, Probate, Limited Civil, Unlawful Detainers and Small Claims, Family Law, Family Support and Juvenile Dependency cases.

We are presently paying the County approximately \$250,000 per year (which is subject to semi-annual increases) for mainframe processing and ACS (now a Xerox company) invoices the Court \$63,000 per year in licensing and technical currency fees through 2014.

BACKGROUND

For more than 10 years, Kings Superior Court has worked with AOC leadership and staff in a resolute attempt to migrate its three (3) legacy COBOL-programmed CMS off the County mainframe to achieve much-needed operational efficiencies and fiscal savings.

The Court positioned itself--as early as 2000--to transition its varied Civil and Juvenile Dependency case types from an aging, County-hosted, mainframe-based CMS to a Court-sited, server-based CMS solution from SCT [subsequently acquired by ACS]. The Court additionally invested in obtaining licenses from ACS for their Criminal and Traffic modules in hopes of completing the full migration of all case types from the County mainframe.

In early 2002, Kings Superior Court approached the AOC about funding for modifications to the then-current ACS CMS to bring it into California statutory compliance. Although such a subsidy would have allowed the Court to finalize its transition from a mainframe environment to a server-based solution for our Criminal, Traffic and Accounts Receivable applications, Kings was directed to await the results of the AOC's CMS Certification Committee's evaluation of CMS vendors seeking to do business with courts in our state.

Following ACS's certification by the AOC in FY2002-03, the Court again sought funding to offset the cost of procuring the California-compliant version of ACS Criminal, Traffic and Juvenile modules. On that occasion, the AOC's Administrative Director [Mr. William Vickrey] advised the Court's CEO to await development/deployment of the California Case Management System [CCMS] and Kings did so.

In 2007, due to growing concerns regarding continued use of the Court's mainframe-based Criminal, Traffic and Accounts Receivable (A/R) COBOL-language applications, including increasing costs, PC terminal emulation problems causing daily losses in connectivity, and the prospective retirement of the County's sole COBOL programmer, the Court again approached the AOC about being considered for V2 implementation while CCMS V4 was being developed. The AOC Information Services staff conducted a December 2007, high-level review of the stability of Kings multiple mainframe-sited CMS but concluded that, because the AOC had made the business decision not to implement V2 in any Court other than Fresno, the Court should remain on the mainframe for its Criminal, Traffic and A/R case processing until V4 was ready for roll-out.

More recently, as a result of Kings Superior Court correspondence and communication with AOC leadership regarding the questionable stability of Kings CMS and the growing uncertainty regarding the viability of CCMS V4, the AOC conducted additional high-level reviews of Kings mainframe-based CMS in September and November of 2011. These assessments determined Kings was in need of a new CMS, but supplemental funding was neither identified nor provided to Kings to offset (or reduce) projected acquisition nor deployment costs of a replacement CMS.

In December 2011, Kings Court received written notice from Kings County of its intention to terminate all mainframe operations in 2014 and, in following discussions, indicated our Court had three alternatives:

- A. Migrate its dated COBOL-language, CMS from the County's resident hardware to a Court-sited mainframe, or
- B. Assume responsibility and full cost (projected to be in excess of \$500,000 annually) for maintenance, operation and programming of the County's mainframe, located in the County's IT building, or
- C. Procure and roll-out a new server-based or web browser-based CMS not later than late 2014.

These three options, identified above, were analyzed for viability, as follows:

Option A (Migrate to Court-sited Mainframe):

Kings Superior Court would have to create its own data processing room, estimated to cost in excess of \$800,000 and establish its own DMV connectivity. We would not migrate our outdated COBOL CMS applications off the County mainframe without converting to a more modern system - and Kings has no funds for this project. The Court's Information Technology [IT] Division has been reduced to two (2) employees from three (3) because of lay-offs and it is not deemed effective to employ our staff members to convert these CMS records in any other language format unless we have a new program to install them in; moreover, maintaining a COBOL environment is financially impractical because of the cost to hire a COBOL programmer and operationally illogical because the COBOL Mainframe CMS is unstable (leading to several "crashes" per day), is antiquated, and lacks the automation and efficiencies sought by this Court.

Option B (Assume full cost for operating and running County mainframe):

This option would be costly both to the Court and the AOC. If the Court remained on the present County Mainframe, there would be a charge in excess of \$500,000 per year for maintenance, *not* including COBOL software support. The Court would be forced to contract with a COBOL Programmer [or two] at an additional cost at the prevailing COBOL Programmer rate of \$150/hour. County I.T. has discouraged continued operation of its main frame for this primary reason.

Option C (New server-based system):

The Court concluded that the procurement and roll-out a new web-based CMS via the RFP process [assisted in its development by experienced AOC staff] would be the most judicious option to put into action because it would represent an economical, long-term solution rather than a costly, short-term one. The Court would expect to realize savings from not having to hire additional staff and should minimize expenditures associated with the purchase of additional or upgraded servers if the application is hosted remotely.

The County notified the Court that mainframe operations would be terminated sometime in 2014. Thereafter *and of critical significance*, the County advised the Court that, effective January 2012, it would no longer maintain a COBOL programmer on its IT staff, which has had a direct impact on current Court operations, not the least being required programmatic system modifications to ensure compliance with new mandates regarding the collection and proper distribution of fees and fines.

For the time being, the County has agreed to contract (on an as-needed, as-available basis) with the recently retired County programmer for very limited services. However, relying on this extra help contractor (rather than a full-time County COBOL programmer employee, as in years past) has placed the Court in the untenable position of being unable to make--with any degree of confidence--operational changes requested by our justice partners, conform to legislative and statutory changes, or produce statistical and ad hoc reports in a timely manner.¹

Following its December 2011 pronouncement, the County later informed us that they will continue to host our CMS applications on the County mainframe [as the sole resident] at an estimated cost of \$550,000 annually (a \$300,000 increase over current annual charges, which increase semi-annually) but with no additional software support. The Court has contacted a number of independent COBOL programmers to determine if it would be feasible to contract with one of them for requisite software support. The Court has been quoted rates starting at \$150 an hour for such services and, therefore, considers this a nonviable option, inasmuch as part-time contractor would cost \$156,000 annually for 1040 hours. Of interest, County Information Technology has informally commented to the Court that they want to "get out of the mainframe business altogether."

During the California Judicial Council (CJC) meeting of March 27, 2012, to address a number of California Case Management System [CCMS] issues, it was declared that the Superior Courts in San Luis Obispo (SLO) and Kings County were each in need of a new CMS.

Subsequently, at the CJC's June 22, 2012 business meeting, SLO was approved to receive an FY 2012 – 2013 TCTF Program 45.10 allocation of up to \$3.36 million dollars (in one-time funding) to address the costs of replacing its failing CMS - and shortly thereafter received invaluable AOC assistance in developing its CMS Request for Proposal (RFP).

NOTE: To date, the only supplemental funding Kings has received was restoration of our 2% reserve [\$94,000] granted by the CJC Judicial Council to Kings in October 2012 – and the AOC's much-welcomed budget change proposal to receive additional state funding in FY13-14 for a Kings replacement CMS was informally, but unambiguously, rejected by California's Department of Finance.

CURRENT SITUATION and RFP DECISION ANALYSIS:

Needing to move forward due to the aforementioned compressed timetable to complete deployment of a successor CMS, the lack of alternative funding sources (other than the Supplemental Funding Request process), and wanting to avoid a delayed replacement CMS roll-out because other California courts would be issuing RFPs for follow-on CMS applications, Kings Superior Court utilized the services of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), including the Office of General Council (OGC), to assist in developing and issuing an RFP in July 2012 for a new CMS, as this was determined to be Kings most pragmatic alternative course of action, given the County's announced and impending decisions.

Based on the requirements set forth in our RFP [Refer to Exhibit 2], the CMS benefits we would realize include:

- ✓ A state-of-the-art system encompassing all case types, compliant with statutory, functional and business requisites.
- ✓ Scalability and appropriate security to accommodate our Court's data volumes and its internal users, as well as satisfy the needs of public web users.
- ✓ E-filing capability with a web-based portal to accommodate the general public.
- ✓ Document Management System [DMS] capability and compatibility.
- ✓ State and local data exchange capability [particularly with our immediate justice partners].
- ✓ Vendor-administered software modifications to comply with Federal and State statutory and CJC Rules of Court changes, as well as responding to formal and ad hoc judicial branch reporting requirements.

The Court received three (3) proposals in response to its RFP, conducted vendor demonstrations in late September, performed the pre-pricing evaluation and reviewed the sealed cost proposals the first week in October 2012, and immediately thereafter finalized the ranking of each of the proposals [See Exhibit 3].

Rather than relying solely on the scoring results of the vendors that responded to Kings RFP, the Court performed a detailed analysis of the business pros and cons of each of the RFP responders, as well as our mainframe and server-based legacy systems, the recommended alternatives offered by the AOC's 2011 high-level reviews of Kings multiple legacy CMS [discussed *supra*], an in-development ACS web-based CMS product, as well an informal proposal received from another county's Superior Court [Riverside] to host Kings on their CMS [an ISD Corporation product]. The key elements of

¹ As an aside, our Presiding Judge and Assistant Presiding Judge recently attended a mandatory budget reduction meeting regarding a new courthouse; they were directed to provide specific numbers regarding prisoners serviced through our Courts. Our computer system cannot provide end-user reports. After refusal by the County's contracted extra-help COBOL programmer, our staff produced these reports by hand count of paper calendars from the last two years.

consideration were financials [one-time court costs for implementation, yearly licensing and maintenance costs, willingness to structure payments over time, hardware acquisition costs], prior experience in California, technical requirements [hosted solution options, disaster recovery, redundancy and back-up choices, ability to establish new DMV connectivity for the Court which is recognized as the project's critical path], and business and functional requirements [integrated DMS option, fully developed e-filing functionality, credit card payment alternatives, in-court processing capability and--of paramount importance—the commitment to complete implementation within 13 months].

The results of this analysis, summarized in Exhibit 4, determined that Tyler Technologies *Odyssey* CMS was clearly the preferred solution, based on the following pivotal factors:

- Tyler Technologies "*Odyssey*":
 - ✓ Tyler can fully deploy *Odyssey* CMS within 13-18 months due, in part, to a team of 100+ *Odyssey* software experts solely dedicated to client implementations, which allows for multiple simultaneous roll-outs.
 - ✓ Tyler 5-year cost projection (of \$2.11 million) is lowest of all candidate solutions.
 - ✓ Tyler offers a Kings-friendly, 5-year structured payment plan; however, actual terms and conditions cannot be determined until contract negotiations are permitted subsequent to issuance of intent to award.
 - ✓ Tyler offers the requisite hosted solution, affording cost savings from both a hardware acquisition standpoint and additional staffing perspective.
 - ✓ *Odyssey* case management software has an integrated e-filing system as well as document management, providing Court with a complete, long-term, end-to-end solution.
 - ✓ *Odyssey* CMS enhancements are performed yearly to meet statutory requirements and are included in annual maintenance support costs.
 - ✓ While Tyler has not deployed a CMS in California to date, San Luis Obispo Superior Court - via the RFP process - has already contracted with Tyler for its replacement CMS.

As for the other RFP and non-RFP alternative solutions considered, "cons" outweighed "pros" in each instance and the major downsides are cited here, as follows:

- Sustain "*eCourt*":
 - (-) Unable to begin Kings 24-month implementation until April-June 2013 due insufficient deployment resources; misses Court's "not later than" target completion date of July 2014 by nearly a year.
 - (-) Browser-based solution not yet implemented in California.
 - (-) Additional infrastructure [servers] needed; will require additional support staff.
 - (-) Proposed solution utilizes 3rd party vendor for DMS.
 - (-) Projected costs did not include Program Manager.
 - (-) Proposal does not provide a "hosted" solution.
- CourtView "*JWorks*":
 - (-) Proposed 24-month deployment; misses Court's "not later than" target completion date of July 2014.
 - (-) Additional infrastructure [servers] needed; will require additional support and technical staff.
 - (-) Requires equivalent of hiring 4.35 FTEs for 2-year duration for data conversion and program integration.
 - (-) Never implemented in California.
 - (-) Proposal does not provide a "hosted" solution.
- County Mainframe [COBOL CMS for Traffic, Criminal & A/R]:
 - (-) Prohibitively expensive over 5-year projection...close to \$600,000 annually.
 - (-) Court does not have infrastructure, space or staffing to take the current mainframe system in-house.
 - (-) County no longer provides in-house COBOL programming support for legacy CMS.
 - (-) Antiquated legacy CMS does not offer credit card payment processing, DMS capabilities, or e-filing.
 - (-) CMS does not permit end-user ad hoc report generation.
- ACS "*Contexte*":
 - (-) Vendor did not respond to RFP.
 - (-) Fast-paced Criminal and Traffic courtroom environment will require additional clerk in five courtrooms.
 - (-) Additional infrastructure [servers] needed; will require additional support and technical staff.
 - (-) Lacks efficient in-court processing; labor-intensive for all in-court and out-of-court transactions.
 - (-) Does not offer DMS or e-filing capabilities.
 - (-) Does not offer credit card processing.
 - (-) Vendor does not intend to continue with development of Criminal and Traffic modules.

- ACS "Agile":
 - (-) Vendor did not respond to RFP despite Court's request to participate.
 - (-) Additional infrastructure [servers] needed; will require additional support and technical staff.
 - (-) Implementation in California unknown as web-based CMS still in final development.
 - (-) Vendor does not provide a "hosted" solution.
 - (-) Solution does not yet integrate Criminal/Traffic component with DMV.
- ISD [Riverside]
 - (-) Vendor [ISD] did not respond to RFP despite Court's request to participate.
 - (-) Represents mid-term solution 5 years or less. Riverside is currently seeking replacement CMS
 - (-) CMS solution utilizes 3rd party vendor for DMS which the Court would also have to go out for RFP and contract separately with.
 - (-) Total implementation costs unverified due to lack of written proposal from ISD but estimated based on costs provided by Riverside which are projected to be \$2.6 million over a 5-year span.

Because of the severe Trial Court Trust Fund reductions allocated to this court for FY2012-13 (and the two Fiscal Years prior), and notwithstanding the imposition of 27 mandatory furlough days, staff layoffs, reduced lobby/counter hours and a courthouse closure since FY 2012-13 began on July 1, 2012), the Court will be compelled to expend its remaining reserves to meet its current fiscal year operational expense. Moreover, Kings is predicting further layoffs in anticipation of otherwise being in a negative cash flow status early in FY 2013-14. Unless its Supplemental Funding Request is granted [see charts *infra*]. Kings Superior Court, was [and still is] unable to announce an award determination.

BUSINESS CASE:

Kings Superior Court's multiple legacy CMS, mainframe and server-based, are expected to cost the Court approximately \$313,000 this fiscal year. However, this expense line in our annual budget is ever increasing, and will be unsustainable in the near-future when no County entity resides on the County's mainframe and its operations are no longer supported by any County IT staff. While the Court has severely reduced its programming expenditures, management reports and data entry costs whenever possible, the savings in no way offset higher billing rates imposed by the County.

Accordingly, Kings Superior Court seeks to lower our escalating operational costs, as well as replace four (4) labor intensive, technologically outmoded CMS (characterized by slow processing speeds, difficulty navigating numerous non-friendly user screens, and an unanticipated, County-induced, inability to comply timely with statewide code changes and new laws) with a single, successor CMS solution.

By supplanting these current legacy systems with a modern, scalable, California compliant, and more efficient CMS, the Court will realize the specific benefits provided by a system that can handle all case types, provide for document management and imaging, will integrate with its justice partners, may allow for credit card payments [with its enhanced revenue component], can offer e-filing, public portals and expanded web services, will afford better fiscal accountability, may permit reduced staffing levels [in view of streamlined case processing and new business practices], and will deliver full redundancy and disaster recovery services, at a considerably lower annual cost than the extant case management configurations.

The lowest 5-year cost for such a new case management system is Tyler Technologies Odyssey, approximately \$2.11 million, as derived from formal bids submitted by various vendors responding to the Court's July 2012 RFP (which did include a Fit Analysis, hardware and software cost, training, and implementation expensing), as well as later-determined costs not specified in each vendor's response to the RFP. The Court also performed cost-benefit analyses on several non-RFP options, including the Riverside ISD solution, continuing our mainframe-sited COBOL CMS operations, and migrating our Criminal and Traffic case types from the County mainframe to the Court's legacy server-based CMS [ACS *Contexte*] Each of these other possible choices was determined to be more expensive than the long-term solution presented by "Odyssey."

BUSINESS PLAN:

Due to the detrimental combination of unavoidable funding shortfalls exacted on the Trial Courts, the unexpected decision by the County of Kings to no longer operationally support our mainframe-hosted Case Management System [CMS] with a COBOL programmer [as of July 1, 2012] – as well as the County's notice to the Court that, as early as January 2015, the Court would incur the full cost of operating and maintaining the mainframe when the last County entity transitions to a server-based solution - *and* the projection that, without extensive layoffs, the Kings Superior Court would, in fact, be in a deficit situation early in FY 2013-14, Kings respectfully seeks supplemental funding in this fiscal year to enable our procurement of a replacement CMS. ***We cannot contract with any vendor unless we have funds to do so.***

With adequate funding - hopefully determined through the CJC's *Supplemental Funding Request* process - we hope to enter into a contract with our preferred vendor during the first quarter of calendar year (CY) 2013, begin implementation of a new CMS in the second quarter of CY 2013, with a projected conclusion of the deployment and a "go live" date no later than the third quarter of CY 2014. Such a timetable, if executed on schedule, will significantly reduce our exposure to the exorbitant costs associated with being the sole resident on the County's mainframe, as early as January 2015.

Section II through Section IV of this form is required to be completed if your court is applying for supplemental funding for urgent needs (unavoidable funding shortfall, unforeseen emergency or unanticipated expenses for existing programs). Please submit attachments to respond to Sections II through Section IV.

SECTION II: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

A. What would be the consequence to the public and access to justice if your court did not receive the requested funding?

Anticipating a prospective decision by the Court to take further extraordinary FY13-14 cost-savings measures by terminating its reliance on our mainframe-based legacy CMS, *all* facets of court operations, from calendaring, to in-court minute orders, to disposition, to fee and fine collection, will be impacted as documentation regarding filings, court proceedings and payments will have to be done manually. The Court will lose all data exchange capability with the AOC, its justice partners, as well as its primary means of electronic connectivity with the bar and the public. In essence, all aspects of technological contact with this Court will come to a virtual standstill, severely impeding access to justice for all participants.

B. What would be the consequence to your court's operations if your court did not receive the requested funding?

Without supplemental funding for a new CMS, the Court may elect to continue relying on our legacy CMS as a hosted-user on the County mainframe in 2014; however, Kings will have insufficient monetary resources for requisite programmatic changes to continue effective collection and timely distribution of existing fees and fines - and will not be able to comply with subsequent legislative and statutory changes.

Alternatively, due to the significantly increased costs charged by the County to Kings (as its only mainframe resident by year's-end of 2014) and non-County support for the Court's current CMS, the Court may well return to its 1970's-era paper and spreadsheet processing and record-keeping practices. The resultant consequences of such action would be a Court staff relegated to manual fee and fine calculations, manual calendaring, manual in-court minute order generation, manual tracking of case management information, as well as manual financial bookkeeping for accounts receivable and mandated distributions to the State, Kings County (and its four (4) municipalities, as appropriate).

Clearly, operating without any CMS [whether it be old or new technology], will create an undue hardship for the judiciary and staff, will cause considerable delays in the Clerk's office, with calendaring, courtroom processing, disposition, payment, reporting, and distribution of fees and fines, and - as previously stated - will have a direct and deleterious impact on our citizenry, the bar and our State and local justice partners.

C. What measures will your court take to mitigate the consequences to access to justice and court operations if funding is not approved by the Judicial Council?

Based upon dismal fiscal projections for the remainder of FY 2012-13 and all of FY 2013-14, the Court is prepared to layoff as few as five and as many as eleven additional employees (a 5.7% to 12.6% reduction in workforce) between February 2013 and June 30, 2014. Additionally, the Court will most likely need to extend the imposition of 27 furlough days on all Court employees through all of FY 2013-14, continue to reduce counter hours at all Court locations and consider an increase in the number of CEO-ACEO job-sharing days. The final consideration will be the closure of our two remaining remote Court locations - *Corcoran* (which processes and conducts a considerable number of prison arraignments and preliminary hearings from 3 prison institutions, housing a total inmate population of approximately 20,000) and *Avenal*.

[Note: The Court has agreed with the County to keep the Avenal court facility open for Court proceedings one day every other week through FY 2012-13. In exchange, the County has reimbursed the Court \$60,000 to pay for 1.5 FTE traffic collection clerks.]

The impact of such measures will result in significant business interruptions to case processing, calendaring and dispositions. This will negatively affect the local Judiciary, the Appellate Court, local Bar and general public. More specifically, the consequences impacting access to justice and Court operations delineated at II.A. and II. B. *supra* are in no way resolved.

In summary, the cost reductions addressed herein will, collectively, yield a balanced budget for FY 2012–13, and these same drastic actions (as descriptively shown in the table below), saving between \$580,000 and \$875,000, should result in avoiding a projected FY 2013-14 budget deficit. Obviously, this marginally positive fund balance will preclude Kings Superior Court from independently accruing the funds it urgently needs to procure a replacement case management system and will force us to remain on an unstable, unsupported and increasingly costly CMS hosted by the County.

Proposed Savings Fiscal Year 2013 – 2014

Description of Personnel Actions	Potential Savings [without layoffs]	Potential Savings [with six (6) layoffs]
Salary and Benefit savings with 27 furlough days for all Staff [Without additional layoffs]	\$508,755.86	---
Salary and Benefit savings with 27 furlough days for all Staff [With six layoffs]	---	\$473,853.32
Salary and Benefit savings with 40 job-share days for C.E.O. and Chief Deputy C.E.O.	\$ 48,209.79	\$ 48,209.79
Salary and Benefit savings with layoffs of 2 Managers and 4 Court Services Clerks	---	\$329,819.93
Salary and Benefits savings with decreasing 1 Full Time Court Services Clerk to Part Time	\$ 24,725.45	\$ 24,725.45
Total Proposed Savings	\$581,691.10	\$876,608.49

D. Please provide five years of filing and termination numbers.

FISCAL YEAR	TOTAL FILINGS	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS
07-08	37,379	32,598
08-09	43,312	40,100
09-10	39,396	36,320
10-11*	40,924	38,594
11-12*	37,841	36,395

*Fiscal Years 10/11 and 11/12 data have not been certified.

SECTION III: REVENUE ENHANCEMENT AND COST CONTROL MEASURES

A. If supplemental funding was received in prior year, please identify amount received and explain why additional funding is again needed in the current fiscal year.

Kings County Superior Court has not received any supplemental funding in prior years.

B. If the request for supplemental funding is not for a one-time concern, the court must include an expenditure/revenue enhancement plan that identifies how the court will resolve its ongoing funding issue.

Although Kings Superior Court is seeking one-time supplemental funding for a replacement case management system [CMS] for its antiquated, costly, and unsupported County mainframe-based CMS, the Court chooses to offer a response to this query. As delineated in sub-Section II. C. herein, Kings has identified further measures [in addition to those already taken per sub-Section III. C.] to continue addressing its staggering structural funding issue, a branch-wide problem precipitated by harsh, unprecedented reductions in Trial Court funding – and which has resulted in Kings suffering a four-year, \$2,000,000 burn-through of its fund balance [“reserved”, in part, for our successor CMS]

C. What has your court done in the past three fiscal years in terms of revenue enhancement and/or expenditure reductions, including layoffs, furloughs, reduced hours, and court closures?

Over the past three fiscal years, Kings has employed a number of actions to increase local revenue, totaling more than \$1,900,000 (and potentially as much as \$2,120,000 by end of FY2012-13) as described below:

- ❖ In the 6-month period from January to November 2012, new and increased local fees generated \$47,000 in additional revenue (with the potential to realize as much as \$136,000 by the end of FY 12-13) per the chart herein:

Increased Fees	Old Fee	New Fee
PC 1205(d) Installment Payments	\$ 35	\$ 50
PC 1203.4(a) Fee for Petition for Dismissal of a Misdemeanor	\$ 25	\$ 60
PC 1203.4 Fee for Petition of Reduction from Felony to Misdemeanor	\$ 25	\$120
New Fees		
PC 1205(d) Accounts Receivable for Payment Extension		\$ 30
PC 1306 (b) Bail Re-assumption of Liability		\$150

- ❖ In light of past and current Trial Court funding reductions, the Court implemented mandatory furlough days for the past 2 years: 12 days in FY 2010-11 and 15 days in FY 2011-12, resulting in a savings of approximately **\$834,000** in salary and benefits.
- ❖ FY 2012-13, the Court implemented 27 mandatory furlough days for a Commissioner, management and represented staff with a projected savings of **\$493,825**.
- ❖ In lieu of 27 furlough days, both the Court Executive Officer and Chief Deputy Court Executive Officer are participating in a job share program of 40 days each, with an additional anticipated savings of approximately **\$48,000**.
- ❖ Three employees were laid off in August 2012 resulting in FY 2012-13 savings of **\$176,000**. Additionally three more positions have been identified for termination in FY 2012-13, during the 3rd and 4th quarters, with a potential savings of **\$219,000**.
- ❖ Effective September 11, 2012 the Court closed its Lemoore facility, relocating its Family Law and Traffic Staff and re-assigning its court calendars in our Hanford and Corcoran court locations. This court closure will result in an estimated annual savings of **\$90,000**.
- ❖ Over the past three fiscal years, through the reduction and/or elimination of employee benefits and by termination or rollback in vendor contracts, the Court has decreased expenditures by more than **\$205,000** and over the past five fiscal years, these measures have saved the Court in excess of **\$289,000**.

D. Please describe the employee compensation changes (e.g. cost of living adjustments and benefit employee contributions) and staffing levels for past five fiscal years for the court.

COMPENSATION CHANGES

- ❖ The Kings County Superior Court has not provided COLAs to any employees [represented, non-represented, and management staff] during the past five fiscal (5) years and none are provided for in the newly negotiated MOU through June 30, 2015.
- ❖ The Kings County Superior Court seven-year history of Negotiated Salary Increases (NSI) from FY 2007-08 through and including all of FY 2013-14, for represented, non-exempt line staff employees is as follows:

FY:	DATE	% NSI	# of FTE
2007-08	July 1, 2007	2.5%	70.5
2007-08	January 1, 2008	4.0%	70.5
2008-09	January 1, 2009	4.0%	69.5
2009-10	January 1, 2010	4.0%	64.5
2010-11	N/A	0.0%	61.5
2011-12	N/A	0.0%	59.0
2012-13	N/A	0.0%	59.0
2013-14	N/A	0.0%	UNK

Notes:

- 1) No pay increases were negotiated for January 1, 2011 through June 30, 2015.
- 2) Eligible employees continue to receive merit step increases (MSI) during the term of the current MOU (January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015). The employees have a seven (7)-step range, with a five percent (5%) differential between each step in the range. MSI are earned through satisfactory work performance annually for steps 1 - 5. Step six (6) is achieved following two consecutive years of satisfactory work performance at step 5 and step seven (7) is achieved following three consecutive years of satisfactory work performance at step 6.

- 3) In early December 2012, the Court and SEIU 521 agreed upon a new contract to replace the MOU due to expire December 30, 2012. This successor MOU provided for no COLAs, no NSIs and no increase in health care benefits for represented staff for the duration of the contract.
- ❖ During the previous five (5) years, Kings County Superior Court non-represented and management employees received pay increases (based on satisfactory work performance) in years 2008, 2009 and 2010. The table below provides the number of non-represented and management personnel that received a pay increase in a given year and the average percentage increase given:

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
# of employees receiving increases	9	14	3	0	0
Average Percent of Pay Increases	10.41%*	3.14%	3.67%**	N/A	N/A

*The Court's lone Court Reporter employee was promoted to a management position to assist in the scheduling of contracted court reporters. This promotion increased the average management increase in 2008 from 3.33% to 10.41%.

** Salary increases were approved for three management employees in 2010. A salary increase was approved to retain two Research Attorneys. The Deputy Court Administrator (DCA) II of the Courtroom Services Division was granted a 4.0% salary increase to avoid a salary compaction issue when it was determined that that division's lead Clerk earned a higher hourly wage than the DCA.

- ❖ Since FY 2007-2008 represented, non-exempt line staff paid seven percent (7%) of the CalPERS retirement employee portion. The current [FY 2012-2013] annual employee CalPERS average contribution is \$2985.80.
- ❖ The annual average health insurance cost for employees is \$7905.83. Represented, non-exempt line staff receives \$7000.00 in Flex Spending Credits for Court provided annual health benefits. The Court offers three (3) medical insurance options with four-tier coverage levels [employee only, employee + spouse, employee + children, and employee + family]. The Court provides one dental and one vision plan. The annual average net out-of-pocket employee cost for Court provided health benefits [medical, dental and vision] is \$838.03.
- ❖ The staffing levels for the Kings County Superior Court for the last five years are as follows:

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Line Staff	71	70	65	62	59
Confidential	3	3	3	3	3
Professional/Exempt*	13	13	13	12	12
Management**	11	11	11	11	11
SJO	2	2	2	2	2
Total	100	99	94	90	87

*Professional and FLSA-exempt personnel include Child Custody Recommending Counselors, Research Attorneys, Administrative, Information Technology, and Finance Staff and Supervising Court Reporter.

**As a direct result of Kings attrition rate of 17% in line staff over the past five fiscal years [due to a combination of retirements, resignations, a sustained hiring freeze, and layoffs], management staffing levels have been kept at a constant as Directors and other supervisory personnel have assumed hands-on responsibility for performing the duties of represented staff no longer employed by the Court.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following:

A. Current detailed budget projections/estimates for the current fiscal year, budget year and budget year plus one (e.g., if current fiscal year is FY 2012-2013, then budget year would be FY 2013-2014 and budget year plus one would be FY 2014-2015).

- Tables 1, 2 and 3 represent budgets that reflect procurement of a new CMS without supplemental funding.
- Table 1 below represents a budget that includes the entire purchase of a new CMS, estimated at \$2.11M, in the current fiscal year FY2012-13. [See Exhibit 1] for pricing breakdown].
- Table 2 provides an alternative budget that amortizes, equally, the cost of that same new CMS over a five (5) year period (through FY2016-17), while a second alternative budget found at Table 3 reflects the procurement of the same new CMS, with a hypothetical structured payment schedule that frontloads the one-time start-up costs of an implementation in Years 1-2 and then spreads the yearly licensing and maintenance costs over years 3-5.
- Lastly, Table 4 includes an entirely different [and unattractive] budget option which reflects the Court remaining on its legacy CMS, hosted on the County Mainframe, without any supplemental funding provision.

CMS payments are as followed:

Table 1

CMS 1 yr payment	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	-1,908,953	-2,082,542
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	5,822,243	5,648,654
Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operations	5,047,045	3,008,441	2,983,941
Expenditures	10,923,389	7,904,785	7,748,285
Ending Fund Balance	-1,908,953	-2,082,542	-2,099,631

Table 2

CMS - 5 yr [Equal payments]	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	-220,869	-816,478
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	7,510,327	6,914,718
Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operations	3,358,961	3,430,461	3,405,961
Expenditures	9,235,305	8,326,805	8,170,305
Ending Fund Balance	-220,869	-816,478	-1,255,587

Table 3

CMS - 5 yr [Structured Schedule]	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	-530,349	-1,262,758
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	7,200,847	6,468,438
Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operations	3,668,441	3,567,261	3,807,986
Expenditures	9,544,785	8,463,605	8,572,330
Ending Fund Balance	-530,349	-1,262,758	-2,103,892

Table 4

CMS - remaining with County	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	141,151	-92,438
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	7,872,347	7,638,758
Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operations	2,996,941	3,068,441	3,243,441
Expenditures	8,873,285	7,964,785	8,007,785
Ending Fund Balance	141,151	-92,438	-369,027

Notes:

1) For All Tables:

- Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15 also reflect savings realized by the elimination of six (6) management and five (5) line staff positions in FY 2013-14, two (2) additional line staff in FY 2014-15, and the continued imposition of 27 mandatory furlough days for all remaining Court employees through the end of FY 2014-15.
- In FY 2012-13, Expenditures line includes \$255,000 in County IT mainframe costs and \$29,000 in emergency COBOL programming costs.
- In FY 2013-14, Expenditures line for County IT mainframe costs increases an additional \$25,500 (to \$280,500) for mainframe routine operation and maintenance.
- In FY 2013-14, Expenditures line includes additional \$156,000 for half-time [1040 hours] COBOL programmer for Court's unsupported 1970's-era legacy CMS.

2) For Tables 1, 2 and 3:

- In FY 2014-15, Expenditures line for County IT mainframe costs increases to \$295,000 for mainframe routine operation and maintenance for 9 months [assumes Court completes transition from mainframe to hosted solution not later than March 2015].
- In FY 2014-15, Expenditures line includes additional \$117,000 for 0.4.FTE COBOL programmer [assumes Court completes transition from mainframe to hosted solution not later than March 2015].

3) For Table 4 [re: CMS – remaining with County alternative budget table];

- In FY 2014-15, Expenditures line for County IT mainframe costs increases to \$430,000 for mainframe routine operation and maintenance.
- In FY 2014-15, Expenditures line includes \$156,000 for half-time [1040 hours] COBOL programmer for Court's unsupported 1970's-era legacy CMS.

B. Current status of your court's fund balance.

The Court's fund balance beginning FY 12/13 was \$1,247,252.

C. Three-year history of your court's year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures.

KINGS SUPERIOR COURT Seven-Year Revenue vs. Expenses History						
KINGS	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	FY11-12	FY12-13 [Projected]
TCTF	\$7.97	\$7.58	\$7.18	\$7.20	\$6.15	\$5.67
Non TCTF	\$1.99	\$2.42	\$2.01	\$2.15	\$2.39	\$2.38
Total Funding	\$9.96	\$10.00	\$9.19	\$9.35	\$8.54	\$8.05
Expenses	(\$10.61)	(\$10.36)	(\$10.28)	(\$10.50)	(\$9.17)	(\$8.87)
End Balance Forward/(Deficit)	(\$0.65)	(\$0.36)	(\$1.09)	(\$1.15)	(\$0.63)	(\$0.82)

Beginning FY Fund Balances and Usage during each FY							
	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	FY11-12	FY12-13 [Projected]	FY13-14 [Projected]
Beginning	\$3,382,290	\$2,990,329	\$2,444,159	\$1,787,231	\$1,532,221	\$1,247,252	\$88,560
Expended	\$391,961	\$546,170	\$656,928	\$255,010	\$284,969	\$1,158,692	\$88,560

D. If the trial courts' application is for one-time supplemental funding, please explain why a loan would not be appropriate.

The Court is not (and will not be) able to repay such a loan.

E. The most recent audit findings of fiscal issues and the remediation measures taken to address them.

The last audit, conducted by the AOC in 2008, did not find any fiscal issues that required remediation.

Table 1

CMS 1 yr payment	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	-1,968,953	-2,202,542
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	5,762,243	5,528,654
x Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
x Operations	5,107,045	3,068,441	3,043,941
Expenditures	10,983,389	7,964,785	7,808,285
Ending Fund Balance	-1,968,953	-2,202,542	-2,279,631

Table 2

CMS - 5 yr [Equal payments]	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	-220,869	-816,478
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	7,510,327	6,914,718
Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operations	3,358,961	3,430,461	3,405,961
Expenditures	9,235,305	8,326,805	8,170,305
Ending Fund Balance	-220,869	-816,478	-1,255,587

Table 3

CMS - 5 yr [Structured Schedule]	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	-530,349	-1,262,758
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	7,200,847	6,468,438
Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operations	3,668,441	3,567,261	3,807,986
Expenditures	9,544,785	8,463,605	8,572,330
Ending Fund Balance	-530,349	-1,262,758	-2,103,892

Table 4

CMS - remaining with County	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Beginning Fund Balance	1,247,252	141,151	-92,438
State Financing Sources	5,600,898	5,624,910	5,624,910
Other Financing Sources	1,710,010	1,650,010	1,650,010
Grants	456,276	456,276	456,276
Revenue Total	9,014,436	7,872,347	7,638,758
Personnel Services	5,876,344	4,896,344	4,764,344
Operations	2,996,941	3,068,441	3,243,441
Expenditures	8,873,285	7,964,785	8,007,785
Ending Fund Balance	141,151	-92,438	-369,027

EXHIBIT 1

COURT COSTS FOR CMS IMPLEMENTATION	COURTVIEW	TYLER	SUSTAIN	ISD/RIVERSIDE	ACS/CONTEXTE	ACS/AGILECOURT
CMS LICENCE AND IMPLEMENTATION (VENDOR COSTS)	\$ 1,254,267	\$ 1,508,784	\$ 1,285,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,771,738	\$ 1,871,238
COURT CMS RELATED COSTS						
PROJECT MANAGER/REPLACEMENT (TEMP)*	\$ 88,902	\$ 88,902	\$ 88,902	\$ 88,902	\$ 88,902	\$ 88,902
COURT INTEGRATION TECHNICIAN (TEMP)*	\$ 680,965	\$ 88,902	\$ 337,475	\$ 383,147	\$ 284,134	\$ 607,543
COBOL PROGRAMMER **	\$ 73,500	\$ 73,500	\$ 73,500	\$ 73,500	\$ 73,500	\$ 73,500
INFRASTRUCTURE/TI INSTALLATION	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
ANNUAL TI COSTS - 5 YEARS (DMV, COURT) ***	\$ 99,461	\$ 149,192	\$ 99,461	\$ 149,192	\$ 99,461	\$ 99,461
HARDWARE and SCANNERS	\$ 22,500	\$ 22,500	\$ 22,500	\$ 22,500	\$ 22,500	\$ 22,500
SERVER HARDWARE	\$ 62,393		\$ 132,478	\$ 36,000	\$ 11,918	\$ 35,731
TRAVEL ****	\$ 66,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000
UNFUNDED COUNTY CMS COSTS *****	\$ 303,613	\$ 113,323	\$ 422,761	\$ 303,613	\$ 303,613	\$ 303,613
TOTAL COURT CMS IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	\$ 2,661,601	\$ 2,110,104	\$ 2,527,077	\$ 2,611,854	\$ 2,698,266	\$ 3,167,488

* Salary for duration of project based on vendor estimate of Court provided labor hours needed
 ** 490 HRS @ \$150/per hour
 *** Costs for DMV required TI and infrastructure requirements (varies per vendor specifications)
 **** Travel costs as stated in Vendor proposals. Used lowest travel costs as estimates for alternative solutions where travel costs were not provided
 ***** Assumed CMS project start date of May 2013, with the following implementation timelines: Courtview=24 months, Tyler=13 months, Sustain=28 months, ISD=24 months (assuming new RFP process will be needed to comply with contract laws), Contexte=24 months, AgileCourt=24 months plus maintaining mainframe for 6 months post go live for data

REQUEST FOR
PROPOSALS

KINGS SUPERIOR COURT

REGARDING:

*KINGS CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REPLACEMENT
RFP #4-12 - Kings*

PROPOSALS DUE:

9/7/2012 NO LATER THAN 4:00 P.M. PACIFIC TIME

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

Document History

Revision Number	Date	Additions/Modifications	Sections	Revised By
1.0	6/6/2012	Initial draft completed	all	Jennifer Dodd Ken Dones
2.0	6/12/2012	Consolidation of scope statement table with bulleted scope details	all	Jennifer Dodd
2.1	6/13/2012	Change milestone procurement schedule per Mr. Barton	4.1	Jennifer Dodd
2.2	7/3/2012	Added changes made to final AOC RFP and suggestions made by KC	all	Jennifer Dodd
2.3	7/20/2012	Change late date vendor can file a complaint or protest	13.0	Jennifer Dodd
2.4	7/30/2012	Updated reference to “Standard Terms and Conditions” and numbering consistencies	all	Jennifer Dodd
2.5	8/28/2012	Updated reflect courts request for a five year support and maintenance agreement and the Evaluation Matrix to adhere to the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual (JBCM) requirements for 50% cost allocation to the evaluation matrix	7.2 9.0	Jennifer Dodd

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Judicial Council of California

The Judicial Council of California, under the leadership of the Chief Justice, is the policymaking body of California's Judicial Branch. In accordance with the California Constitution, the Council is responsible for ensuring the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the Courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Council performs most of its work through advisory committees and task forces.

1.2 Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

The AOC is the staff agency to the Judicial Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties. The Information Services Division (ISD) is responsible for the development, acquisition, implementation, and support of automated systems in the Appellate Courts and the AOC. Over the past several years, the AOC scope of responsibility has broadened to include coordination of technological developments in some of the trial courts.

1.3 CCSM V4 Termination

The California Court Case Management System (CCMS) was a statewide initiative to develop and deploy a unified case management system for all 58 Superior Courts within the state. CCMS was designed to reduce operating costs, increase efficiency, and give Californians an unprecedented level of access to their courts. During the March 27, 2012, Judicial Council business meeting, the Council unanimously voted to terminate CCMS V4 deployment due to the current budgetary constraints. In the wake of the Judicial Council's decision to terminate the project, replacing the Court's antiquated mainframe system and creating a unified case management system for all case types has become a top priority.

1.4 Kings Superior Court

Kings Superior Court is seeking vendors to provide information technology products and services for a replacement Case Management System (CMS) for the Kings Superior Court of California. The agreements will be between the selected vendor and the Kings Superior Court. The product being sought is a replacement CMS application with a Document Management System (DMS), and Electronic Filing (E-Filing) capabilities to provide a fully developed paperless CMS to provide efficient service to the Court, justice partners and the public.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF GOODS AND/OR SERVICES

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Request for Proposal (hereinafter called RFP) is to obtain written proposals for a Court CMS comprised of the combination of products and services to support a thirteen-month implementation of a CMS for the Kings Superior Court. This RFP also includes deployment services, training of all judicial and non-judicial personnel who may utilize the system. The purpose of the project is to provide Kings Superior Court with a state-of-the-art CMS, DMS, and E-Filing applications collectively known as "CMS". The Court will consider either a locally-hosted or off-site hosted solution. The hosted solution should include the design of the CMS and all requirements for the infrastructure necessary to implement the CMS solution, implementation services, training, and a hardware, network and desktop assessment with

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

recommendations in order to ensure that an adequate desktop and network infrastructure is in place to support the CMS solution. These products and services will also require ongoing application maintenance and support pursuant to the software service license and maintenance agreements.

2.2 Goal

The primary goal of the RFP is to replace Kings Superior Court's existing legacy systems with a unified, fully developed, paperless CMS solution. The selected CMS associated services and capabilities should be modern, efficient, reliable, economical and proven. It is also the goal of this RFP to engage an experienced vendor capable of executing an efficient project within the thirteen-month timeframe and also within budget.

2.3 Scope

The scope of the RFP is to obtain case management software, licensing, implementation services, data conversion, network and infrastructure recommendations, and a hosting solution for the CMS applications.

The implementation of Case Management System Application includes:

- Providing CMS application software that meets the functional requirements for Kings Superior Court including but not limited to the following components: database security, an integrated DMS, E-filing functionality, fully developed paperless case management processing, and a web-based public-facing portal.
- Analyzing Trial Court operations to effectively implement the CMS applications
- Installing, configuring, and testing the CMS applications according to the business rules and processes of the Court to produce a high performance CMS
- Configurable workflow to actively process cases using automated and manual work queues to maximize productivity and efficiency
- CMS configured to be current with state laws, federal regulations, rules of court, calculations of fees & fines distribution, and administrative requirements (*Attachment 1*)
- Maintaining the CMS application for changes in regulatory requirements, application enhancements, common configuration changes, and fixing program defects
- Scalable system to accommodate court size, court users, data volume, and public web users
- Full State and local data exchange and interface integration

The recommendation for a Trial Court network infrastructure includes:

- Desktop assessment with hardware and software recommendations
- Network assessment and design specifications for network security and bandwidth specifications to adequately handle anticipated networking loads and access for the CMS proposed solution
- Integration support for the network infrastructure to function with the CMS
- Data Integration support ensuring connectivity for all required state and local Justice Partners and interfaces

Hosting solution includes:

- Providing the design specifications and acquisition details for locally and/or off-site hosted CMS, DMS, and E-Filing applications, including production and non-production environments to run the CMS and to support DMS and E-Filing applications, using modern proven technology that is in compliance with the security and infrastructure requirements (detailed in *Attachment 13*)

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

- Integrating the CMS servers and network servers with the network infrastructure and desktop workstations
- Document Management Services including any additional hardware and third party software recommendations
- Systems management (administration, change management, security, data recovery, and disaster recovery)
- Assisting in DMS scanners setup, configuration and business use

2.4 Deployment Services

It is the aim of the Court to appoint an experienced vendor capable of executing an efficient project within the agreed-upon schedule and budget. Based on the goals detailed in Section 2.2 and the capacity of the vendor, please prepare a deployment approach and implementation plan that will meet the high-level tasks for this project. The deployment approach should include resource loading necessary for implementation activities. Deployment services proposal should include the following project management, solution design and implementation planning suggestions.

A. Deployment Approach:

- Project Management
The vendor will develop a comprehensive project management plan. The proposed plan will be used to track and control project progress as well as provide weekly updates. Additional project management tasks should include:
 - Scheduling project kick-off and project status meetings
 - Developing and presenting a project plan and schedule, and updating as necessary
 - Managing, monitoring and controlling project activities and progress
 - Breaking down work by resources
 - Resource Plan loading
 - Use of project management tools
 - Use of project change requests, issue and risk documentation, and status
 - Preparing and distributing weekly status reports to designated stakeholders
- Solution Environment Design
The vendor will provide a formal design, acquisition inventory list, and build instruction of what will become the CMS solution implementation environment. When describing your approach to designing the solution environment keep in mind that the Court and vendor should eventually have joint validation work sessions to plan the installations, including identification of the requirements for hardware and network provisioning.
- Functional Requirements Gap Analysis
The vendor will iteratively review configurations and develop business processes that take advantage of the new available functionality of the CMS product and document the functional requirements including, but not limited to, requirements for each case type and role. When describing how you will determine and deal with functional gaps, the description should include requirements validation and gap analysis work sessions with Court subject matter experts. This phase should include notices/documents and reports requirements. This phase should also include reviews of any required additional modules such as financials, automation, minutes, notes, and public portal.

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

- Implementation Plan
Provide a detailed implementation plan that includes the following, as well as assumptions, necessary Court staff, and required skill sets:
 - Implementation timeline preferred to be completed within 13 months
 - Infrastructure design, hardware and software inventory acquisition list, and build instructions
 - Software loads
 - Base system ready and set up date
 - Data conversion from existing system
 - Resources and responsibilities
 - Business process change strategy
 - Testing strategy
 - Training strategy
 - Planned communication to stakeholders
 - Go-Live support approach and planning
 - Risk analysis and contingency planning
 - Post-implementation approach and support planning

- Integration Plan
Describe your approach to integration planning in order to replace, convert, and/or support existing data exchanges for state and local Justice Partners. The proposed integration plan should describe how the vendor will analyze the integration requirements (*Attachment 11*).

B. Vendor Resources and Implementation Activities:

- Implementation Services
The vendor and the Court will implement the user acceptance test and production environments solution. Vendor and the Court will execute the implementation plan defined—that includes an emphasis on implementation, cut-over, risk and contingency planning, post-implementation support planning, and knowledge transfer and transition strategy.

- Set-Up and Administration
The vendor will work with the Court to have the appropriate hardware required for the CMS solution installed. Vendor will install and configure the CMS solution into the Court environment. Vendor will train the Court staff in the installation, administration, system updating, tuning, and troubleshooting procedures.

- Application Configuration
With guidance from designated Court staff, vendor will work with the Court to build the application configuration that will serve as the foundation of the CMS solution.

- Reports and Forms
The vendor will work with the Court to identify reports and forms required as well as codified values that should be included in the new CMS configuration.

- Documentation

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

- The vendor is responsible for creating the standard operational documentation. The vendor working with the Court will create user and system administration manuals that are required by the Court.
- Testing of Business Functionality and Validation
The vendor and the Court will train several groups of Court testers in the use of the system using the approved configuration and documentation. The Court testers with vendor business leads will then conduct system testing and validation of the configuration. They will draw from their experience and also use the test cases created by the vendor, working with Court subject matter experts. Configuration and application fixes will be regression tested and reexamined by Court testers with the assistance of vendor business leads until testing results meet the agreed upon exit criteria.
 - End User Training/Knowledge Transfer
The vendor will train the Court trainers until the Court is satisfied. The Court trainers utilizing vendor-provided core documentation will create, with vendor's assistance, the training program, including documentation as desired. Training programs should include but not be limited to:
 - Baseline End-User Training
 - Specific Case Processing by Functional Area
 - System Administrator Training
 - Technical Support & Operations Knowledge Transfer
The vendor will train the Court technical staff and provide the necessary documentation and procedures. Training programs should include but not be limited to:
 - System Operations training and documentation
 - User Acceptance Activities
The vendor will provide resources to coordinate and support all User Acceptance Testing (UAT) activities utilizing the Court and vendor SMEs to plan, coordinate, conduct end-to-end integration testing, and obtain Court signoff on results
 - Go-Live Support
The vendor will provide resources for go-live activities ensuring a seamless business transition utilizing the new CMS solution. Two distinct cutovers are to be included in the implementation plan:
 - Criminal, Traffic, and Juvenile Delinquency
 - Civil
 - Each cutover should be separated by a minimum of six to eight weeks
 - Post Implementation Support and Project Closeout
The vendor will provide business and technical support of the CMS solution to ensure a successful implementation by the user community. The vendor will provide application support, track and resolve issues that are uncovered, assist the Court in performing any necessary system tuning to maintain acceptable system performance (*as per service levels detailed in Exhibit 9 of Attachment 2*), finalize technical documentation, and finalize knowledge transfer to the Court. The vendor will perform project closeout tasks to transfer project roles to the Court for ongoing operational support of the new system and document lessons learned.

2.5 Guidelines for Deployment Services Deliverables

The goal of this project is to have a new CMS installed and configured within thirteen (13) months after a contract or letter of intent is signed. Based upon these goals and the capacity of your company, prepare a deployment schedule, project plan and deployment budget.

- Describe your implementation planning (including project management) process.
- Describe your recommendation for roles your company personnel will assume and the roles that Court staff should assume in the implementation process.
- Respond to the following questions that relate to specific issues:
 - 1) Describe how you would facilitate any required interfaces or electronic tools that have been purchased and/or installed and may be copyrighted. Examples of local interfaces may include jail management systems, booking systems, juvenile detention management systems, imaging systems, and probation systems.
 - 2) Describe the process involved in implementing any required specific configurations, e.g., local ordinances, terms of probation and pretrial release, and creation of standard local documents using case management information. Include any local Court personnel required to accomplish the task.
 - 3) Describe the process, resources, and expertise in converting data from existing system into the new CMS
- Describe your process for coordinating user acceptance.
- Describe your process for change management.
- Describe your process for critical defect scenarios.
- Describe your process for coordinating software upgrades and version management.
- Describe the process employed to track and report progress in system deployment.
- Describe the process and standards employed in determining when phases of deployment are satisfactorily completed.
- Describe the process involved in implementing any required state and local configurations, e.g., implementation of state statutes and rules, creation of standard state documents, state calendar, etc. Include any Court personnel required to accomplish the task.
- Describe the process involved in assessing and recommending the required hardware and software that will ensure improved performance for the end-users is achieved, and that it is scalable to meet the future needs of the Court.

2.6 Vendor maintenance and support

Maintenance and support that complies with the Court's Standard Terms and Conditions (Exhibit 9 of Attachment 2) which shall include but not be limited to:

- Application Software Licensing
- Application Support and Technical Support for local hosted solution
- End-user and technical support
- Provision of periodic maintenance, legislative updates, and security upgrades per service-level standards and support agreements
- Global configuration changes necessary to support business changes
- Emergency support for break-fix situations

2.7 Vendor Warranty

- Service Warranty that complies with the Court's Standard Terms and Conditions (Section B.1 of Attachment 2)

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

- Licensed Software Warranty that complies with the Court’s Standard Terms and Conditions (Section B.2 of Attachment 2)

3.0 ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Vendor Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Function
Project Sponsor	The Project Sponsor will provide executive oversight and the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership and resources to support project success • Participation in escalation discussions as appropriate
Project Manager	The Project Manager will plan and manage delivery of tasks in collaboration with vendor resources, will as specified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage vendor responsibilities and resources throughout the full project life cycle • Develop and maintain a Court-approved project plan and manage necessary vendor and Court resources with assistance from the Court Project Manager • Develop and ensure timely completion of all necessary tasks required to meet the project delivery schedule • Provide necessary assistance and support to the Court Project Manager regarding issues requiring CMS implementation decisions • Have knowledge of Court standards, procedures and business processes, as generally implemented in the industry, and be able to designate vendor support personnel who may be required to participate on project teams • Keep the Court Project Manager apprised of business, organizational and technical issues that may have an impact on the performance and delivery of this project • Work with the Court Project Manager on issues and risks that may cause delays in the delivery schedule • Maintain issue and resolution documentation and provide status reports • Agree to timely resolution of issues and completion of tasks within the vendor’s scope of responsibility that are causing delay to the delivery schedule • Work jointly with the Court to ensure project success • Ensure all activities are coordinated with Court resources
Architect	The Architect will provide technical leadership as well as be responsible for the design, hardware and software acquisition list, build instructions of the CMS and DMS solution, and the associated implementation tasks.
Business resources (configuration)	The business resources will provide the business expertise in case management, as well as business analysis experience with “as-is” and “to-be” systems. These resources will also bring field expertise in implementing interfaces as well as development of business rules, workflows and reports. These resources will be responsible for transitioning CMS knowledge to Court staff over the course of the entire project.
Testing resources	The testing resources will:

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Execute functional testing of the core CMS and DMS applications against the functional requirements (including that which represents functionality provided by the Court’s current CMS configuration—including but not limited to all extracts and interfaces—plus additional functionality available to the Court, except where explicitly agreed to by both Court and vendor) • Support testing of the Court-specific configuration • Work with Court Subject Matter Experts by providing test scripts and coordinating each test phase (including unit testing, integration testing, and user acceptance testing) • Validate expected results
Programming resource	The programming resources will provide expertise in development of the core CMS application, as well as support for configuration items and required interfaces.

3.2 Court Roles and Responsibilities

Project Sponsor	<p>The Project Sponsor will provide executive oversight and the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership and resources to support project success • Participation in escalation discussions as appropriate
Project Manager	<p>The Project Manager will plan and manage delivery of tasks as specified and the delivery schedule. The Project Manager is responsible for managing Court responsibilities and resources throughout the full project life cycle. The Court Project Manager, in collaboration with business resources, will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a separate project plan detailing all necessary Court tasks and resources required to meet the project delivery schedule • Work jointly with vendor to ensure project success • Collaborate with the vendor to ensure timely completion of Court responsibilities to support the project delivery schedule • Provide assistance and support to the vendor Project Manager regarding issues requiring Court-specific decisions and actions • Have knowledge of Court standards, procedures, business processes and strategic goals, and be able to designate support personnel who may be required to participate on project teams • Keep the vendor Project Manager apprised of business, organizational and technical issues that may have an impact on the performance and delivery of this project • The Court will agree to timely resolution of issues and completion of tasks within the Court’s scope of responsibility that are causing delay to the delivery schedule.
Business resources	<p>The business resources will provide the business expertise in the Court’s processing. These resources will be able to provide the vendor with case type and process-specific information for all phases of the project. Resources, including testing personnel, will be required specific to case-type processing, accounting processing, interface requirements, technical support for Court-supplied infrastructure and components including responsibility for network connectivity, and network performance</p>

Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings

Vendor Access	<p>The Court will provide the vendor access (during normal business hours and other mutually agreed-upon times) to Court functional, technical and business staff, facilities, and equipment. The Court will provide assistance and cooperation, complete and accurate information/data, and access to, if required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems and networks • Current processes and procedures • Workflow diagrams • Architectural designs • On-site resource personnel as needed for functional and technical reviews
---------------	--

4.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

4.1 Proposed Procurement Schedule

Proposals are due by 4:00 pm (Pacific Time) September 7, 2012. Application demonstrations are to be held starting two weeks after the RFP submission deadline. Procurement will be satisfied when a contract or letter of intent is signed. It is the Court's intention to have a signed contract within 60 days of the RFP submission deadline.

No.	Milestone	Date
1	Kings Superior Court issues RFP	8/1/2012
2	Deadline for vendors to submit questions, requests for clarifications or modifications to rfp@kings.courts.ca.gov	8/8/2012
3	Deadline for vendors to register for vendor conference	8/8/2012
4	Vendor conference	8/21/2012
5	Post vendor questions and Court answers	8/28/2012
6	Vendor solicitation specifications protest deadline	9/4/2012
7	Proposal due date and time (4:00pm PDT)	9/7/2012
8	Finalists' presentations (solution demonstrations and interviews)	9/17-9/27/2012
9	Pre-pricing evaluation	10/1-10/2/2012
10	Cost portion of proposals public opening	10/3/2012
11	Notice of intent to award	10/10/2012
12	Contract negotiations	10/15-10/31/2012
13	Execution of contract between vendor and Kings Superior Court	11/5/2012
14	Anticipated contract terms	5 years

4.2. Pre-Proposal Conference

The Court will hold a pre-proposal conference on the date identified in the timeline above. The pre-proposal conference will be held via conference call. Attendance at the pre-proposal conference is optional. Vendors are encouraged to attend.

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

5.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are included as part of this RFP.

5.1 Contractual Attachments

ATTACHMENT	DESCRIPTION
Attachment 1: Administrative Rules Governing RFPs (IT Goods and Services)	These rules govern this solicitation.
Attachment 2: Court Standard Terms and Conditions	If selected, the person or entity submitting a proposal (the “vendor”) must sign a Court Standard Form Agreement containing these terms and conditions (the “Terms and Conditions”).
Attachment 3: Vendor’s Acceptance of Terms and Conditions	On this form, the vendor must indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions.
Attachment 4: Payee Data Record Form	This form contains information the Court requires in order to process payments and must be submitted with the proposal.
Attachment 5: Iran Contracting Act Certification	Vendor must complete the Iran Contracting Act Certification and submit the completed certification with its proposal.
Attachment 6: Conflict of Interest Certification Form	Vendor must complete and submit signed Conflict of Interest certification

5.2 CMS Requirements and Court Informational Attachments

ATTACHMENT	DESCRIPTION
Attachment 7	CMS Business and Functional Requirements
Attachment 8	CMS Testing Requirements
Attachment 9	CMS Configuration Requirements
Attachment 10	CMS Training Requirements
Attachment 11	CMS Integration Requirements
Attachment 12	CMS Network/Desktop Requirements
Attachment 13	CMS Infrastructure/Application/Architecture / Security Requirements
Attachment 14	CMS DMS Requirements
Attachment 15	Kings Court Information
Attachment 16	Kings CMS RFP Costing Matrix
Attachment 17	RFP Response Template

5.3 CMS Functional Requirements Exhibits

ATTACHMENT	DESCRIPTION
Exhibit A	Manual of Accounting
Exhibit B	Bail Calculation and Recalculation Process
Exhibit C	JBSIS Implementation Manual

6.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

6.1 Vendors should respond to each and every section of this RFP and all attachments and sub-exhibits. An RFP response template has been included (*Attachment 17*) for standardization of responses. Proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements of the “Proposal Contents” section below. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the RFP’s instructions and requirements, and completeness and clarity of content.

6.2 The vendor must submit its proposal in two parts, the non-cost portion (*Attachment 17*) and the cost portion (*Attachment 16*).

- A. The vendor must submit **one (1) original and seven (7) copies** of the non-cost portion (*Attachment 17*) of the proposal. The original must be signed by an authorized representative of the vendor. The must write the RFP title and number on the outside of the sealed envelope.
- B. The vendor must submit **one (1) original and seven (7) copies** of the cost portion (*Attachment 16*) of the proposal. The original must be signed by an authorized representative of the vendor. The original cost portion (and the copies thereof) must be submitted to the Court in a single sealed envelope, separate from the non-cost portion. The vendor must write the RFP title and number on the outside of the sealed envelope.
- C. The vendor must submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CDROM. The files contained on the CD-ROM should be in PDF, Word, or Excel formats.

6.3 Proposals must be delivered by the date and time listed on the coversheet of this RFP to:

Kings Superior Court
Attn: Sandy Salyer
1426 South Drive
Hanford, CA 93230

RFP@kings.courts.ca.gov
PHONE: 559-582-1010 X5010

6.4 Late proposals will not be accepted. Postmarks by the due date will not substitute for actual receipt of proposal by the Court.

Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings

- 6.5 Only written proposals will be accepted. Proposals must be sent by registered or certified mail, courier service (e.g., FedEx), or delivered by hand. Proposals may not be transmitted by fax or email.

7.0 PROPOSAL CONTENTS

- 7.1 Non-Cost Portion. The following information must be included in the non-cost portion of the proposal (*Attachment 17*). A proposal lacking any of the following information may be deemed non-responsive
- A. Vendor’s name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and federal tax identification number. Note that if vendor is a sole proprietor using his or her social security number, the social security number will be required before finalizing a contract.
 - B. Name, title, address, telephone number, and email address of the individual who will act as vendor’s designated representative for purposes of this RFP.
 - C. Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of 5 clients for whom the vendor has provided similar goods. The Court may check references listed by vendor.
 - D. For each key staff member: a resume describing the individual’s background and experience, as well as the individual’s ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.
 - E. Proposed approach and methodology employed to complete the work.
 - F. Acceptance of the Terms and Conditions.
 - a. On Attachment 3, the vendor must either indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or clearly identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. An “exception” includes any addition, deletion, qualification, limitation, or other change.
 - b. If exceptions are identified, the vendor must also submit a red-lined version of the Terms and Conditions that clearly tracks proposed changes, and a written explanation or rationale for each exception and/or proposed change.
 - G. Certifications, Attachments, and other requirements.
 - a. Vendor must include the following certification in its proposal: Vendor has no interest that would constitute a conflict of interest under California Public Contract Code Sections 10365.5, 10410 or 10411; Government Code Sections 1090 et seq. or 87100 et seq.; or Rule 10.103 or Rule 10.104 of the California Rules of Court, which restrict employees and former employees from contracting with Judicial Branch entities.
 - b. Vendor must submit with its proposal, for itself and each of its affiliates that make sales for delivery into California, a copy of either (i) a California seller's permit

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

issued under Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6066 et seq. or (ii) a certificate of registration issued under Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6226.

- c. The RFP Response Template (Attachment 17) contains a number of questions entitled 'Minimum Requirements to Qualify.' If Proposer answers "no" to any of these questions, its proposal may be rejected.
- d. If vendor is a corporation, proof that vendor is in good standing and qualified to conduct business in California.
- e. Copies of current business licenses, professional certifications, or other credentials.
- f. Proof of financial solvency or stability (e.g., balance sheets and income statements).

7.2 Cost Portion. The following information must be included in the cost portion of the proposal (Attachment 16).

A. IT Goods:

- a. CMS (Schedule 1) Application Software licensing – Supply any and all estimate software application licensing costs.

B. IT Services:

- a. Professional Services (Schedule 2) – Supply any and all estimated professional services costs by implementation phase and activity in Section 1, as well as any and all assumed Court participation in Section 2.
- b. Maintenance and Support (Schedule 3) – Supply five years of costs for Maintenance and Support.

NOTE: It is unlawful for any person engaged in business within this state to sell or use any article or product as a "loss leader" as defined in Section 17030 of the Business and Professions Code.

8.0 OFFER PERIOD

A vendor's proposal is an irrevocable offer for ninety (90) days following the proposal due date. In the event a final contract has not been awarded within this period, the Court reserves the right to negotiate extensions to this period.

9.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The cost portion of proposals will be publicly opened on 10/1/12 at Kings Superior Court. At the time proposals are opened, each proposal will be checked for the presence or absence of the required proposal contents.

- Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if, in the opinion of the Court, the information was intended to mislead the state regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

- If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with solicitation document requirements. Material deviations cannot be waived. Immaterial deviations may also cause a proposal to be rejected.
- Cost sheets will be checked only if a proposal is determined to be otherwise qualified. All figures entered on the cost sheets must be clearly legible.
- During the evaluation process, the Court may require a vendor's representative to answer questions with regard to the vendor's proposal. Failure of a vendor to respond and demonstrate in a timely manner that the claims made in its proposal are, in fact, true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal nonresponsive.
- A vendor is eligible for a total of 100 points for the written proposal.
- Written proposals will be evaluated by the Court per the following selection criteria and weighting:

Category	Factors		Total Possible Points
Purchase Price	Overall Cost, including any ongoing support and maintenance that may be required by the Court or its agents	Total Score	50
Meeting Business Requirements and Deployment Services deliverables	Degree to which the vendor's proposed solution meets the functional and technical requirements	Total Score	30
Experience and Qualifications	Level of vendors experience, qualifications, and success rate of implementing proposed product and services	Total Score	5
Technical Support and Maintenance	Degree that technical support and maintenance will be provided and availability and deployment of version updates	Total Score	10
Changes/Exceptions to Standard Terms and Conditions	Degree of impact of exceptions to the Standard Terms and Conditions	Total Score	5

10.0 FINALISTS PRESENTATIONS (SOLUTIONS DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERVIEWS)

The Court may conduct interviews with vendors to clarify aspects set forth in their proposals or to assist in finalizing the ranking of top-ranked proposals. The interview process may require a demonstration. The interview may also require a demonstration of equivalence if a brand name is included in the specifications. The interviews may be conducted in person or by phone. If

*Kings Case Management System Replacement
RFP #4-12 – Kings*

conducted in person, interviews will likely be held at the Court's offices. The Court will not reimburse vendors for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the interview location. The Court will notify eligible vendors regarding interview arrangements.

11.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

One copy of each proposal will be retained by the Court for official files and will become a public record. California Judicial Branch entities are subject to Rule 10.500 of the California Rule of Court, which governs public access to Judicial Administrative Records (see www.courtinfo.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=ten&linkid=rule10_500).

If information submitted in a proposal contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the Court's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then that information will not be disclosed upon a request for access to such records. If the Court finds or reasonably believes that the material so marked is **not** exempt from disclosure, the Court will disclose the information regardless of the marking or notation seeking confidential treatment.

Notwithstanding the above, the California Public Contract Code requires the public opening of certain proposals. If required to do so by the Public Contract Code, the Court may disclose all information contained in a proposal, including information marked as confidential or proprietary.

12.0 PROTESTS

Any protests will be handled in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Judicial Branch Contract Manual (see www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf). Failure of a vendor to comply with the protest procedures set forth in that chapter will render a protest inadequate and nonresponsive, and will result in rejection of the protest. The deadline for the Court to receive a solicitation specifications protest is 9/4/12. Protests should be sent to:

Kings Superior Court
Attn: Sandy Salyer
1426 South Drive
Hanford, CA 93230

EXHIBIT 3

VENDOR: COURTVIEW

Score Category	Scoring Components	Scoring Method	Total Avail Points	Actual Points	Percent of Points	Max RFP Weighted Total Score	Vendor Score	Vendor Total Score
Initial Screening	Proposal Completeness, Timeliness	Use Included Checklist in RFP	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes/No	YES	n/a
Purchase Price	Overall Cost Including Ongoing Support and Maintenance	Automatic	50	31	0.62	50	31	31
Meeting Business Requirements and Deployment Services Deliverables	Functional Technical * Implementation/Deployment	Manual Scoring	5	1	0.20	14	2.80	9
			5	2	0.4	8	3.2	
			5	2	0.4	8	3.2	
Experience and Qualifications	Company References and Expertise	Manual Scoring	5	1	0.2	5	1	1
Technical Support and Maintenance	Degree that technical support will be provided and deployment of version updates	Manual Scoring	5	2	0.4	10	4	4
Changes/Exceptions to Standard Terms and Conditions	Degree of Adherence to the Standard Terms and Conditions	Manual Scoring	5	3	0.6	5	3	3
TOTAL SCORE			100					48

* Establishing new DMV connectivity is identified as the project critical path; vendors were made aware of this important technical requirement

EXHIBIT 3 (cont)

VENDOR: TYLER

Score Category	Scoring Components	Scoring Method	Total Avail Points	Actual Points	Percent of Points	Max RFP Weighted Total Score	Vendor Score	Vendor Total Score
Initial Screening	Proposal Completeness, Timeliness	Use Included Checklist in RFP	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes/No	YES	n/a
Purchase Price	Overall Cost Including Ongoing Support and Maintenance	Automatic	50	38	0.76	50	38	38
Meeting Business Requirements and Deployment Services Deliverables	Functional Technical * Implementation/Deployment	Manual Scoring	5	3.5	0.70	14	9.8	25
			5	4.8	0.96	8	7.68	
			5	5	1	8	8	
Experience and Qualifications	Company References and Expertise	Manual Scoring	5	5	1	5	5	5
Technical Support and Maintenance	Degree that technical support will be provided and deployment of version updates	Manual Scoring	5	5	1	10	10	10
Changes/Exceptions to Standard Terms and Conditions	Degree of Adherence to the Standard Terms and Conditions	Manual Scoring	5	4	0.8	5	4	4
TOTAL SCORE			100				82	

* Establishing new DMV connectivity is identified as the project critical path; vendors were made aware of this important technical requirement

EXHIBIT 3 (cont)

VENDOR: SUSTAIN

Score Category	Scoring Components	Scoring Method	Total Avail Points	Actual Points	Percent of Points	Max RFP Weighted Total Score	Vendor Score	Vendor Total Score
Initial Screening	Proposal Completeness, Timeliness	Use Included Checklist in RFP	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes/No	YES	n/a
Purchase Price	Overall Cost Including Ongoing Support and Maintenance	Automatic	50	27	0.54	50	27	27
Meeting Business Requirements and Deployment Services Deliverables	Functional	Manual Scoring	5	3.2	0.64	14	8.96	
	Technical *	Manual Scoring	5	2	0.4	8	3.2	14
	Implementation/Deployment	Manual Scoring	5	1	0.2	8	1.6	
Experience and Qualifications	Company References and Expertise	Manual Scoring	5	2	0.4	5	2	2
Technical Support and Maintenance	Degree that technical support will be provided and deployment of version updates	Manual Scoring	5	3	0.6	10	6	6
Changes/Exceptions to Standard Terms and Conditions	Degree of Adherence to the Standard Terms and Conditions	Manual Scoring	5	3	0.6	5	3	3
TOTAL SCORE			100					52

* Establishing new DMV connectivity is identified as the project critical path; vendors were made aware of this important technical requirement

EXHIBIT 4

Description		Pros	Cons	Base Costs	Additional CMS Related Costs*	Total Costs (5 yrs)
Legacy Systems / Current CMS						
Mainframe (County Hosted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires no action Has DMV access using county owned and managed interfaces Requires no training for existing criminal and traffic clerks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibitively too expensive to operate and cover County costs Antiquated mainframe system which crashed daily Has a single mainframe programmer to support the system who retired January of 2012. County has given the Court written notice that it will no longer provide necessary level of service or support of the system and will not guarantee programming services County will migrate its last and final Property Management system off the mainframe by December 2014, at which time they may elect to no longer physically host the hardware and/or provide any support for the mainframe system. System does not offer automation, processing of credit card payments, public access to records, document management capabilities, e-filing, digital output (most reports can only be printed as a hardcopy) with no web-based, pdf, xml, or other output methods in use today. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> System does not offer automation, processing of credit card payments, document management capabilities, or e-filing. Lacks modern efficiencies to handle in-court processing. Requires two FTE courtroom clerks in each trial court. 			\$ 2,909,727
ACS Contexte (Civil)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires no action Requires no training for existing civil clerks 	TOTAL 5 YEAR COST OF CURRENT CMS				\$ 3,234,727
Previously Reviewed Systems						
ACS Contexte (Criminal/Traffic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires no action Integrated CMS across all case types No training required for Civil clerks Court can take advantage of the State's Oracle relational database management system (RDBMS) licensing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACS Contexte is an older CMS product and does not offer state of the art functionality Implementation in unknown given that ACS has not shown a recent interest in this project ACS does not currently integrate Criminal/Traffic with DMV interfaces Does not provide in-court processing; requires two FTE courtroom clerks per department to operate ACS Contexte did not submit proposal response to the Court's RFP Continued support, updates, and development of the Criminal/Traffic Contexte system is uncertain. 	\$ 1,771,738	\$ 926,528	\$ 2,698,266	

EXHIBIT 4 (cont)

Proposal Responses from RFP			
CourtView	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated CMS across all case types • Utilizes more user friendly interface over current system • JWorks is web-based and highly configurable by the Court 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not offer a hosted CMS solution • Does not offer full redundancy nor disaster recovery • Courtview integrates with a third-party vendor for DMS requiring separate licensing, maintenance, and support • Proposes a 24-month implementation costing the Court an additional \$303,613 in unfunded additional mainframe costs * • Courtview requires 17,406 Court-provided labor hours to implement: This would necessitate the hiring of 4.35 FTE's for the 24 month duration at an additional cost of \$769,867 ** • Required programming language knowledge for creating reports, forms, and other data outputs, and for making system changes for statistical data reporting, legislative changes, and business rule changes • Courtview would require server and infrastructure acquisitions and additional technical support by the Court • Will not structure implementation and conversion costs over five years with minimal costs in years 1-2 	<p>\$ 1,254,267 \$ 1,407,334 \$ 2,661,601</p>
Sustain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated CMS across all case types • Utilizes more user friendly interface over current system • eCourt is newest product from Sustain • eCourt is web-based and highly configurable by the Court 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eCourt has not yet been deployed for Criminal/traffic/civil cases in any California Court • Does not offer a hosted CMS solution • Does not offer full redundancy nor disaster recovery • Sustain integrates with a third-party vendor for DMS requiring separate licensing, maintenance, and support • Sustain proposes full integration with standard state interfaces but at addition and unspecified costs to the Court • Sustain proposes a 24-month implementation not to start until May-June, 2013 costing the Court an additional \$422,761 in unfunded additional mainframe costs * • Sustain requires 9,640 Court-provided labor hours to implement: This would necessitate the hiring of 2.16 FTE's for the 24 month duration at an additional cost of \$426,377 ** • Required programming language knowledge for creating reports, forms, and other data outputs, and for making system changes for statistical data reporting, legislative changes, and business rule changes • eCourt would require significant server and infrastructure acquisitions and additional technical support • Will not structure implementation and conversion costs over five years with minimal costs in years 1-2 	<p>\$ 1,285,000 \$ 1,242,077 \$ 2,527,077</p>

EXHIBIT 4 (cont)

<p>Tyler</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated CMS across all case types • Utilizes more user friendly interface over current system • Offers fully integrated DMS • Offers fully integrated e-filing solution • Odyssey is web-based and highly configurable by the Court • Custom report creation through user-friendly GUIs; no programming knowledge is required • Offers a hosted CMS solution • Can implement CMS in 13 Months • Offers a full redundancy and disaster recovery • Odyssey offers perpetual life cycle, all upgrades are included in maintenance costs – no cost to upgrade CMS versions in future • Will structure implementation and conversion costs over five years with minimal costs in year one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tyler CMS is not currently deployed in any California court, however San Luis Obispo has awarded its CMS contract to Tyler in its recent RFP process and will be implementing the Odyssey CMS • Tyler proposes a 13 month implementation costing the Court an additional \$113,323 in unfunded additional mainframe costs * • Tyler requires 4,020 Court-provided labor hours to implement. This would necessitate the hiring of 2 FTE's for the 13 month duration at an additional cost of \$177,805 ** 	<p>\$ 1,508,784</p>	<p>\$ 601,320</p>	<p>\$ 2,110,104</p>
<p>Other Options</p>					
<p>AgileCourt by ACS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated CMS across all case types • Utilizes more user friendly interface over current system • Court can take advantage of the State's Oracle relational database management system (RDBMS) licensing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AgileCourt does not offer a fully automated CMS with state of the art functionality • Implementation in unknown given that ACS has not shown a recent interest in this project • ACS does not currently integrate Criminal/Traffic with DMV interfaces • Does not provide in-court processing; requires two FTE courtroom clerks per department to operate • ACS AgileCourt did not submit a proposal response to the Court's RFP 	<p>\$ 1,871,238</p>	<p>\$ 1,296,250</p>	<p>\$ 3,167,488</p>
<p>ISD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can obtain DMV access through Riverside • Riverside Court has offered to host • DMS provide through third party vendor, separate contract will be required for license, maintenance, and support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISD did not submit a proposal response to the Court's RFP • ISD integrates with a third-party vendor for DMS requiring separate licensing, maintenance, and support • There is not sufficient data nor demonstration to evaluate whether this system meets functional or technical requirements of the Court • Not all associated costs for the ISD solution has been obtained or can be gathered. Costs provided have been included here. 	<p>\$ 1,383,247</p>	<p>\$ 1,228,607</p>	<p>\$ 2,611,854</p>

* Very Important – Total costs for solutions proposed in this document ARE NOT STATIC. Costs will increase monthly. Costs shown here are based on a CMS PROJECT START DATE OF MAY, 2013.
 ** Additional project management, data conversion, and technical support is calculated at an averaged rate of \$44.23 per hour based on the required number of hours as estimated and provided by vendors.

EXHIBIT 1A

	Year 1 2013	Year 2 2014	Year 3 2015	Year 4 2016	Year 5 2017	TOTAL COSTS FOR 5 YEARS
CMS VENDOR COSTS						
One-Time Implementation Costs*	181,500					181,500
Annual License and Maintenance	250,000	257,500	265,225	273,182	281,377	1,327,284
SUBTOTAL CMS VENDOR COST	\$ 431,500	\$ 257,500	\$ 265,225	\$ 273,182	\$ 281,377	\$ 1,508,784
COURT CMS COSTS						
PROJECT MANAGER (TEMP)	47,414	41,488	-	-	-	88,902
COURT INTEGRATION TECHNICIAN (TEMP)	47,414	41,488				88,902
COBOL PROGRAMMER	73,500	-	-	-	-	73,500
INFRASTRUCTURE/T1 INSTALLATION	10,000	-	-	-	-	10,000
ANNUAL T1 COSTS - 5 YEARS (DMV, COURT)	29,838	29,838	29,838	29,838	29,838	149,192
HARDWARE and SCANNERS	22,500	-	-	-	-	22,500
SERVER HARDWARE	-					-
TRAVEL	29,333	25,667	-	-	-	55,000
UNFUNDED COUNTY CMS COSTS **	41,249	72,074				\$ 113,323
SUBTOTAL COURT CMS COST	\$ 301,250	\$ 210,554	\$ 29,838	\$ 29,838	\$ 29,838	\$ 601,319
TOTAL CMS COSTS PER YEAR	\$ 732,750	\$ 468,054	\$ 295,063	\$ 303,020	\$ 311,215	\$ 2,110,103

*Vendor proposal shows reduced implementation costs in year 1 with balance of implementation costs spread over the remaining years 2-5 and is included in the Annual License and Maintenance costs. (all subject to final contract negotiations with the vendor)

**Unfunded County CMS costs shows the additional cost for operating the old mainframe system concurrent with the implementation of the new system. These are unfunded costs due to cost increases the county will impose on to the Court once the court becomes the sole user of the mainframe system.

APPLICATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FORM

Please check the type of funding that is being requested:

- CASH ADVANCE** (Complete Section I only.)
- URGENT NEEDS** (Complete Sections I through IV.)
- ONE-TIME DISTRIBUTION**
- LOAN**

**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

SUPERIOR COURT: San Joaquin	PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer): David P. Warner, Presiding Judge	
	CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO: Rosa Junqueiro, Court Executive Officer Phone: (209) 468-2539	
DATE OF SUBMISSION: 1/28/2013	DATE FUNDING IS NEEDED BY: 2/26/2013	REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$628,244

REASON FOR REQUEST

(Please briefly summarize the reason for this funding request, including the factors that contributed to the need for funding. If your court is applying for a cash advance, please submit a cash flow statement when submitting this application. Please use attachments if additional space is needed.)

Years of underfunding coupled with the ongoing, pro-rata budget cuts this fiscal year totaling nearly \$3.4 million imposed on our court's budget are no longer sustainable. For the past ten years, this court has taken several measures to streamline operations in order to reduce costs and increase efficiencies. We are the only court that has gone through the Court Assistance and Review Team (CART) process. This was the result of our supplemental funding request received in fiscal year 2011 – 2012. However, in spite of all of our efforts in implementing 78% of these recommendations in less than one year, we continue to be in a deficit and need additional funding to support the most critical operations necessary to provide the public with the constitutional services this court is obligated to provide. Although we have taken many actions to mitigate our budget shortfall, implementing additional cuts to meet our deficit will cripple the operations of this court and further diminish access to justice in this county.

The amount requested will eliminate the deficit we face this current fiscal year with no emergency and operating reserve fund balance to cover any unbudgeted financial emergencies. It will allow the court to fully resume processing small claims cases and restore justice to those citizens in San Joaquin county who have been denied their due process.

Section II through Section IV of this form is required to be completed if your court is applying for supplemental funding for urgent needs (unavoidable funding shortfall, unforeseen emergency or unanticipated expenses for existing programs). Please submit attachments to respond to Sections II through Section IV.

SECTION II: TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**A. What would be the consequence to the public and access to justice if your court did not receive the requested funding?**

If this request is not fully funded, our backlogs will continue to grow and we will need to lay off additional staff. Furloughs for all staff will continue and we will not be able to fill any new vacant positions since the last round of lay-offs on August 1, 2012. Our ability to process civil, either limited or unlimited, some family law and probate cases will be affected. Our staffing level today is not sufficient

to process all case types this court is required to hear.

Before October 1, 2011, we had a total of 21 staff in our civil division. After the October 1, 2011 layoffs, we were down to 15 staff. Today, we have a total of 9 staff assigned to our civil division. In less than 1 year, we have had to reduce our civil division 42%.

Since the layoffs on August 1, 2012, our backlog in civil has grown. On August 12, 2012, our backlog in processing civil clerk and court judgments was 622 cases. Today, our backlog has grown to a total of 954 judgments needing to be processed with the oldest cases dating back six months. It is projected that without the needed staff, our backlog will grow by at least 67 cases each month.

In San Joaquin County today, access to justice has already been diminished. With the court closures in Lodi and Tracy, we have reduced access to justice for the citizens of those communities we serve for the case types of traffic, small claims and civil. Today, all citizens needing to use the court for those case types have to travel to as much as 40 miles to our Stockton branch court location.

Furthermore, we are no longer processing small claims cases filed on or after September 1, 2012. As of January 25, 2013, there have been a total of 423 new small claims cases filed, placed in a box with no hearings scheduled. Historically, our small claims monthly filings have been between 237 and 303. Our projected average for the current fiscal year is 223. After we provided notice to the public that we would no longer be processing small claims cases beginning September 1, 2012, in the month of August 2012, we recorded 582 filings in a single month. We believe one factor contributing to the projected reduction in small claims filings in the current year is due to the court's inability to fully process these cases. We also believe that once the court resumes processing small claims cases, there will potentially be an onslaught of filings.

B. What would be the consequence to your court's operations if your court did not receive the requested funding?

Given the number of filings, the caseload and the reduction of staff, the court will not be able to process all case types in a timely manner and some case types will not be processed at all. Family law, civil, small claims, probate, guardianship, conservatorship, and mental health cases will all suffer. Severe backlogs of these case types will occur. There will not be enough staff to process all case types and there will be no justice system for many citizens in San Joaquin County.

Furloughs of all staff will continue and we will not be able to fill new vacancies since the August 1, 2012 lay-offs. On top of insufficient staff levels, when you add furloughs to those staff, you essentially are reducing staff productivity by another 5%. Since FY09-10, our staffing levels have been reduced by 33%.

This court has done everything possible to maintain operations. We will continue to explore and investigate all potential areas for improvements, efficiencies and increases in revenue.

C. What measures will your court take to mitigate the consequences to access to justice and court operations if funding is not approved by the Judicial Council?

Because this court has historically been underfunded, there are no other means or alternatives the court has to mitigate the consequences of access to justice to the public if this request is not approved. Since 2004, this court has taken several measures, as identified in Section III, to mitigate its expenses and stay within budget. The court has and remains good stewards of public funds. If funding is not approved, the court will have to lay off additional staff, which will have a direct impact to access to justice in most case types for the citizens of San Joaquin County.

Our court and our operations have been reviewed. In the last 18 months, we have been before the Judicial Council on four separate occasions: the Audit Report; our Emergency Funding Request; and the Court Assessment and Review Team (CART) and our Supplemental Funding Request of October 26, 2012. Despite our lack of resources, we have worked tirelessly to implement and complete both the audit report and CART recommendations. We have completed 80% of the financial issues identified in the audit report and 78% of the CART recommendations. By the end of the current fiscal year, we anticipate implementing the majority of the remaining CART recommendations.

D. Please provide five years of filing and termination numbers.

Case Type		Fiscal Year				
		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Felony	Filings	7,805	7,608	6,630	6,028	6,185
	Dispositions	7,115	6,833	5,586	5,346	4,814
Misdemeanors	Filings	35,321	37,820	31,983	26,757	24,650
	Dispositions	32,769	37,578	35,947	31,055	21,237
Infractions	Filings	113,158	122,574	116,786	85,285	63,131
	Dispositions	97,460	107,350	103,721	86,483	62,533
Civil Unlimited	Filings	3,196	3,553	3,425	3,153	2,912
	Dispositions	2,601	2,413	2,742	2,973	2,621
Civil Limited	Filings	13,593	17,017	14,593	13,005	10,337
	Dispositions	11,794	12,478	14,696	15,964	10,943
Small Claims	Filings	3,772	3,645	3,567	3,213	2,846
	Dispositions	5,223	2,905	3,162	2,972	2,233
Appeals	Filings	93	88	85	64	69
	Dispositions	106	88	87	71	61
Juvenile Delinquency	Filings	2,415	1,790	1,372	968	917
	Dispositions	2,023	1,793	1,443	929	850
Juvenile Dependency	Filings	491	581	499	510	524
	Dispositions	513	537	431	469	356
Family Law	Filings	9,209	10,700	9,738	8,872	8,137
	Dispositions	8,647	9,144	10,175	8,152	7,486
Probate	Filings	811	769	728	767	789
	Dispositions	684	556	709	592	644
Mental Health	Filings	1,059	1,095	804	775	958
	Dispositions	926	738	962	690	639

SECTION III: REVENUE ENHANCEMENT AND COST CONTROL MEASURES**A. If supplemental funding was received in prior year, please identify amount received and explain why additional funding is again needed in the current fiscal year.**

Our court received \$1.084 million in supplemental funding and \$916,000 as a loan in FY11-12 for a total of \$2 million. Those funds enabled the court to continue processing all case types. We continued to streamline where possible, implementing several CART recommendations, addressing audit issues and were able to end FY11-12 with a fund balance of \$1.3 million and the \$916,000 loan remains in our budget as a liability.

During this court's last visit to the Judicial Council on Friday, October 26, 2012, the Council directed the court to use the loan to "implement CART recommendations and other efficiencies." One of the CART recommendations identified the need of the court to get off of the County's old mainframe case management system and to get on to a newer system (a plan our court has actively been working on for several years). The court has decided to use the loan funds to offset the costs of implementing a new case management system (CMS) for criminal, traffic and juvenile delinquency case processing. The court has had several meetings with the County Administrator's Office and the county's Information Systems Division director to discuss the court's transition away from the county's case management system, Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS). The county charges the court approximately \$1.5 million to \$1.6 million each year for CJIS, a 30 year old CMS written in Cobol.

The court plans on using the statewide Master Services Agreement for CMS vendors that will be negotiated and available for use by the Judicial Branch within the next thirty (30) days. Based on current cost estimates, a newer CMS could cost the court between \$1 million and \$2.6 million. These cost estimates include implementation, software and maintenance, and licensing for five (5) years. Depending on which vendor the court ultimately uses, will determine the final yearly savings to our court. Even if the court chose the highest cost estimate, we would still achieve significant annual/ongoing savings each year. In fact, the savings annually could be as much as \$1.0 million each year. The court believes the transition to a new CMS could take 18 to 24 months, so the immediate savings will not be realized until full deployment of the new CMS.

B. If the request for supplemental funding is not for a one-time concern, the court must include an expenditure/revenue enhancement plan that identifies how the court will resolve its ongoing funding issue.

The court has already reduced expenditures beyond what is reasonable and necessary to process all case types. We have reduced expenses in all line items where the court had control to do so.

In terms of revenue generating, the court has already implemented several new fees this fiscal year and has also implemented a civil assessment program for failure to pay on infractions and some criminal cases. However, because our court faces a deficit this year, to project revenue estimates of these new fees and to try to balance our budget on these fees, should they not be realized, would be a mistake. Should the revenues come in under what was projected and budgeted, this would cause the court to be in a deficit once again. We are better to be conservative in our approach to these new fees especially when our court has already seen a steady decline in the civil assessment revenue we receive for the program we have had in place since 1995. San Joaquin's civil assessment revenue decreased by \$549,797 from \$817,309 in FY2009-10 to \$267,512 in FY2011-12.

The new civil assessment program collections will be done by the court's third party vendor, Municipal Services Bureau (MSB). We are currently in discussions with the county to have all remaining court collections performed by MSB as well. We believe MSB, a true collection agency, is better equipped to handle all court fees and fines collections, than the county's Revenue and Recovery Department.

The court continues to explore all potential areas for savings, be it one-time or on-going. We will implement future cost saving measures in order to lessen the impact of any future budget cuts allocated to this court. For fiscal year 2013-2014 the court has identified several areas where future savings and revenue enhancements may assist the court in its projected budget deficit: court staff reorganization - \$1,386,000; half year savings from new case management system - \$575,000; annual revenue increase from new civil assessment program - \$500,000; negotiations of potential revenue from the county - \$1,250,000; continuation of staff furloughs - \$584,000; full year savings of the layoff of one commissioner - \$234,000. Total savings for this reduction plan is \$4,529,000.

C. What has your court done in the past three fiscal years in terms of revenue enhancement and/or expenditure reductions, including layoffs, furloughs, reduced hours, and court closures?

We have already reduced expenses in every single line item in our operations budget, where the court had control to do so. The following are other actions taken by the court:

1. In FY2004-2005, we replaced sheriff's staff at our weapons screening stations with private security;
2. In FY2004-2005, we replaced sheriff deputies in 3 of our 4 civil courtrooms with private security or court attendants;
3. A commissioner position has been kept vacant since January 2010;
4. The court does not pay for minor's counsel in family law cases;
5. We implemented a hiring freeze in FY2008-2009;
6. Since March of 2010, we closed a courtroom at our Tracy branch court 4 days a week and a courtroom in Stockton 1 day each week;
7. Effective August 3, 2009, we reduced the clerks public counter hours, closing to the public at 3:00 p.m.;
8. In FY2009-2010, our employees took 12 mandatory furlough days and deferred a 3% COLA that had been negotiated 2 years prior;
9. In FY2009-2010, eliminated the payment to attorneys serving as arbitrators in the Judicial Arbitration Program;
10. Since FY2009-2010, all judicial and court staff training was reduced to only those training events that are mandatory;
11. Since FY2009-2010, with the cooperation of the local bar, we reduced the mandatory two psychiatric evaluations to one in the majority of criminal cases;
12. Since FY2009-2010, we redirected the use of asset replacement funds;
13. In FY2010-2011, our employees took 8 mandatory furlough days;
14. In FY2011-2012, our employees took 4 mandatory furlough days;
15. On October 1, 2011, we closed our 2 courtroom, full service courthouse in Tracy;
16. On October 1, 2011, we closed 1 of 2 full service courtrooms at our courthouse in Lodi;
17. On October 1, 2011, we laid off 42 employees;
18. Effective July 1, 2012, unrepresented employees began taking 12 furlough days for FY2012-2013;
19. On August 1, 2012, we laid off 13 employees;
20. As of September 30, 2012, we have a 33% vacancy rate compared to our staffing level of FY2009-2010; our hiring freeze implemented in FY2008-2009 had to change to a "soft hiring freeze." Only 2 critically needed and funded staff have been hired since FY2008-2009;
21. On September 1, 2012, we stopped setting new small claims filings for hearing;
22. On October 1, 2012, we stopped providing court reporters in all 5 of our civil courtrooms;
23. We have scrutinized every single line item in the court's budget and have renegotiated contracts, eliminated coffee, tea and water for jurors, eliminated water for courtrooms, reduced office supplies, no longer purchase post-it notes, reduced the number of parking spaces paid for by the court, reduced the number of court provided cell phones from 8 to 4, reduced the number of vehicles the court leases for official court use to 3, reduced the use of court reporters for cases unless required by statute and we continue to use typewriters for processing our juvenile delinquency cases as we have never had the funds to support the implementation of a computerized case management system.

24. To date, we have implemented 78% of the CART recommendations and expect to complete/implement the majority by the end of the fiscal year.
25. The court has implemented FiServe. This process enables the public to pay traffic citations at retail establishments located throughout our county. This provides a payment alternative to the public especially in those communities where we have closed courthouses.
26. The court began a civil assessment program on failure to pay cases in traffic and some criminal cases on January 7, 2013. Furthermore, these new cases will be sent to one of the Judicial Council's/AOC's statewide master contract vendors for collections, MSB (Municipal Services Bureau).
27. The court will be closing the remaining courtroom/courthouse in Lodi effective March 4, 2013.
28. The court will be laying off one of our commissioners also effective March 4, 2013 – this action will reduce our commissioners by 50%. We will only have 1 AB1058 commissioner and 1 commissioner handling subordinate judicial officer caseload and AB109 cases.

D. Please describe the employee compensation changes (e.g. cost of living adjustments and benefit employee contributions) and staffing levels for past five fiscal years for the court.

FY07-08 Staffing Levels: 299 FTE's

FY07-08: This was our court's 3rd year of SAL Inflation and Workforce funding and because our court has always been one of the most underfunded courts in the state it was also our 3rd year of Workload and Equity funding determined by the RAS model. Because of our historical lack of funding, FY07-08 was the first year that we believed we could address the inequities of our staff's salaries that had been falling behind those of their colleagues for years. It had been 7 years since any equities had been given to court staff and many professional level positions in Finance, Procurement, Human Resources and Information Technology had been added during this time due to increased responsibilities taken on by the Court from the County. In many cases the entry level total compensation for these positions was far below the mean of like positions in other courts of similar size. The Court negotiated a 3.4 year contract in spring of 2007 for the term covering July 1, 2007 through October 31, 2010. One of the terms of this 3 year contract was to conduct a compensation study to determine if equities were appropriate. The court surveyed total compensation packages of all court positions using the 10 courts in the counties specified in our employee/employer MOUs that were agreed upon for this purpose (rolled over from when the court staff were county employees). It is important to note that the 3% COLA given to all staff (except commissioners and interpreters) in FY07-08 was subtracted from the calculated equity increase to determine the net equity percentage given. It has been the practice of this county to only provide salary compensation to raise staff salaries to the median level of those classifications they are compared with.

The following are the equities provided effective January 1, 2008:

- 0% - No equity provided to 11 staff
- 3% equity provided to 43 staff
- 3.5% equity provided to 164.5 staff
- 5% equity provided to 1 staff
- 6% equity provided to 8 staff
- 7% equity provided to 24 staff
- 8% equity provided to 1 staff
- 9.5% equity provided to 1 staff
- 10% equity provided to 12 staff
- 10.5% equity provided to 1 staff
- 11.5% equity provided to 21 staff
- 14% equity provided to 2 staff
- 16.5% equity provided to 8 staff
- 20% equity provided to 2 staff

- 22% equity provided to 1 staff
- 23.5% equity provided to 1 staff

Overall, an average of 5.7% equity was provided to court staff.

FY08-09 Staffing Levels: 334 FTE's

FY08-09: 3% COLA (negotiated in Spring of 2007 as part of a 3-year contract)

FY09-10 Staffing Levels: 336 FTE's

FY09-10: Contract side letter negotiated to defer 3% COLA one year due to allocated budget reductions. Court staff furloughed 1 day per month for 12 months. (COLA was due as part of 3-year contract negotiated in Spring of 2007)

FY10-11 Staffing Levels: 325 FTE's

FY10-11: FY09-10 side letter sunsets restoring 3% COLA that was deferred in FY09-10 and ending furloughs. Court issued 12.75 layoff notices effective 8/13/10. To avoid layoffs, further negotiations resulted in SEIU voting to furlough 1 day per month until the end of the contract beginning January 1, 2010 resulting in 6 furlough days in FY10-11.

FY11-12 Staffing Levels: 310 FTE's

FY11-12: No COLA, 4 furlough days, 42 positions laid off due to insurmountable allocated budget reductions.

FY12-13 Staffing Levels: 250 FTE's

FY12-13: No COLA. Unrepresented employees – 12 furlough days; represented employees – 8 furlough days; 13 staff laid off on August 1, 2012.

SECTION IV: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following:

- A. Current detailed budget projections/estimates for the current fiscal year, budget year and budget year plus one (e.g., if current fiscal year is FY 2012-2013, then budget year would be FY 2013-2014 and budget year plus one would be FY 2014-2015).**

See Attachment A.

- B. Current status of your court's fund balance.**

The court is projecting a negative fund balance in the current fiscal year of \$628,244. With the approval of this supplemental funding request, the court is projecting a fund balance of \$193,603 all of which are restricted funds for statutorily required programs: Alternative Dispute Resolution and Small Claims Advisory Program.

- C. Three-year history of your court's year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures.**

See Attachment B.

- D. If the trial courts' application is for one-time supplemental funding, please explain why a loan would not be appropriate.**

Our court is simply not in a financial position to repay any loan amount. We currently owe the Judicial Council \$916,000 from our Supplemental Funding Request received in FY2011-2012.

E. The most recent audit findings of fiscal issues and the remediation measures taken to address them.

See Attachment C.

Attachment D – Updated CART Recommendation Tracking Document

San Joaquin Superior Court
3 Year Budget Projection
As of December 31, 2012

	As of Dec 31, 2012 FY12-13 Projections	FY13-14 Projection	FY14-15 Projections
REVENUES:			
812110 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-OPERATIONS	(23,407,621)	(22,287,748)	(22,287,748)
812140 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-SMALL CLAIMS - SERVICE BY MAIL	(3,458)	(3,458)	(3,458)
812141 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGE RETURNED	(2,240)	(2,240)	(2,240)
812142 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGE FOR	(400)	(400)	(400)
812144 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-CLERK TRANSCRIPTS ON APPEAL	(26,421)	(26,421)	(26,421)
802125 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-EXTRA COURT REPORTER	(1,500)	(1,500)	(1,500)
812146 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-COPY PREPARATION	(84,172)	(84,172)	(84,172)
812148 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-MANUAL SERCH OF RECORDS OR	(6,720)	(6,720)	(6,720)
812149 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-REIMBURSEMENT OF OTHER COSTS	(49,693)	(49,693)	(49,693)
812151 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10- CUSTODY/VISITATION - MEDIATION	(9,619)	(9,619)	(9,619)
812153 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10- GUARDIANSHIP INVESTIGATIONS	(680)	(680)	(680)
812154 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-INFORMATION PACKAGE FOR	(320)	(320)	(320)
812155 TCTF-PROGRAM 45.10-CONSERVATORSHIP INVESTIGATION	(65,720)	(65,720)	(65,720)
812158 TCTF-PROGRAM 10- CUSTODY/VISITATION - FAMILY	(4,822)	(4,822)	(4,822)
812159 TCTF-10-CIVIL ASSESSMENT	(278,587)	(278,587)	(278,587)
812160 TCTF-10-MICROGRAPHICS	(52,771)	(52,771)	(52,771)
812165 TCTF-PROG 45.10-STEP PARENT ADOPTION INVESTIGATION	(13,912)	(13,912)	(13,912)
812167 GC 77207.5 REPLACE 2%	(201,698)	(201,698)	(201,698)
816111 GENERAL FUND REVENUE	(1,472,902)	(1,161,327)	(1,161,327)
TCTF - PGM 10 OPERATIONS	(25,683,256)	(24,251,808)	(24,251,808)
821123 LOCAL FEE 3	(75,550)	(75,550)	(75,550)
821127 LOCAL FEE 7	(10,246)	(10,246)	(10,246)
821130 LOCAL FEE 10	(666)	(666)	(666)
821131 LOCAL FEE 11	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
821132 LOCAL FEE 12	(408)	(408)	(408)
821182 PC1205d STAY FEE	(3,990)	(3,990)	(3,990)
821190 VC11205m TRAFFIC SCHOOL	(31,600)	(31,600)	(31,600)
821191 VC40508.6 DMV HISTORY/PRIORS	(66,836)	(66,836)	(66,836)
LOCAL FEES REVENUE	(199,296)	(199,296)	(199,296)
821201 ENHANCED COLLECTIONS (CIVIL ASSESSMENT)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)
821202 ENHANCED COLLECTIONS (OTHER)	(121,941)	(121,941)	(121,941)
ENHANCED COLLECTIONS - REVENUE	(146,941)	(146,941)	(146,941)
822102 NON-FEE REV 2	(1,225)	(1,225)	(1,225)
LOCAL NON-FEES REVENUE	(1,225)	(1,225)	(1,225)
823001 MISC REVENUE	(7,628)	(7,628)	(7,628)
823002 ESCHEATMENT REVENUE	(91,945)	(25,000)	(25,000)
OTHER - REVENUE	(99,573)	(32,628)	(32,628)
825010 INTEREST INCOME	(11,842)	(11,842)	(11,842)
INTEREST INCOME	(11,842)	(11,842)	(11,842)
TRIAL COURT REVENUE SOURCES	(26,142,133)	(24,643,740)	(24,643,740)
831010 GF-AB2030/AB2695 SERVICE OF PROCESSING	(31,845)	(31,845)	(31,845)
831012 GF-PRISONER HEARING COST	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)
GENERAL FUND - MOU/REIMBURSEMENTS	(159,845)	(159,845)	(159,845)
832010 TCTF MOU REIMBURSEMENTS	(110,009)	(110,009)	(110,009)
832011 TCTF-PGM 45.10-JURY	(265,000)	(265,000)	(265,000)
832012 TCTF-PGM 45.10-CAC	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
832013 TCTF-PGM 45.10-ELDER ABUSE	(13,598)	(13,598)	(13,598)
PROGRAM 45.10 - MOU/REIMBURSEMENTS	(438,607)	(438,607)	(438,607)
834010 PROGRAM 45.45-COURT INTERPRETER	(1,178,977)	(1,178,977)	(1,178,977)
PROGRAM 45.45 - REIMBURSEMENTS	(1,178,977)	(1,178,977)	(1,178,977)
837010 IMPROVEMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	(93,925)	(93,925)	(93,925)
IMPROVEMENT FUND - REIMBURSEMENTS	(93,925)	(93,925)	(93,925)
838010 AB1058 GRANTS	(998,910)	(998,910)	(998,910)
838020 OTHER AOC GRANTS	(27,516)	(27,516)	(27,516)
AOC GRANTS - REIMBURSEMENTS	(1,026,426)	(1,026,426)	(1,026,426)
839010 NON-AOC GRANTS	(918,834)	(918,834)	(918,834)

ATTACHMENT A

**San Joaquin Superior Court
3 Year Budget Projection
As of December 31, 2012**

NON-AOC GRANTS - REIMBURSEMENTS

841010 SMALL CLAIMS ADVISORY

841011 DISPUTE RESOLUTION

841012 GRAND JURY

841015 OTHER COUNTY SERVICES

COUNTY PROGRAM - RESTRICTED FUNDS

861010 CIVIL JURY REIMBURSEMENT

861011 MISCELLANEOUS REIMBURSEMENTS

REIMBURSEMENTS - OTHER

TRIAL COURT REIMBURSEMENTS

PRIOR YEAR ADJ REV

TOTAL REVENUE

	As of Dec 31, 2012 FY12-13 Projections	FY13-14 Projection	FY14-15 Projections
	(918,834)	(918,834)	(918,834)
	(30,500)	(30,500)	(30,500)
	(146,000)	(146,000)	(146,000)
	(105,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)
	(390,089)	(390,089)	(390,089)
	(671,589)	(671,589)	(671,589)
	(63,200)	(63,200)	(63,200)
	(20,366)	(20,366)	(20,366)
	(83,566)	(83,566)	(83,566)
	(4,571,769)	(4,571,769)	(4,571,769)
	(25,013)	-	-
	(30,738,915)	(29,215,509)	(29,215,509)

ATTACHMENT A

San Joaquin Superior Court
3 Year Budget Projection
As of December 31, 2012

Attachment C-1

	As of Dec 31, 2012 FY12-13 Projections	FY13-14 Projection	FY14-15 Projections
EXPENDITURES:			
SALARIES - STAFF	15,605,346	15,840,041	15,840,041
SALARIES - JUDICIAL OFFICERS	449,730	449,730	449,730
TOTAL SALARIES	16,055,076	16,289,771	16,289,771
TAX	1,140,628	1,158,582	1,158,582
HEALTH INSURANCE	3,180,585	3,180,585	3,180,585
RETIREMENT	4,632,711	4,632,711	4,632,711
WORKERS' COMPENSATION	283,420	283,420	283,420
OTHER INSURANCE	122,556	123,964	123,964
OTHER BENEFITS	8,694	8,694	8,694
TOTAL BENEFITS	9,368,594	9,387,957	9,387,957
SALARY SAVINGS - BUDGET ONLY	-	-	-
TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	25,423,670	25,677,727	25,677,727
LABORATORY EXPENSE	10,502	10,502	10,502
FEES/PERMITS	222,987	222,987	222,987
DUES AND MEMBERSHIPS	5,167	5,167	5,167
OFFICE EXPENSE	90,324	90,324	90,324
ADVERTISING	1,225	1,225	1,225
MEETINGS, CONFERENCES, EXHIBITS	21,690	21,690	21,690
LIBRARY PURCHASES AND SUBSCRIPTIONS	215,469	215,469	215,469
PHOTOGRAPHY	70	70	70
MINOR_EQUIPMENT - UNDER \$5K	46,542	46,542	46,542
EQUIPMENT RENTAL/LEASE	23,411	23,411	23,411
EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	47,255	47,255	47,255
EQUIPMENT REPAIRS	29,700	29,700	29,700
GENERAL EXPENSE - SERVICE	12,656	12,656	12,656
GENERAL EXPENSE	726,998	726,998	726,998
PRINTING	84,041	84,041	84,041
PRINTING	84,041	84,041	84,041
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	341,323	341,323	341,323
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	341,323	341,323	341,323
STAMPS, STAMPED ENVELOPES, POSTCARDS	235,326	235,326	235,326
POSTAGE	235,326	235,326	235,326
INSURANCE	10,129	10,129	10,129
INSURANCE	10,129	10,129	10,129
TRAVEL	70,476	70,476	70,476
TRAVEL	70,476	70,476	70,476
TRAINING	2,844	2,844	2,844
TRAINING	2,844	2,844	2,844
SECURITY	730,175	730,175	730,175
SECURITY	730,175	730,175	730,175
RENT/LEASE	270,360	270,360	270,360
JANITORIAL	162,308	162,308	162,308
MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLIES	9,200	9,200	9,200
ALTERATION	1,500	1,500	1,500
OTHER FACILITY COSTS - GOODS	7,450	7,450	7,450
FACILITY OPERATIONS	450,818	450,818	450,818
UTILITIES	41,691	41,691	41,691
UTILITIES	41,691	41,691	41,691
GENERAL CONSULTANT AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	614,551	767,977	767,977
COURT INTERPRETER SERVICES	251,979	251,979	251,979
COURT REPORTER SERVICES	21,326	21,326	21,326
COURT TRANSCRIPTS	401,260	401,260	401,260
COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL CHARGES	50,000	50,000	50,000
INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES	458	458	458
COURT ORDERED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	450,145	450,145	450,145
MEDIATORS / ARBITRATORS	146,000	146,000	146,000

ATTACHMENT A

San Joaquin Superior Court
3 Year Budget Projection
As of December 31, 2012

Attachment C-1

	As of Dec 31, 2012 FY12-13 Projections	FY13-14 Projection	FY14-15 Projections
COLLECTION SERVICES	68,100	68,100	68,100
LEGAL	30,500	30,500	30,500
OTHER CONTRACT SERVICES - ARMORED CAR	17,300	17,300	17,300
CONTRACTED SERVICES	2,051,619	2,205,045	2,205,045
SHERIFF -AB2030/AB2695	31,845	31,845	31,845
COUNTY-PROVIDED SERVICES	1,728,653	1,728,653	1,728,653
CONSULTING AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	1,760,498	1,760,498	1,760,498
IT MAINTENANCE	10,628	10,628	10,628
IT COMMERCIAL CONTRACT	83,104	83,104	83,104
IT REPAIRS/SUPPLIES/LICENSE	59,834	59,834	59,834
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)	153,566	153,566	153,566
MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	-	-
MAJOR EQUIPMENT (OVER \$5,000)	-	-	-
VEHICLE OPERATIONS	20,000	20,000	20,000
CASHIER SHORTAGES	588	588	588
OTHER ITEMS OF EXPENSE	20,588	20,588	20,588
OPERATING EXPENSES AND EQUIPMENT	6,680,092	6,833,518	6,833,518
JURY COSTS	328,200	328,200	328,200
JURY COSTS	328,200	328,200	328,200
GRAND JURY COSTS	65,328	65,328	65,328
OTHER	65,328	65,328	65,328
SPECIAL ITEMS OF EXPENSE	393,528	393,528	393,528
DEPT INDIRECT ALLOC	-	-	-
PRIOR YEAR ADJ EXP	(741)	-	-
EXPENSES	32,496,549	32,904,773	32,904,773
Total	1,757,634	3,689,264	3,689,264
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	1,323,188	(628,049)	(4,510,917)
RESTRICTED FUNDS	193,603	193,603	193,603
CHANGE TO FUND BALANCE	(1,757,634)	(3,689,264)	(3,689,264)
ENDING FUND BALANCE	(628,049)	(4,510,917)	(8,393,784)

Note: In FY 12-13 Court laid off 13 employees effective 08-01-12. Unrepresented employees resumed furloughs in July, 1 day per month, for 12 months. Represented employees began furloughs 12/17/12. Assumes all furloughs end March 11, 2013. FY13-14 assumes no furloughs. FY12-13 assumes rehiring of 11 LPCs and 1 Deputy CEO

ATTACHMENT B

San Joaquin County Superior Court
Revenue, Expense and Fund Balance History
Fiscal Years FY09-10, FY10-11 and FY11-12

GL ACCOUNTS	11/12 YTD 2011	10/11 YTD 2010	09/10 YTD 2009
** 812100-TCTF - PGM 10 OPERATIONS	\$ (27,806,164)	\$ (38,248,019)	\$ (37,574,502)
** 816000-OTHER STATE RECEIPTS	\$ (813,169)	\$ -	\$ -
** 821000-LOCAL FEES REVENUE	\$ (216,056)	\$ (261,706)	\$ (269,131)
** 821200-ENHANCED COLLECTIONS - REVENUE	\$ (140,419)	\$ (160,376)	\$ (146,073)
** 822000-LOCAL NON-FEES REVENUE	\$ (2,044)	\$ (89,390)	\$ (51,731)
** 823000-OTHER - REVENUE	\$ (22,675)	\$ (32,302)	\$ (87,818)
** 825000-INTEREST INCOME	\$ (161,858)	\$ (34,697)	\$ (79,092)
** 831000-GENERAL FUND - MOU/REIMBURSEMENTS	\$ (205,755)	\$ (197,050)	\$ (181,916)
** 832000-PROGRAM 45.10 - MOU/REIMBURSEMENT	\$ (527,524)	\$ (630,610)	\$ (621,414)
** 833000-PROGRAM 45.25 - REIMBURSEMENTS	\$ (137,750)	\$ (240,936)	\$ (304,000)
** 834000-PROGRAM 45.45 - REIMBURSEMENTS	\$ (1,249,581)	\$ (1,318,458)	\$ (1,451,865)
** 835000-PROGRAM 45.55 - REIMBURSEMENTS	\$ (554)	\$ (30,927)	\$ (2,562)
** 836000-MODERNIZATION FUND - REIMBURSEMEN	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
** 837000-IMPROVEMENT FUND - REIMBURSEMENTS	\$ (1,172,977)	\$ (76,695)	\$ (73,820)
** 838000-AOC GRANTS - REIMBURSEMENTS	\$ (981,338)	\$ (1,073,523)	\$ (1,151,892)
** 839000-NON-AOC GRANTS - REIMBURSEMENTS	\$ (1,475,474)	\$ (1,041,148)	\$ (388,963)
** 840000-COUNTY PROGRAM - RESTRICTED FUNDS	\$ (550,850)	\$ (652,934)	\$ (586,473)
** 860000-REIMBURSEMENTS - OTHER	\$ (73,378)	\$ (59,904)	\$ (60,098)
** 890000-PRIOR YEAR REVENUE	\$ (13,820)	\$ 139,901	\$ 1,155
**** REVENUE TOTAL	\$ (35,551,386)	\$ (44,008,772)	\$ (43,030,195)
900301 SALARIES - PERMANENT	\$ 16,508,342	\$ 18,267,741	\$ 17,699,003
900320 LUMP SUM PAYOUTS	\$ 264,558	\$ 59,239	\$ 87,541
900350 FURLOUGH & SALARY REDUCTION SAVINGS (NON	\$ (243,504)	\$ (565,550)	\$ (823,302)
900351 FURLOUGH CLOSURE (NON-JUDICIAL OFFICERS)	\$ 243,504	\$ 565,550	\$ 823,302
903301 TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES - ON P/R	\$ 320,038	\$ 157,928	\$ 192,053
906303 SALARIES - COMMISSIONERS	\$ 457,664	\$ 457,664	\$ 520,582
906311 SALARIES - SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES	\$ 128,214	\$ 271,658	\$ 269,111
906350 FURLOUGH SAVINGS - COMMISSIONER	\$ 17	\$ -	\$ (25,342)
906351 FURLOUGH CLOSURE - COMMISSIONER	\$ (17)	\$ -	\$ 25,342
908301 OVERTIME	\$ 137	\$ 1,484	\$ 2,837
** SALARIES TOTAL	\$ 17,678,953	\$ 19,215,715	\$ 18,771,126
910301 SOCIAL SECURITY INS & MEDICARE - OASDI	\$ 1,011,332	\$ 1,093,221	\$ 1,071,085
910302 MEDICARE TAX	\$ 239,383	\$ 257,930	\$ 254,638
910401 DENTAL INSURANCE	\$ 181,738	\$ 201,508	\$ 211,492
910501 MEDICAL INSURANCE	\$ 3,141,931	\$ 3,231,497	\$ 3,152,095
910503 RETIREE BENEFIT	\$ 277,450	\$ 212,341	\$ 260,486
910601 RETIREMENT (NON-JUDICIAL OFFICERS)	\$ 4,448,031	\$ 4,742,864	\$ 4,301,204
912301 RETIREMENT (SUBORDINATE AND JUDICIAL OFF	\$ 128,020	\$ 120,938	\$ 130,135
912501 STATUTORY WORKERS COMPENSATION	\$ 332,399	\$ 322,754	\$ 273,972
913301 UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	\$ 94,729	\$ 54,007	\$ 51,291
913501 LIFE INSURANCE	\$ 14,943	\$ 15,465	\$ 17,071
913601 VISION CARE INSURANCE	\$ 27,308	\$ 30,410	\$ 31,798
913701 OTHER JUDGES BENEFITS	\$ 1,603	\$ 3,504	\$ 4,831
913850 BENEFIT REDUCTION SAVINGS	\$ (20,088)	\$ (45,045)	\$ (67,467)
913851 BENEFIT REDUCTION	\$ 20,088	\$ 45,045	\$ 67,467

ATTACHMENT B

San Joaquin County Superior Court
 Revenue, Expense and Fund Balance History
 Fiscal Years FY09-10, FY10-11 and FY11-12

GL ACCOUNTS	11/12 YTD 2011	10/11 YTD 2010	09/10 YTD 2009
913899 OTHER BENEFITS	\$ 9,866	\$ 14,766	\$ 18,924
** STAFF BENEFITS TOTAL	\$ 9,908,733	\$ 10,301,205	\$ 9,779,021
*** PERSONAL SERVICES TOTAL	\$ 27,587,686	\$ 29,516,920	\$ 28,550,148
* 920200 - LABORATORY EXPENSE	\$ 3,719	\$ 2,969	\$ 12,624
* 920300 - FEES/PERMITS	\$ 268,163	\$ 244,698	\$ 255,913
* 920500 - DUES AND MEMBERSHIPS	\$ 5,933	\$ 6,415	\$ 5,557
* 920600 - OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 76,514	\$ 96,248	\$ 106,666
* 921500 - ADVERTISING	\$ 1,217	\$ 1,794	\$ 212
* 921700 - MEETINGS, CONFERENCES, EXHI	\$ 28,504	\$ 27,667	\$ 27,499
* 922300 - LIBRARY PURCHASES AND SUBSC	\$ 181,325	\$ 192,922	\$ 168,128
* 922500 - PHOTOGRAPHY	\$ 37	\$ 75	\$ -
* 922600 - MINOR EQUIPMENT - UNDER \$5K	\$ 22,023	\$ 21,579	\$ 73,973
* 922700 - EQUIPMENT RENTAL/LEASE	\$ 12,573	\$ 19,228	\$ 29,903
* 922800 - EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	\$ 41,582	\$ 52,995	\$ 38,532
* 922900 - EQUIPMENT REPAIRS	\$ 30,716	\$ 33,669	\$ 339
* 923900 - GENERAL EXPENSE - SERVICE	\$ 2,150	\$ 3,875	\$ 3,470
* 924500 - PRINTING	\$ 75,761	\$ 180,534	\$ 205,300
* 925100 - TELECOMMUNICATIONS	\$ 318,752	\$ 358,285	\$ 381,399
* 926200 - STAMPS, STAMPED ENVELOPES,	\$ 209,456	\$ 228,241	\$ 256,727
* 928800 - INSURANCE	\$ 9,544	\$ 9,919	\$ 9,787
* 929200 - TRAVEL- IN STATE	\$ 58,395	\$ 32,841	\$ 29,790
* 933100 - TRAINING	\$ 2,020	\$ 8,080	\$ 4,349
* 934500 - SECURITY	\$ 733,463	\$ 9,686,134	\$ 7,774,488
* 935200 - RENT/LEASE	\$ 270,360	\$ 270,399	\$ 270,389
* 935300 - JANITORIAL	\$ 163,622	\$ 180,982	\$ 178,682
* 935400 - MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLIES	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ 292
* 935600 - ALTERATION	\$ 2,920	\$ -	\$ -
* 935700 - OTHER FACILITY COSTS - GOODS	\$ 116	\$ 513	\$ 293
* 935800 - OTHER FACILITY COSTS - SERV	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -
* 936100 -UTILITIES	\$ 32,089	\$ -	\$ 804
* 938300 - GENERAL CONSULTANT AND PROF	\$ 775,264	\$ 858,305	\$ 685,882
* 938500 - COURT INTERPRETER SERVICES	\$ 295,080	\$ 548,713	\$ 650,189
* 938600 - COURT REPORTER SERVICES	\$ 96,875	\$ 124,803	\$ 112,575
* 938700 - COURT TRANSCRIPTS	\$ 457,639	\$ 463,801	\$ 563,754
* 938800 - COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL CHA	\$ 46,115	\$ 67,175	\$ 72,346
* 938900 - INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES	\$ 136	\$ 324	\$ 523
* 939000 - COURT ORDERED PROFESSIONAL	\$ 795,927	\$ 370,952	\$ 437,234
* 939100 - MEDIATORS/ARBITRATORS	\$ 146,000	\$ 145,836	\$ 157,611
* 939200 - COLLECTION SERVICES	\$ 94,139	\$ 83,241	\$ 96,656
* 939400 - LEGAL	\$ 30,500	\$ 42,842	\$ 30,228
* 939800 - OTHER CONTRACT SERVICES	\$ 17,102	\$ 20,934	\$ 21,368
* 941100 - SHERIFF	\$ 31,845	\$ 28,923	\$ 26,578
* 942100 - COUNTY-PROVIDED SERVICES	\$ 1,867,075	\$ 1,712,498	\$ 1,813,365
* 943200 - IT MAINTENANCE	\$ 8,876	\$ 8,100	\$ 21,569
* 943300 - IT COMMERCIAL CONTRACT	\$ 130,345	\$ 114,368	\$ 136,918
* 943500 - IT REPAIRS/SUPPLIES/LICENSE	\$ 93,765	\$ 120,068	\$ 150,602
* 946600 - MAJOR EQUIPMENT	\$ 47,962	\$ -	\$ -

ATTACHMENT B

San Joaquin County Superior Court
Revenue, Expense and Fund Balance History
Fiscal Years FY09-10, FY10-11 and FY11-12

GL ACCOUNTS	11/12 YTD 2011	10/11 YTD 2010	09/10 YTD 2009
* 952300 - VEHICLE OPERATIONS	\$ 19,641	\$ 22,756	\$ 16,343
* 952500 - CASH DIFFERENCES	\$ 546	\$ -	\$ 616
*** OPERATING EXPENSE AND EQUIPMENT TTL	\$ 7,506,089	\$ 16,393,701	\$ 14,829,476
** JURY COSTS TOTAL	\$ 313,643	\$ 406,515	\$ 394,535
* 971000 - OTHER-SPECIAL ITEMS OF EXPENSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
* 972001 - JUDGMENTS, SETTLEMENTS AND	\$ -	\$ 4,318	\$ -
* 972200 - GRAND JURY COSTS	\$ 65,224	\$ 155,576	\$ 94,866
** OTHER TOTAL	\$ 65,224	\$ 159,894	\$ 94,866
*** PRIOR YEAR EXPENSE ADJUSTMENTS TOTAL	\$ (11,244)	\$ 5,430	\$ 438
**** EXPENSES TOTAL	\$ 35,461,399	\$ 46,482,460	\$ 43,869,463
*** 701100 OPERATING TRANSFERS IN	\$ (11,809)	\$ (377,327)	\$ (70,570)
*** 701200 OPERATING TRANSFERS OUT	\$ 11,809	\$ 377,327	\$ 70,570
**** OTHER FINANCIAL SOURCES (USES)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
***** REV & EXP	\$ (89,987)	\$ 2,473,688	\$ 839,269
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$ 1,323,187	\$ 1,233,200	\$ 3,706,888

ATTACHMENT C
 San Joaquin County Superior Court
 Comprehensive Audit Finding Summary
 As of 1/28/13

	Number of Issues	%
As of 1/28/13		
Completed Issues	110	71%
Incomplete Issues	46	29%
	<u>156</u>	<u>100%</u>

Letter from AOC - John Judnick as of October 28, 2011

Completed	32	21%
Incomplete	124	79%
	<u>156</u>	<u>100%</u>

Since October 28, 2011, we have completed an additional 77 items. We still have 30% to complete, however these include items such needing new facilities and money for purchasing IT software and supplies.

Financial Issues		
Total Accounting, Payroll and Procurement Issues		
Total Accounting Issues	83	
Issues Resolved	66	80%
Incomplete Issues	17	20%
		<u>100%</u>

Incomplete Financial Issues - Finance; Payroll and Procurement as of 9/30/12

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets	2.1	4	The Court Needs to Improve Its Payroll Processing Practices The County mails checks and paystubs to Court employees' homes rather than providing checks and paystubs to the Court for physical distribution to each Court employee. Consequently, the Court risks making payments to fictitious employees.	1		The County Auditor's office processes our payroll and paychecks. It is the County's policy that paychecks must either be electronically deposited to the employee's bank or financial institution, or the paycheck must be mailed via US Postal Service to their home address. The County does not physically distribute any payroll checks so the Court will not be able to comply with the recommendation to have the County deliver to the Court employee's checks for physical distribution. However, the Court's Senior Human Resources Analyst will print out a list of all court staff from the Court's position control list and match the list with the names on payroll at least quarterly to ensure that the names are legitimate court staff.	HR Manager	When we stop using the County to process our Payroll
3 Fund Accounting			No issues to report.					
5 Cash Collections	5.1		The Court Needs to Improve Its Control and Oversight over Handwritten Receipts					
	5.2		The Court Needs to Strengthen Its Cash Handling Procedures					
	6.3		The Court Needs to Improve Its Calculations and Distributions of Court Collections					
	15		For the three DUI and Reckless Driving cases reviewed, the 20% State Surcharge was derived from the reduced base fine rather than the original base fine causing the 20% State Surcharge to be understated.	1		We agree with the audit findings and are currently working with the County to make the recommended distribution corrections to address items 1 through 11. In addition, over the next several months we will be reviewing other court collection case types to ensure we are complying with the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule. We would like to note that the Court uses the County's case management system (AMOS) for traffic and criminal distributions. AMOS is a 25+ year old case management system that is out dated and inflexible. As a result, making complicated distribution changes is difficult, time consuming and sometimes impossible. If County programmers are unable to make mandated legislative changes to distributions in the system, court and county accounting staff must create Excel spreadsheets to do the more complicated second and sometimes third distributions.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	The Court's CMS is not configured to calculate the 30% railroad fine distribution pursuant to PC 1463.12.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE	
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets									
		15	For one of the two child seat cases reviewed, the Court transposed the education program and loaner program distribution percentages.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	For the one unattended child case reviewed, there is no evidence of the 70/15/15 split pursuant to VC 15630, causing the County distribution, and ultimately the 50/50 MOE, to be overstated.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	The Court's State/County domestic violence fee distribution is 67%/33% instead of 66.67%/33.33%, thereby understating the State distribution by \$1.33 for each domestic violence fee assessed.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	For the one Health and Safety case reviewed, the 75%/25% split pursuant to H&S 11502 is not evident.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	For the one Fish and Game case reviewed, the \$15 Secret Witness penalty pursuant to F&G 12021 was not assessed.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	For one of the two red light cases reviewed, the ICNA portion of the State Court Facilities Construction Fund distribution was not reduced by the 30% red light allocation pursuant to PC 1463.11. Also, the two DNA penalty assessments are overstated by \$1 each.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	For the second red light case reviewed, the Court incorrectly included the 20% State Surcharge in calculating the 30% red light allocation pursuant to VC 42007.3.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	For the three traffic violator school cases reviewed, the Court does not include the DNA penalty assessments pursuant to GC 76104.6 and GC 76140.7 in its distribution of the traffic violator school fee assessed pursuant to VC 42007.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		15	For the one child seat traffic school case reviewed, the Court distributed the base fine and penalty assessments to the code used for traffic school cases. However, child seat traffic school cases are distributed the same as a child seat bail forfeiture case.	1		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
		Log	In 4 of 15 cases reviewed, the variance between the actual total bail and the standard total bail was not prorated among the penalty assessments causing the base fine distribution to the county and city, as well as the 20% State Surcharge, to be either understated or overstated.	1		We agree with the findings. We are working with the County to correct these errors.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013	
	9 Procurement								
		9.1		The Court Can Further Improve Its Procurement Practices					
	10 Contracts								

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets		Log	Two contracts related to court security contained a contractor termination clause other than for cause.	1		Yes, these contracts were developed prior to the Court & County separation and have remained in effect. At present the Court has good relationships with both entities and determined that the other than cause clause would not adversely affect these relationships or cause the Court harm; however, the Business Services Manager will evaluate the clause with the Court's CEO to determine if a change is necessary.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	The MOU related to providing space for the Self-Help Center did not contain a contract change clause or a confidentiality clause.	1		This MOU will be reviewed and discussed with the Court's CEO to determine if any changes need to be made.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	Access to contract, bid, and vendor files is not limited to minimize the potential for misplaced or lost files.	1		Due to facility restraints, the Court has minimal secure filling space for contract, bid and vendor files. The new courthouse scheduled to be completed in 2015 will address this issue. In the interim, the Court will seek avenues to minimize access to these files.	Business Services Manager	December 2015 - when new courthouse is built
		Log	The Court acknowledged that its MOU with the County does not include costs of services provided or anticipated service outcomes as required by Government Code §77212(d)(1).	1		This is correct. This issue memo log will be discussed with the Court's CEO to determine any changes the CEO desires.	Business Services Manager	December 2012 - working with AOC Audit division
11 Accounts Payable	11.1		The Court Should Strengthen Its Petty Cash Procedures					
	11.2		Court Travel and Business Meal Expense Reimbursement Procedures Need Improvement					
		Log	Accounts payable files for one of 30 invoices reviewed did not contain purchase agreements; therefore, we were unable to determine whether payments were made in accordance with a purchase agreement.	1		The Court agrees that one invoice did not contain a purchase agreement. The Court will work to develop a purchase agreement with the City of Stockton for our employee parking. The City has not wanted to do this in the past.	CFO	The parking garage changed ownership. Working on agreement, will be completed 12/31/12
13 Audits			No issues to report.					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets	2.1	4	The Court needs to improve its Payroll Processing Practices. The Court does not require all of its employees to submit a supervisor-approved timesheet regardless of whether the employee used leave time. Consequently, the Court risks paying employees for time not worked.		C	The Court established a new policy requiring employees to complete and sign the time off request (timesheet) and submit it to their supervisor or manager for approval. The supervisor or manager will sign the timesheet after reviewing and ensuring the timesheet is complete and the information accurate. The Court Human Resources Technician (payroll processor) will ensure the timesheet has been approved by the supervisor or manager prior to posting the time into the payroll system. The Senior Human Resources Analyst will review the system payroll data for accuracy before the County Auditor's Office records payroll for distribution to Court employees.	Human Resources Manager	November 2010
		4	Out of our sample of 10 regular full-time employees, one, a court commissioner, did not turn in a timesheet to document leave taken as required by the Court's Personnel Rules.		C	See response above.	Human Resources (HR) Manager	November 2010
		4	The Court does not always document prior approval of all overtime worked.		C	Currently all overtime requests must be approved by the Court Executive Officer prior to a supervisor or manager allowing staff to work overtime. Timesheets have been modified to include a box that supervisors or managers must check indicating overtime was approved prior to allowing the employee to work overtime. Courtroom staff can work overtime without prior approval pursuant to the Court's Personnel Rules. In this case, court runs late into the lunch hour or after normal work hours. Courtroom staff must complete a timesheet indicating the overtime hours (or minutes) they worked and submit the timesheet to their supervisor or manager to verify court ran over. The supervisor or manager will initial the timesheet indicating the overtime is approved before submitting the timesheet to payroll for processing.	HR Manager	November 2010
		4	The County mails checks and paystubs to Court employees' homes rather than providing checks and paystubs to the Court for physical distribution to each Court employee. Consequently, the Court risks making payments to fictitious employees.	I		The County Auditor's office processes our payroll and paychecks. It is the County's policy that paychecks must either be electronically deposited to the employee's bank or financial institution, or the paycheck must be mailed via US Postal Service to their home address. The County does not physically distribute any payroll checks so the Court will not be able to comply with the recommendation to have the County deliver to the Court employee's checks for physical distribution. However, the Court's Senior Human Resources Analyst will print out a list of all court staff from the Court's position control list and match the list with the names on payroll at least quarterly to ensure that the names are legitimate court staff.	HR Manager	When we stop using the County to process our Payroll
3 Fund Accounting			No issues to report.					
4 Accounting Principles and Practices		Log	The Court is not calculating janitorial costs correctly for the Child Support Commissioner Program (CSC) grant. Specifically, the Court is not applying the CSC occupancy percentage to the Court's total janitorial cost prior to applying the percentage for partially reimbursable operating expenses.		C	The court will document the calculation used to allocate janitorial costs to the Child Support Commissioner Program (CSC) grant. The calculation will be based on occupancy percentage and applied to the total janitorial cost prior to the application of the percentage for partially reimbursable operating expenses.	Chief Financial Officer (CFO)	July 2010

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets								
5 Cash Collections	5.1		The Court Needs to Improve Its Control and Oversight over Handwritten Receipts Supervisor does not secure the manual receipt book when not in use.					
		I			C	Securing handwritten receipt books - The court agrees there is an issue with the securing of handwritten receipt books at some of our court locations. We will require managers and supervisors to secure and maintain physical custody of the handwritten receipt books when not in use.	CFO	November 2010
		I			C	Missing receipts, out of sequence receipts, completion of pertinent information on receipts and the timely entering of hand written receipts into CMS issues - The Court agrees with issue 2 and will implement the audit recommendations. We will require managers and/or supervisors to review at least quarterly the handwritten receipt books to ensure all receipts are accounted for. When the CMS goes down, handwritten receipt books will be issued to staff and subsequently returned to the manager and/or supervisor when the CMS is restored to use. The manager and/or supervisor will review the books when returned to ensure the receipts were issued in sequential order, that staff completed receipts with all pertinent information and that receipts are entered into the CMS no later than 1 business day following the day the CMS system was restored to use. When discrepancies are discovered, they will be discussed immediately with staff, documented and retained with the receipt book for audit purposes.	CFO	November 2010
		I			C	Manual receipts used out of sequence.	CFO	November 2010
		I			C	Manual receipts not always completed with all relevant information.	CFO	November 2010
		I			C	Court location could not determine the amount of money collected due to a manual receipt not noting a case number or the dollar amount paid.	CFO	November 2010
		I			C	Manual receipts not always posted timely in CMS.	CFO	November 2010
		I			C	Manual receipts used for reasons other than when CMS is down.	CFO	November 2010
		I			C	Using handwritten receipts for instances other than CMS being down - The Court agrees that handwritten receipts should not be used except when CMS is down. The instances where the court has used handwritten receipts and our responses are as follows: 1. Victim Restitution - After investigating the handwritten receipt the auditor found that prompted this finding, our manager over criminal found it was a payment that was taken in the courtroom at the request of a judge 2 years ago. This was an isolated event. I met with one of our courtroom supervisors and she will remind staff that the court does not have a mechanism to collect and disburse victim restitution. Also, with handwritten receipts secured by only managers and/or supervisors, they would be aware of this situation if it happened in the future and would instruct the clerk and/or judge in the proper procedure. 2. UD Writs - We have reiterated with staff that hand written receipts are only to be used when the CMS system is down. Also, with handwritten receipts secured by only managers and/or supervisors, they would be aware of this situation if it happened in the future and would instruct the clerk in the proper procedure.	CFO	November 2010 January 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets						<p>3. Juror Sanctions – This issue arose because jurors would come to the counter to pay right from court after being sanctioned, before a JUR case had been opened in our CMS (V3). Because V3 will not let a receipt be issued until a case is opened, staff would issue a handwritten receipt. A new procedure has been developed and implemented that allows a clerk at the counter to open the JUR case and issue a receipt in V3 thus preventing the use of handwritten receipts.</p> <p>4. Payments needing judicial review prior to filing – Our staff have been told that handwritten receipts are only to be issued in the event a CMS is down. Using handwritten receipts for payments needing judicial review prior to filing may have been an access and/or training issue so we are enforcing the rule that handwritten receipts be secured by only managers and/or supervisors. If receipt books have to be obtained from the manager or supervisor it gives them an opportunity to review the situations and train clerks in the correct procedures thus avoiding the use of handwritten receipts.</p> <p>5. Trust payments associated with different locations – Our staff have been told that handwritten receipts are only to be issued in the event a CMS is down. To avoid turning away customers wanting to establish trust for another location as much as possible, we have given the manager and supervisor Global Accounting access to our traffic CMS (Amos) which enables them to establish trusts for other locations. If by chance the supervisor or manager is not there, if the customer pays with a check, their canceled check is their receipt. If they want to pay in cash, staff will instruct the customer to go pay at the correct location.</p>		
	5.2		The Court Needs to Strengthen Its Cash Handling Procedures Cashiers share the same cash bag when taking payments.				CFO	March 2011
	3		No evidence of supervisory review of cashiers' beginning cash.				CFO	March 2011
	3		Court location does not always retain the original voided receipts.				CFO	March 2011
	3		The Void Payment Acknowledgement Form is not always sign-approved or retained to support voided transactions.				CFO	March 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEWO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets								
		3	Inconsistent supervisory review and approval of void transactions. As a result, our review of voided transactions revealed that a LPC II, rather than a manager, supervisor, or LPC III, voided transactions at one location, an LPC III voided 10 of their own transactions and a LPC II, rather than a manager, supervisor, or LPC III, voided another transaction at another location, and a LPC I, instead of a manager, supervisor, or LPC III, voided transactions at a third location.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	No evidence of supervisory review of cashiers' daily closeout, including monies collected in the courtroom.		C	The court agrees with all the recommendations of issue 3. The court will require each location to perform the daily closeout process at the end of each day. Supervisors will be required to review, sign and date their staff's closeout/balancing reports to demonstrate their review of the process and that staff have performed all the necessary end-of-day balancing functions.	CFO	March 2011
		3	One cash bag assigned to the Civil division contained four unprocessed cash payments with dates ranging from June 2008 to March 2010.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Clerks do not always sign their cashier balancing reports.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Clerks do not always prepare an adding machine tape to verify total amount of checks collected.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Daily balancing is not done until the following day.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Two-person team not used to open mail.		C	Due to staffing restrictions and the already time consuming process of opening and processing mail, the court is struggling with the 2 person team needed to open the mail and log all checks received, particularly at the branch locations. I am working with managers to see if we can come up with an alternative procedure that will comply with the procedure. We agree we should safeguard and secure unprocessed mail payments until they can be entered into the CMS and we agree we should make every effort to process all mail payments by the next business day. We will also consider putting those checks in "suspense" that are unable to be processed but we are hopeful that once we reiterate with staff and hold them accountable, we should rarely need to do that.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Mail payment log not used.		C	Processing payments each day or locking up the money in the safe. Process approved by John Judnick.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Clerk opening mail also performs the incompatible function of processing mail payments on the same day.		C	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Clerk processing mail payments also performs the incompatible function of processing counter payments on the same day.		C	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Clerk processing drop box payments also performs the incompatible function of processing counter payments on the same day.		C	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Unprocessed mail payments are left unsecured on clerks' desks.		C	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Mail payments are held unprocessed longer than 48 hours.		C	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Court location does not maintain an aging schedule of unprocessed mail payments.		C	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Court location does not have an escalation process for unprocessed mail payments.		C	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	No evidence of supervisor or manager verifying the deposit.		C	We agree that supervisors should sign and date all deposit slips to demonstrate their review of the deposit. In Stockton procedures have been changed where either supervisors or lead clerks verify deposits from cashiers every day. We will work with the branch courts to make sure they are following this procedure as well.	CFO	Stockton - May 2011 Branch Courts - October 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets								
	3		Court personnel who verify cashier daily closeout and balance also perform the incompatible function of preparing the deposit.		C	In the accounting department, staff who do the deposits no longer verify the daily closeout and balance function.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	Court stamps are not secured overnight at three locations.		C	We agree that stamps should be secured overnight and will implement as soon as possible at all locations.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Photo ID is not required for credit card payments at one location.		C	We agree that photo ID should be required for credit card payments at all locations and will implement as soon as possible.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Access to safe is not limited to supervisors and managers at three locations.		C	Safe access should be limited to supervisors, managers and designated lead clerks if necessary. We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	The safe remains unlocked throughout the entire day or for extended lengths of time at four locations.		C	The safe should remain locked throughout the entire day at all locations. We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	No locations had a receipt notice posted at the time of our review.		C	The 3rd floor of the Stockton courthouse now has a receipt notice posted for the public. We will work with all locations to implement.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Fee waiver notice not posted at the time of our review at one location.		C	The 3rd floor of the Stockton courthouse now has a fee waiver notice posted for the public. We will work with all locations to implement.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	HR poster not posted at the time of our review at one location.		I	We received updated Fed and State Law posters on 2/2/11 and were posted at all court locations by 2/11/11.	HR Manager	February 2011
		Log	HR poster incomplete or outdated at the time of our review at three locations.		C	Updated posters were provided to all court locations by 2/11/11. A follow up will be conducted to make sure all posters are visible to staff.	HR Manager	May 2011
		Log	Log and summary of occupational injuries and illnesses incomplete or not displayed at the time of our review at eight locations.		C	A copy of the required OSHA reports and logs are available in the HR office. OSHA 300A Summary of Work Related Injuries and illnesses were provided to all Court Managers for posting in their department on 5/16/11.	HR Manager	May 2011
		Log	Clerks keep cash bags in their unlocked desk drawer during the day at one location.		C	Clerks must keep cash bags locked up whether they are in the safe, their cash drawer at the counter or at their desk. We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Not all clerks assigned to cashier are given cash bags since the majority of transactions are done via check. As a result, cashiers must leave their window to get change from the accounting unit when needed at one location.		C	We have returned to the policy that all cashiers for the day check out cash bags. Select supervisors have been given change bags to eliminate the need for cashiers to go to accounting for change.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	One court location does not maintain a drop box payment log.			We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Public access to cashiers is not restricted at one location.			As an under resourced court, we are unable to provide restricted public access to cashiers in the form of glass partitions at the counter. When the court is adequately funded, the court will do so.	Business Services Manager	If funding allows, FY 2013-14 When new building is built
		Log	Clerk did not complete all required information on the "Daily Cash Count" form at one location.		C	We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Arrangement of offices at four locations is not designed to prevent employees who handle cash from having access to accounting records, such as daily closeout reports and bank deposit packages.			Unfortunately our court locations have limited space for employees in our current facilities. Fortunately, each of the 4 locations where this issue was identified will be getting new/remodeled facilities over the next few years. Once these new facilities are completed the court will be in a much better position to facilitate compliance to this issue.	Court Management	FY 2014-15 - May be closing locations - will update when funds are available
		Log	Main accounting does not note in its manual receipts book when it receives used manual receipt books.		C	The court is recreating the log for its manual receipt books in Excel and will include on this log the date it receives used manual receipt books back from managers/supervisors.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	The Court does not always note the CVMS receipt number on manual receipts per its own policy.		C	We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	One court location had completed manual receipt books that it had not turned in to main accounting.		C	We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	Court is using County-issued manual receipt books.		C	Due to limited resources the court will wait until the next time we need to order manual receipt books to get our own. Current supply could last anywhere from one year to 18 months.	CFO	FY 2013-14

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets		Log	One court location secures non-court funds, a personal party fund, in its safe.		C	The box for the employee's picnic/party fund raised money will be removed from the safe and kept in the employee's locked desk drawer. According to the custodian, the money has always been in her drawer but the box was in the safe empty.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	One court location has a \$9.09 overage fund that is not listed on main accounting's list of change and petty cash funds for each court location.		C	Main accounting will check into the origination of these funds and determine a course of action based on our findings.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	Main accounting does not retain voided original receipts and cashier closeout reports from one Court location as required by the FIN Manual.		C	The court has contacted the managers/supervisors at the locations mentioned and corrected the issue	CFO	May 2011
		Log	The Fiscal Technician who prepares the deposit at the main courthouse location also performs the incompatible functions of processing voids for another Court location as well as verifying the daily closeout for all clerks within the main courthouse location.		C	Another fiscal technician is now preparing the deposits that does not process voids for any Court location. Also, cashier supervisors are now verifying the daily closeout for all clerks, including the counting of the cash.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	An overage/shortage form, similar to the one used in the Traffic division, is not used in the Criminal division. As a result, the overage fund did not vouch to the Criminal division's tracking sheet. The overage fund was over 66 cents.		C	The staff will be reminded to use the Overage/Shortage form when they are out of balance.	Criminal Supervisor	May 2011
		Log	There is no periodic supervisory review of the overage funds for the Criminal and Traffic divisions in order to vouch the overage funds to supporting documentation such as tracking sheets.		C	The court will ensure supervisory review of the overage fund for the Criminal and Traffic division.	CFO	May 2011
	6.3		The Court Needs to Improve Its Calculations and Distributions of Court Collections					
	15		For the three DUI and Reckless Driving cases reviewed, the 20% State Surcharge was derived from the reduced base fine rather than the original base fine causing the 20% State Surcharge to be understated.	I		We agree with the audit findings and are currently working with the County to make the recommended distribution corrections to address items 1 through 11. In addition, over the next several months we will be reviewing other court collection case types to ensure we are complying with the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		The Court's CMS is not configured to calculate the 30% railroad fine distribution pursuant to PC 1463.12.	I		We would like to note that the Court uses the County's case management system (AMOS) for traffic and criminal distributions. AMOS is a 25+ year old case management system that is out dated and inflexible. As a result, making complicated distribution changes is difficult, time consuming and sometimes impossible. If County programmers are unable to make mandated legislative changes to distributions in the system, court and county accounting staff must create Excel spreadsheets to do the more complicated second and sometimes third distributions.		
	15		For one of the two child seat cases reviewed, the Court transposed the education program and loaner program distribution percentages.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		For the one unattended child case reviewed, there is no evidence of the 70/15/15 split pursuant to VC 15630, causing the County distribution, and ultimately the 50/50 MOE, to be overstated.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets								
		15	The Court's State/County domestic violence fee distribution is 67%/37% instead of 66.67%/33.33%, thereby understating the State distribution by \$1.33 for each domestic violence fee assessed.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one Health and Safety case reviewed, the 75%/25% split pursuant to H&S 11502 is not evident.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one Fish and Game case reviewed, the \$15 Secret Witness penalty pursuant to F&G 12021 was not assessed.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For one of the two red light cases reviewed, the ICNA portion of the State Court Facilities Construction Fund distribution was not reduced by the 30% red light allocation pursuant to PC 1463.11. Also, the two DNA penalty assessments are overstated by \$1 each.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the second red light case reviewed, the Court incorrectly included the 20% State Surcharge in calculating the 30% red light allocation pursuant to VC 42007.3.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the three traffic violator school cases reviewed, the Court does not include the DNA penalty assessments pursuant to GC 76104.6 and GC 76140.7 in its distribution of the traffic violator school fee assessed pursuant to VC 42007.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one child seat traffic school case reviewed, the Court distributed the base fine and penalty assessments to the code used for traffic school cases. However, child seat traffic school cases are distributed the same as a child seat bail forfeiture case.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		Log	In 4 of 15 cases reviewed, the variance between the actual total bail and the standard total bail was not prorated among the penalty assessments causing the base fine distribution to the county and city, as well as the 20% State Surcharge, to be either understated or overstated.	I		We agree with the findings. We are working with the County to correct these errors.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		Log	The Court delayed for at least seven months implementation of the penalty assessment and fee increases pursuant to SB 1407.	I	C	It was not the court's decision to delay implementation of SB1407. The case management system that must be updated when these increases occur is owned by the County and is 25 years old. As a result, the Court must rely on the County to make any programming changes. Depending on their workload, the County is not always able to make the changes quickly and often has to bring back retired programmers to work on changes due to the obsolete nature of the system.	Court Management Analyst	We are now in compliance with SB 1407.
7 Banking and Treasury	7.1		The Court Needs to Reconcile Its Trust Account Balances					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets		8	The Court acknowledged that it is not current with trust account reconciliations. Specifically, according to the Court, since converting from its ShowMe CMS to CCMS V3 in April 2008, it has not been able to perform reconciliations due to problems the Court accounting unit has experienced with CCMS V3 system reports. For example, according to the Court, the CCMS V3 system report does not always list all deposits for particular cases. So, to determine whether the total stated on the system report is accurate, the Court needs to go through the case history and tally all deposits made. The Court is currently working with the AOC CCMS V3 project team to address this issue, among others it is experiencing with CCMS V3.		C	We are working with the AOC CCMS V3 project team and have made great progress. While the reports still have some errors, the majority of the Trust Detail Report errors have been fixed.	Court Management Analyst	January 2011
		8	In the meantime, the Court is working on reconciling its trust accounts through developing a report of its own using information in the ShowMe CMS as well as information in CCMS V3. However, the Court currently has one part-time Court employee working on developing this report. Therefore, the Court expects that it will be well into the 2011 calendar year before it becomes current in its trust account reconciliations.		C	We have developed reports that will allow us to reconcile our trust accounts. We continue to have our retired Fiscal Services Supervisor working part time to help bring current our trust reconciliations. Once she is comfortable with the accuracy of the reconciliations using the V3 reports we will begin to redirect staff to assist her in expediting the trust reconciliations.	Court Management Analyst	January 2011
		Log	Our review of the segregation of duties matrix revealed that for the Court's e-file bank account, the same person who controls the check stock also prepares checks.		C	The court will have one of our lead accounting technicians control the check stock so the person who prepares the checks will have only controlled access.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	The Court did not report a County bank account to the AOC.		C	The Court did not report a County bank account to the AOC because it is not the Court's bank account. The account is a consolidation of funds from all County departments. The Court has a fund balance with the County because the County still processes the Court's payroll and provides county services that the court pays for. All Court/County transactions are recorded monthly in the AOC's financial system. In the future we will report the Court's year-end fund balance in the County's bank account to the AOC.	CFO	June 2011
9 Procurement								
	9.1	11	The Court Can Further Improve Its Procurement Practices Out of 29 Cal Card transactions reviewed, the Court could not provide a purchase requisition for 20 transactions, one of which exceeded the \$1,500 per transaction limit stated in the FIN Manual. In addition, the purchase requisitions for two other Cal Card transactions were not sign-approved.		C	The Court does require the substantial of approved requisitions prior to procurement of goods or services. The Court acknowledges that there have been instances of purchase card transactions, and court ordered services, that which a requisition was not submitted prior to the purchase. Immediate action is being taken to ensure all staff adheres to the TCFPP. This action will be ongoing in the form of reminders and monitoring.	Business Services Manager	July 2011
		11	The Court's current approval matrix does not reflect the Court's policy of following the FIN Manual's suggested approval thresholds for the trial court procurements. As a result, purchase requisitions for five of the 29 Cal Card transactions reviewed were approved by a court manager not listed on the Court's current approval matrix.		C	The Court agrees that this is an issue, and will take immediate action to monitor, and remind card holders as well as accounting staff of TCFPP policy requirements.	CFO and Business Services Manager	July 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets		11	The Court did not have documented evidence that a purchase requisition was prepared and properly approved for all 20 expenditures reviewed.		C	The Court does require the submittal of approved requisitions prior to procurement of goods or services. The Court acknowledges that there have been instances of purchase card transactions, and court ordered services, that which a requisition was not submitted prior to the purchase. Immediate action is being taken to ensure all staff adheres to the TCFPP. This action will be ongoing in the form of reminders and monitoring.	Business Services Manager	July 2011
		11	At the time of our review, the Court could not provide documentation supporting the procurement process used for 14 of the 20 expenditures reviewed. Subsequently, the Court asserted that it did not know the procurement process for two procurements, another eight procurements were either competitive or sole source and the document retention period had expired for seven of the eight procurements, and the remaining four procurements utilized State master agreements or were mini purchases that did not require procurement files.		C	The Court recognizes the necessity to improve past practices of documenting procurement files, and has made considerable improvement the past several years. The Court continues to improve procurement practices to align practices with the TCFPP and to ensure good stewardship of public funds. With regards to the two of the fourteen (14) procurements singled out by the auditor, the following applies: Two of the unknown procurement methods are related to past practices that have been corrected. One of the two was a result of County procurement practice prior to the Court/County separation; however, the Court has evaluated the procurement and found that during these challenging times, the provider has developed into an effective and reliable source and has worked with the Court to minimize annual cost increases.	Business Services Manager	July 2011
10 Contracts		Log	Two contracts related to court security contained a contractor termination clause other than for cause.	I		Yes, these contracts were developed prior to the Court & County separation and have remained in effect. At present the Court has good relationships with both entities and determined that the other than cause clause would not adversely affect these relationships or cause the Court harm; however, the Business Services Manager will evaluate the clause with the Court's CEO to determine if a change is necessary.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	The MOU related to providing space for the Self-Help Center did not contain a contract change clause or a confidentiality clause.	I		This MOU will be reviewed and discussed with the Court's CEO to determine if any changes need to be made.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	Access to contract, bid, and vendor files is not limited to minimize the potential for misplaced or lost files.	I		Due to facility restraints, the Court has minimal secure filing space for contract, bid and vendor files. The new courthouse scheduled to be completed in 2015 will address this issue. In the interim, the Court will seek avenues to minimize access to these files.	Business Services Manager	December 2015 - when new courthouse is built
		Log	The Court acknowledged that its MOU with the County does not include costs of services provided or anticipated service outcomes as required by Government Code §77212(d)(1).	I		This is correct. This issue memo log will be discussed with the Court's CEO to determine any changes the CEO desires.	Business Services Manager	December 2012 - working with AOC Audit division
11 Accounts Payable	11.1		The Court Should Strengthen Its Petty Cash Procedures The Family Law location commingles its \$100 petty cash fund with its \$250 change fund, does not maintain a log of petty cash expenditures, does not retain original receipts to support petty cash expenditures, and makes the commingled fund accessible to all cashiers when change is needed.		C	The Family Law location has separated its \$100 petty cash from the \$250 change fund and has been given a locking cash box for the petty cash fund. The main courthouse location has ordered a locking cash box for the petty cash fund. The Family Law location is now retaining receipts to support its disbursements.	CFO	January 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets								
		7	The Lodi, Tracy, and main courthouse locations keep their petty cash fund in the same safe as their daily receipts, cash difference fund, and change fund.		C	Each of these other locations have only 1 safe to keep all of these items secured. Rest assured, all items are kept separately in either locked boxes or bags to prevent co-mingling.	CFO	January 2011
		7	The Accounting Unit does not perform a periodic reconciliation of the Court's petty cash funds.		C	The Accounting Unit will perform quarterly reconciliations of the petty cash and change funds at all Court locations.	CFO	September 2011
		7	The Lodi and Tracy locations do not utilize the Petty Cash Receipt form or some other form documenting disbursements from the petty cash fund and containing information specified in the FIN Manual. As a result, a \$4 petty cash reimbursement at the Court's Lodi location was for a \$3.74 expenditure and the location could not account for the 26 cent difference.		C	The Accounting Unit will be working with all branch locations on using the Petty Cash Receipt form to document disbursements from petty cash and to maintain a log of petty cash disbursements.	CFO	September 2011
		7	One petty cash expenditure at the main courthouse location, \$237.75 for stamped envelopes, exceeds the \$100 per petty cash transaction threshold and there was no evidence of CEO or designee pre-approval.		C	We will no longer be issuing petty cash for stamped envelopes since the cost exceeds the \$100 petty cash threshold.	CFO	January 2011
		7	The petty cash fund at the main courthouse exceeds the required \$200 total limit. Specifically, the main courthouse location has a \$750 petty cash fund. We reviewed the petty cash expenditures for fiscal year 2009-2010 to determine the average monthly use of petty cash. After taking out the petty cash transactions exceeding the \$100 per petty cash transaction threshold, we found that the average monthly petty cash use was about \$52. Therefore, the Court should consider reducing its petty cash fund.		C	The main courthouse will reduce the petty cash fund to \$200 and eliminate all disbursements exceeding the \$100 threshold.	CFO	January 2011
	11.2		Court Travel and Business Meal Expense Reimbursement Procedures Need Improvement					
		10	Three out of eight travel expense claims reviewed were not signed approved and a fourth was not approved by the appropriate-level supervisor. Further, the Court could not demonstrate prior approval for out-of-state travel related to the fourth travel expense claim.		C	The court agrees with this audit finding and will implement the following changes: a.) All Judges travel claims must have an approval signature from either the Presiding Judge or the Assistant Presiding Judge before payment. b.) Presiding Judge travel claims must have the approval signature from the Assistant Presiding Judge and Assistant Presiding Judge travel claims must have the approval signature from the Presiding Judge before payment. c.) All travel claims of court staff must be approved by their immediate manager or a higher level manager before payment. The Court Executive Officer's travel claims must be approved by either the Presiding Judge or the Assistant Presiding Judge. d.) Accounts payable approval staff will make sure the appropriate signatures are on the travel claim forms prior to posting in SAP.	CFO	January 2011
		10	For the two business-related meals reviewed, the Court could not provide completed business-related meal expense forms. Therefore, we could not determine the location or cost-per-person for one of the two meals reviewed. Further, the Court could not provide prior approval for the two business-related meals reviewed.		C	The court agrees with this audit finding and will implement the following procedure. The court has created a Business Related Meals Form and will provide it to all managers to complete in the event there is a need to incur this type of expense in the future.	CFO	January 2011
		Log	The Court does not ensure that individuals who operate a vehicle on Court business attend the defensive driver's training class every four years.		C	The Court acknowledges this issue log, and will begin a process to ensure drivers are trained every four years.	HR Analyst II	June 12, 2012
		Log	The single transaction limits for 4 of 6 Cal Cards exceed the \$1,500 limit stated in the FIN Manual.		C	The court will review the transaction limits for Cal Cards and reduce the transaction limits to those recommended by the TCFPP if applicable.	CFO	May 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE	
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets		Log	The Court indicates that it does not complete Form SF-274 Supervisor Review of Motor Vehicle Accident, in the event of a vehicle accident.		C	The Court does complete the SF-270, but was not familiar with the SF-274 and will ensure the SF-274 is completed in addition to the SF-270.	Respective - Supervisor and Manager	January 2012	
		Log	The Court did not use the most appropriate general ledger account for two of the 30 invoices reviewed.		C	The court uses GL 921704 in cost center 392190 to track our summer youth program, regardless of the type of expense because it is a "special event". Because the costs associated with this are only a few hundred dollars, we did not set up a WBS to track. In the future we will do so.	CFO	July 2011	
		Log	Nine of 30 invoices reviewed did not demonstrate that the Court performed a three-point match of the invoice to a purchase agreement, such as a purchase order or contract, and to proof of receipt and acceptance of goods or services, such as a packing slip or acknowledgment that acceptable goods or services were received.		C	The Court agrees with the issue that we are not applying the 3 point match policy with some of our contract and blanket POs. Accounts Payable will immediately request, prior to payment, acceptance documentation from the person requesting the procurement good or service.	CFO	The parking garage changed ownership. Working on agreement, will be completed 12/31/12	
		Log	Accounts payable files for one of 30 invoices reviewed did not contain purchase agreements; therefore, we were unable to determine whether payments were made in accordance with a purchase agreement.	I		The Court agrees that one invoice did not contain a purchase agreement. The Court will work to develop a purchase agreement with the City of Stockton for our employee parking. The City has not wanted to do this in the past.	CFO	The parking garage changed ownership. Working on agreement, will be completed 12/31/12	
		Log	One court interpreter mileage claim used a P.O. Box address, instead of a business or residence address, which makes it difficult for the Court to verify the claimed mileage.		C	The interpreter coordinator will ask that the interpreter put her street address, in addition to her PO Box, on future claims.	CFO	June 2011	
		Log	Two court reporter transcript invoices were not paid according to rates established in Government Code section 69550. As a result, the two invoices were underpaid by at least \$1,290.		C	The Court agrees with the underpayment of the court reporter transcript invoices. The court reporters were not aware that the requirement of 5 ASCIIs on death penalty cases had been changed to 6. Because they were unsure they created the 6 eds but only charged the Court for 5.	CFO	June 2011	
	12 Fixed Assets Management	12.1		The Court Could Improve Its Tracking and Reporting of Court Assets					
			9	The Court acknowledged that it does not have a list of court-owned computer software and may not have been in compliance with all software vendor licensing agreements. However, the Court stated that had entered into a new agreement to bring it into compliance with the licensing agreements.		C	The Court agrees with the audit team's recommendations/assessment. Our responses are as follows: The court has entered into a software licensing agreement as of May 14, 2010. This licensing agreement provides the Court third party assistance and online tools to manage software licensing. These management control tools include methods of periodically comparing installed software against licensing terms.	Information Systems Manager	May 2010
			9	Our review of four expenditures classified as inventory items revealed that not all inventory items purchased were listed on the Court's inventory list. Specifically, one printer/copier was not on the list.		C	The Court, prior to the audit, had been, and will continue working to improve staff understanding of the importance of fixed asset management. Constant communication with outlying court locations and training is essential to full cooperation. The Court's goal is to maintain compliance with the Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures and to establish other internal methods to improve cooperation such as training for all trial court staff involved in the acquisition, recording, transfer and disposal of fixed assets.	Business Services Manager	July 2009 and ongoing
			9	Out of the 98 inventory items selected for "floor-to-list" verification, 19 inventory items were not found on the inventory list. Also, 10 of the 19 inventory items did not have an asset ID tag. In addition, the 79 inventory items listed, the inventory list did not accurately reflect the description for one inventory item. Further, the inventory list did not accurately reflect the location for 11 of the 79 inventory items found on the inventory list.		C	See response above.	Business Services Manager	July 2009 and ongoing

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets								
		Log	The Court does not have a process to periodically identify and dispose of obsolete IT equipment, such as identifying broken or obsolete equipment during its annual inventory.		C	The Court has implemented processes to follow the TCFPP for asset disposal. However internally, the process is not always followed by staff creating the perception of no process. The Court continues to work with staff to ensure TCFPP asset disposal processes are always followed.	Business Services Manager	January 2012
		Log	The Court's inventory list did not accurately reflect the location for one of the 11 fixed assets selected to review.		C	The Court appreciates these comments and does continue to improve upon its current practices. Some items do have generally described locations due to shared equipment; however, we do understand that being more specific greatly assist with inventory. Because the fixed asset inventory requires cooperation of all staff, it is often difficult to maintain a completely accurate inventory of the Court's 4,300+ tagged items.	Business Services Manager	January 2012
		Log	Out of the 67 inventory items selected for "list-to-floor" verification, we could not locate three inventory items. In addition, of the 64 inventory items located, the Court's inventory list did not completely or accurately reflect the identifying information or description for six inventory items. Further, the inventory list did not accurately reflect the location for nine of the 64 inventory items located.		C	The Court appreciates these comments and does continue to improve upon its current practices. Some items do have generally described locations due to shared equipment; however, we do understand that being more specific greatly assist with inventory. Because the fixed asset inventory requires cooperation of all staff, it is often difficult to maintain a completely accurate inventory of the Court's 4,300+ tagged items.	Business Services Manager	January 2012
13 Audits			No issues to report.					
				83	17	83		
				66	80%			
				17	20%			
					100%			

Total Accounting Issues 83
 Issues Resolved 66
 Incomplete Issues 17

Incomplete items as of 12/14/12 46

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
1 Court Administration	1.1	1.3	The Court Has Not Developed a Written Business Continuity Plan	1	1	The Court does not have a written business continuity plan.	Information Technology (IT) Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14
			Although the Court uses the County's CJIS and AMOS systems, it does not have a copy of the County's business continuity plan readily available in case of emergency.			IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14	
			The Court/County MOU does not include annual testing of the business continuity plan and disaster recovery plan on the CJIS and AMOS systems by the County.			IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14	
			The Court's draft IT disaster recovery plan does not address remote storage of emergency materials, conditions under which the backup site would be used, or procedures for notifying the backup site and the company providing remote storage.			IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14	
			The Court has not tested its existing evacuation plan.			IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14	
			The Court does not test the backup site.			IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14	
			The County mails checks and paystubs to Court employees' homes rather than providing checks and paystubs to the Court for physical distribution to each Court employee. Consequently, the Court risks making payments to fictitious employees.			HR Manager	When we stop using the County to process our Payroll	
			No issues to report.					
			Log					
			One court location does not maintain a drop box payment log.					
2 Fiscal Management and Budgets		4		1	1			
3 Fund Accounting				1	1			
4 Accounting Principles and Practices				1	1			
5 Cash Collections				1	1			
							CFO	June 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	Public access to cashiers is not restricted at one location.	I		As an under resourced court, we are unable to provide restricted public access to cashiers in the form of glass partitions at the counter. When the court is adequately funded, the court will do so.	Business Services Manager	If funding allows, FY 2013-14. When new building is built
		Log	Arrangement of offices at four locations is not designed to prevent employees who handle cash from having access to accounting records, such as daily closeout reports and bank deposit packages.	I		Unfortunately our court locations have limited space for employees in our current facilities. Fortunately, each of the 4 locations where this issue was identified will be getting new/remodeled facilities over the next few years. Once these new facilities are completed the court will be in a much better position to facilitate compliance to this issue.	Court Management	FY 2014-15 - May be closing locations - will update when funds are available
6	Information Systems							
	6.1		The Court Needs to Strengthen Its Procedures for Controlling Access to Sensitive Electronic Data Records					
	6		At the time of our review, the Court did not have a current MOU with DMV.	I		After contacting the DMV, the Court learned that the DMV had abolished MOU's for government end users. Instead agencies submit a 60+ page Security Requirement Package. After the DMV reviews and approves the package, in lieu of the MOU that was sent out for signatures, they send an approval letter to the agency, no signatures required. The agency must re-apply every 4 years.	Business Services Manager & Court Manager Of Traffic Division	FY 2012/13
	6.2		Information System User Account Requirements Should Be Strengthened					
	14		The Court does not have written IT policies and procedures. As a result, it does not have written policies and procedures that address issues concerning the creation, deletion, and modification of user IDs and password management.	I		Agree: While the Court does have some minimal written IT policies and procedures, they do not address the creation, deletion or modification of user ID's and password management. The IT manager position was filled a couple of months ago, and will work to create written policies concerning the creation, deletion and modification of user ID's within the next six months. However, it should be noted that the Court has an outdated Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 network domain that has very limited features when it comes to password management. The outdated network platform does not have the capability to log users off for periods of inactivity, it does not allow us to disable accounts after invalid log-in attempts. The platform also does not allow us the capability to force users to change their passwords after a fixed period of time. Furthermore, the platform does not allow us the capability to force syntax and type of character set or password length.	Supervising Information Systems (IS) Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
						The Court's previous IT Manager did initiate plans to upgrade the Court's network platform to a Microsoft Active Directory platform, with that plan possibly coming to fruition in fiscal year 2011-2012. However, with extremely limited financial resources available to our Court, there is some concern that the migration to an active directory platform may be beyond the resources available to the Court. There have been other issues that have arisen in regards to additional server upgrades that will need to be made that have made this project problematic for a court with limited fiscal resources. The IT department will continue to plan the migration to the newer network platform, however, with current fiscal limitations, no date of completion is available at this time. Agree: The Court's Programming and Systems Analyst will work to incorporate forcing users to change passwords periodically, force syntax requirements and password lengths. We are not certain that all of these controls can be implemented due to the age of the ShowMe code, or the ability to modify the code accordingly. We will investigate the capabilities of the current system and work on adding these security features with a possible completion period of six months.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
	14	The Court's network system, as well as its CJIS/AMOS CMS and ShowMe CMS, do not require users to change the initial password after initial sign-on.	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not enforce restrictions on password syntax, such as not using the same character consecutively and requiring the use of more than one type of character set (numbers, letters, symbols, etc.)	I	I	The outdated Microsoft Windows NT4.0 network platform does not have the capability to require users to change passwords periodically, force syntax requirements and control password lengths. See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
	14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not require an appropriate minimum password length.	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not require an appropriate minimum password length.	I	I	See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
	14	The Court's network system, as well as its CJIS/AMOS CMS and ShowMe CMS, do not require passwords to be changed periodically.	The Court's network system, as well as its CJIS/AMOS CMS and ShowMe CMS, do not require passwords to be changed periodically.	I	I	See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
	14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not disable user accounts after a number of invalid sign-on attempts.	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not place time restrictions on user accounts for a specified period of inactivity.	I	I	Agree: The outdated Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 network domain does not have the capability to allow user accounts to be disabled after a number of invalid sign-on attempts or after a period of inactivity. The ShowMe CMS user accounts can possibly be modified to disable the user after a number of invalid sign-on attempts or after a period of inactivity. The Court's Programming and Systems Analyst will work on adding these security features with a possible completion period of six months.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
	14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not disable user accounts after a period of inactivity.	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not disable user accounts after a period of inactivity.	I	I	See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
	6.3		The Court Needs to Improve Its Calculations and Distributions of Court Collections					
	15		For the three DUI and Reckless Driving cases reviewed, the 20% State Surcharge was derived from the reduced base fine rather than the original base fine causing the 20% State Surcharge to be understated.	1	1	We agree with the audit findings and are currently working with the County to make the recommended distribution corrections to address items 1 through 11. In addition, over the next several months we will be reviewing other court collection case types to ensure we are complying with the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule.	Court Management Analyst	December 2011
	15		The Court's CMS is not configured to calculate the 30% railroad fine distribution pursuant to PC 1463.12.	1	1	We would like to note that the Court uses the County's case management system (AMOS) for traffic and criminal distributions. AMOS is a 25+ year old case management system that is out dated and inflexible. As a result, making complicated distribution changes is difficult, time consuming and sometimes impossible. If County programmers are unable to make mandated legislative changes to distributions in the system, court and county accounting staff must create Excel spreadsheets to do the more complicated second and sometimes third distributions.	Court Management Analyst	December 2011
	15		For one of the two child seat cases reviewed, the Court transposed the education program and loaner program distribution percentages.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		For the one unattended child case reviewed, there is no evidence of the 70/15/15 split pursuant to VC 15630, causing the County distribution, and ultimately the 50/50 MOE, to be overstated.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		The Court's State/County domestic violence fee distribution is 67%/37% instead of 66.67%/33.33%, thereby understating the State distribution by \$1.33 for each domestic violence fee assessed.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		For the one Health and Safety case reviewed, the 75%/25% split pursuant to H&S 11502 is not evident.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		For the one Fish and Game case reviewed, the \$15 Secret Witness penalty pursuant to F&G 12021 was not assessed.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		For one of the two red light cases reviewed, the ICNA portion of the State Court Facilities Construction Fund distribution was not reduced by the 30% red light allocation pursuant to PC 1463.11. Also, the two DNA penalty assessments are overstated by \$1 each.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
	15		For the second red light case reviewed, the Court incorrectly included the 20% State Surcharge in calculating the 30% red light allocation pursuant to VC 42007.3.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		15	For the three traffic violator school cases reviewed, the Court does not include the DNA penalty assessments pursuant to GC 76104.6 and GC 76140.7 in its distribution of the traffic violator school fee assessed pursuant to VC 42007.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one child seat traffic school case reviewed, the Court distributed the base fine and penalty assessments to the code used for traffic school cases. However, child seat traffic school cases are distributed the same as a child seat bail forfeiture case.	1	1	See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		Log	The Court's network system and ShowMe CMS; do not limit the ability to re-use passwords.	1	1	Network system is old technology and does not have that capability. ShowMe CMS may have capability, Programmer will assess this function.	Information Systems and Programming Analyst / ShowMe	December 1, 2013
		Log	The Court's network system and ShowMe CMS; do not limit the number of concurrent logins.	1	1	Network system is old technology and does not have that capability. ShowMe CMS may have capability, Programmer will assess this function.	Information Systems and Programming Analyst / ShowMe	December 1, 2013
		Log	The Court does not use power cut-off switches or water and smoke detectors in its computer room.	1	1	The County is responsible for this building, not the Court. The Court is not aware that these devices are available. We will investigate the possibility of installing these devices. However, existing asbestos in building may limit the ability to install these devices for the court.	Supervising IS Analyst	FY 2013-14
		Log	Emergency lighting is not available in the Court's computer room.	1	1	The County is responsible for this building, not the Court. The Court is not aware that these devices are available. We will investigate the possibility of installing these devices. However, existing asbestos in building may limit the ability to install these devices for the court.	Supervising IS Analyst	FY 2011-12
		Log	Although most computer equipment is stored off the floor, some servers are on the floor of the computer room, which is located in the basement.	1	1	Court will move two servers off of the floor and relocate on to cart.	Supervising IS Analyst	May 2011
		Log	The computer room does not have flood alarms installed.	1	1	The County is responsible for this building, not the Court. The Court is not aware that these devices are available. We will investigate the possibility of installing these devices. However, existing asbestos in building may limit the ability to install these devices for the court.	Supervising IS Analyst	FY 2013-14
		Log	In 4 of 15 cases reviewed, the variance between the actual total bail and the standard total bail was not prorated among the penalty assessments causing the base fine distribution to the county and city, as well as the 20% State Surcharge, to be either understated or overstated.	1	1	We agree with the findings. We are working with the County to correct these errors.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
7	Banking and Treasury							
8	Court Security							
		8.1	The Court Needs to Strengthen Its Processes Regarding Court Security					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		2	The Court has not submitted its Comprehensive Court Security Plan to the Judicial Council for review and approval since Fiscal Year 2007-2008.	I		We agree with the audit findings and are currently taking corrective actions. Below are our responses to the two security audit issues: In conjunction with the San Joaquin County Sheriff, we submitted our updated Security Plan to the Administrative Office of the Court's Office of Emergency Response and Security Division (ERS) in June 2010. The ERS had concerns regarding our plan, and returned it for revision. We intend to resubmit our plan by the end of November 2010.	Court Executive Officer (CEO)	May 1, 2013
		Log	At the time of our review, fire suppression and/or fire control systems have not been tested within the last 12 months at one location.	I		This log does not specify which location; however, the Court will ask the AOC's FMU to ensure that systems are tested as required/needed.	AOC Facilities Management Unit & Court's Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	At the time of our review, smoke detectors had not been tested within the last 12 months at one location.	I		The Court will work with the AOC's FMU to resolve this issue.	AOC Facilities Management Unit & Court's Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	Fire extinguishers are not well marked at two locations.	I		The Court will work with the AOC's FMU to resolve this issue.	AOC Facilities Management Unit & Court's Business Services Manager	December 2012
9 Procurement								
10 Contracts								
	9.1	Log	The Court Can Further Improve Its Procurement Practices Two contracts related to court security contained a contractor termination clause other than for cause.	I		Yes, these contracts were developed prior to the Court & County separation and have remained in effect. At present the Court has good relationships with both entities and determined that the other than cause clause would not adversely affect these relationships or cause the Court harm; however, the Business Services Manager will evaluate the clause with the Court's CEO to determine if a change is necessary.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	The MOU related to providing space for the Self-Help Center did not contain a contract change clause or a confidentiality clause.	I		This MOU will be reviewed and discussed with the Court's CEO to determine if any changes need to be made.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	Access to contract, bid, and vendor files is not limited to minimize the potential for misplaced or lost files.	I		Due to facility restraints, the Court has minimal secure filing space for contract, bid and vendor files. The new courthouse scheduled to be completed in 2015 will address this issue. In the interim, the Court will seek avenues to minimize access to these files.	Business Services Manager	December 2015 - when new courthouse is built
		Log	The Court acknowledged that its MOU with the County does not include costs of services provided or anticipated service outcomes as required by Government Code §77212(d)(1).	I		This is correct. This issue memo log will be discussed with the Court's CEO to determine any changes the CEO desires.	Business Services Manager	December 2012 - working with AOC Audit division
11 Accounts Payable								
	11.1		The Court Should Strengthen Its Petty Cash Procedures					
	11.2		Court Travel and Business Meal Expense Reimbursement Procedures Need Improvement					
		Log	Accounts payable files for one of 30 invoices reviewed did not contain purchase agreements; therefore, we were unable to determine whether payments were made in accordance with a purchase agreement.	I		The Court agrees that one invoice did not contain a purchase agreement. The Court will work to develop a purchase agreement with the City of Stockton for our employee parking. The City has not wanted to do this in the past.	CFO	The parking garage changed ownership. Working on agreement, will be completed by 12/31/12
12 Fixed Assets Management								
13 Audits								
			No issues to report.					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
14 Records Retention			No issues to report.					
15 Domestic Violence								
16 Exhibits	16.1		Improvements Can Be Made to Strengthen Accountability Over Exhibits					
17 Bail			No issues to report.					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
1	Court Administration							
	1.1		The Court Has Not Developed a Written Business Continuity Plan The Court does not have a written business continuity plan.	I		The Court agrees with the finding(s). During March 2011, the Court's Business Services Manager and IT Manager attended a two day AOC Continuity of Operations training to assist the Court with ongoing development of a BCP, and a DRP. Due to significant lack of financial resources, the Court was not able to replace the IT Manager until a couple of months ago. As a result, it will take some time for the Court to finalize both plans. The Court fully understands the importance of these plans and will continue to press forward to completion. In addition, the Court has already obtained a copy of the County's BCP/DRP related to the CJIS and AMOS systems.	Information Technology (IT) Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14
		13		I		See response above.	IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14
		13	Although the Court uses the County's CJIS and AMOS systems, it does not have a copy of the County's business continuity plan readily available in case of emergency.	I		See response above.	IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14
		13	The Court/County MOU does not include annual testing of the business continuity plan and disaster recovery plan on the CJIS and AMOS systems by the County. The Court's draft IT disaster recovery plan does not address remote storage of emergency materials, conditions under which the backup site would be used, or procedures for notifying the backup site and the company providing remote storage.	I		See response above.	IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14
		13	The Court has not tested its existing evacuation plan.	I		See response above.	IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14
		13	The Court does not test the backup site.	I		See response above.	IT Manager and Business Services Manager	FY 2013-14
		Log	One of ten submitted cases we reviewed was decided on at least 122 days after being taken under submission.		C	Responsible Subordinate Judicial Officer retired.	Presiding Judge	Complete
2	Fiscal Management and Budgets							
	2.1		The Court Needs to Improve Its Payroll Processing Practices					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	The Court is not calculating janitorial costs correctly for the Child Support Commissioner Program (CSC) grant. Specifically, the Court is not applying the CSC occupancy percentage to the Court's total janitorial cost prior to applying the percentage for partially reimbursable operating expenses.	C		The court will document the calculation used to allocate janitorial costs to the Child Support Commissioner Program (CSC) grant. The calculation will be based on occupancy percentage and applied to the total janitorial cost prior to the application of the percentage for partially reimbursable operating expenses.	Chief Financial Officer (CFO)	July 2010
5 Cash Collections	5.1		The Court Needs to Improve Its Control and Oversight over Handwritten Receipts Supervisor does not secure the manual receipt book when not in use.		C	Securing handwritten receipt books - The court agrees there is an issue with the securing of handwritten receipt books at some of our court locations. We will require managers and supervisors to secure and maintain physical custody of the handwritten receipt books when not in use.	CFO	November 2010
			Manual receipt books contained missing receipts that could not be accounted for.		C	Missing receipts, out of sequence receipts, completion of pertinent information on receipts and the timely entering of hand written receipts into CMS issues. - The Court agrees with issue 2 and will implement the audit recommendations. We will require managers and/or supervisors to review at least quarterly the handwritten receipt books to ensure all receipts are accounted for. When the CMS goes down, handwritten receipt books will be issued to staff and subsequently returned to the manager and/or supervisor when the CMS is restored to use. The manager and/or supervisor will review the books when returned to ensure the receipts were issued in sequential order, that staff completed receipts with all pertinent information and that receipts are entered into the CMS no later than 1 business day following the day the CMS system was restored to use. When discrepancies are discovered, they will be discussed immediately with staff, documented and retained with the receipt book for audit purposes.	CFO	November 2010
			Manual receipts used out of sequence.		C	See response above.	CFO	November 2010
			Manual receipts not always completed with all relevant information.		C	See response above.	CFO	November 2010
			Court location could not determine the amount of money collected due to a manual receipt not noting a case number or the dollar amount paid.		C	See response above.	CFO	November 2010
			Manual receipts not always posted timely in CMS.		C	See response above.	CFO	November 2010

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		1	Manual receipts used for reasons other than when CMS is down.		C	<p>Using handwritten receipts for instances other than CMS being down – The Court agrees that handwritten receipts should not be used except when CMS is down. The instances where the court has used handwritten receipts and our responses are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Victim Restitution - After investigating the handwritten receipt the auditor found that prompted this finding, our manager over criminal found it was a payment that was taken in the courtroom at the request of a judge 2 years ago. This was an isolated event. I met with one of our courtroom supervisors and she will remind staff that the court does not have a mechanism to collect and disburse victim restitution. Also, with handwritten receipts secured by only managers and/or supervisors, they would be aware of this situation if it happened in the future and would instruct the clerk and/or judge in the proper procedure. 2. UD Writs – We have reiterated with staff that hand written receipts are only to be used when the CMS system is down. Also, with handwritten receipts secured by only managers and/or supervisors, they would be aware of this situation if it happened in the future and would instruct the clerk in the proper procedure. 3. Juror Sanctions – This issue arose because jurors would come to the counter to pay right from court after being sanctioned, before a JUR case had been opened in our CMS (V3). Because V3 will not let a receipt be issued until a case is opened, staff would issue a handwritten receipt. A new procedure has been developed and implemented that allows a clerk at the counter to open the JUR case and issue a receipt in V3 thus preventing the use of handwritten receipts. 4. Payments needing judicial review prior to filing – Our staff have been told that handwritten receipts are only to be issued in the event a CMS is down. Using handwritten receipts for payments needing judicial review prior to filing may have been an access and/or training issue so we are enforcing the rule that handwritten receipts be secured by only managers and/or supervisors. If receipt books have to be obtained from the manager or supervisor it gives them an opportunity to review the situations and train clerks in the correct procedures thus avoiding the use of handwritten receipts. 	CFO	January 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
						5. Trust payments associated with different locations – Our staff have been told that handwritten receipts are only to be issued in the event a CMS is down. To avoid turning away customers wanting to establish trust for another location as much as possible, we have given the manager and supervisor Global Accounting access to our traffic CMS (Amos) which enables them to establish trusts for other locations. If by chance the supervisor or manager is not there, if the customer pays with a check, their canceled check is their receipt. If they want to pay in cash, staff will instruct the customer to go pay at the correct location.		
	5.2	3	The Court Needs to Strengthen Its Cash Handling Procedures Cashiers share the same cash bag when taking payments.		C	The Court agrees that we need to standardize our cash collection procedures at all locations. Individual cash bags will be assigned to each cashier on a daily basis. We have created a sign-out/sign-in log that supervisors, managers or lead clerks will complete each day when issuing cashiers their change bags. Thorough completion of the log will assure bags that are checked-out are checked-in and that the counting of the cash at each of these intervals has been completed.	CFO	March 2011
		3	No evidence of supervisory review of cashiers' beginning cash.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Court location does not always retain the original voided receipts.		C	The Court agrees with the recommendations of issue 2. Managers will be sent instructions to retain a copy of all voided transactions and to make sure either a manager, supervisor or lead LPC signs and retains the Void Payment Acknowledgement Form. Also, we will reiterate with managers that only managers, supervisors and a designated lead clerk (LPCIII) should have system access to void transactions and that anyone that has system access to void should never void their own transaction.	CFO	March 2011
		3	The Void Payment Acknowledgement Form is not always sign-approved or retained to support voided transactions.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Inconsistent supervisory review and approval of void transactions. As a result, our review of voided transactions revealed that a LPC II, rather than a manager, supervisor, or LPC III, voided transactions at one location, an LPC III voided 10 of their own transactions and a LPC II, rather than a manager, supervisor, or LPC III, voided another transaction at another location, and a LPC I, instead of a manager, supervisor, or LPC III, voided transactions at a third location.		C	See response above.	CFO	March 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		3	No evidence of supervisory review of cashiers' daily closeout, including monies collected in the courtroom.	C	I	The court agrees with all the recommendations of issue 3. The court will require each location to perform the daily closeout process at the end of each day. Supervisors will be required to review, sign and date their staff's closeout/balancing reports to demonstrate their review of the process and that staff have performed all the necessary end-of-day balancing functions.	CFO	March 2011
		3	One cash bag assigned to the Civil division contained four unprocessed cash payments with dates ranging from June 2008 to March 2010.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Clerks do not always sign their cashier balancing reports.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Clerks do not always prepare an adding machine tape to verify total amount of checks collected.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Daily balancing is not done until the following day.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	March 2011
		3	Two-person team not used to open mail.	C	I	Due to staffing restrictions and the already time consuming process of opening and processing mail, the court is struggling with the 2 person team needed to open the mail and log all checks received, particularly at the branch locations. I am working with managers to see if we can come up with an alternative procedure that will comply with the procedure. We agree we should safeguard and secure unprocessed mail payments until they can be entered into the CMS and we agree we should make every effort to process all mail payments by the next business day. We will also consider putting those checks in "suspense" that are unable to be processed but we are hopeful that once we reiterate with staff and hold them accountable, we should rarely need to do that.	CFO	March 2011 May 2011
		3	Mail payment log not used.	C	I	Processing payments each day or locking up the money in the safe. Process approved by John Judnick.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Clerk opening mail also performs the incompatible function of processing mail payments on the same day.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Clerk processing mail payments also performs the incompatible function of processing counter payments on the same day.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Clerk processing drop box payments also performs the incompatible function of processing counter payments on the same day.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Unprocessed mail payments are left unsecured on clerks' desks.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Mail payments are held unprocessed longer than 48 hours.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Court location does not maintain an aging schedule of unprocessed mail payments.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	Court location does not have an escalation process for unprocessed mail payments.	C	I	See response above.	CFO	May 2011
		3	No evidence of supervisor or manager verifying the deposit.	C	I	We agree that supervisors should sign and date all deposit slips to demonstrate their review of the deposit. In Stockton procedures have been changed where either supervisors or lead clerks verify deposits from cashiers every day. We will work with the branch courts to make sure they are following this procedure as well.	CFO	Stockton - May 2011 Branch Courts - October 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		3	Court personnel who verify cashier daily closeout and balance also perform the incompatible function of preparing the deposit.	C	I	In the accounting department, staff who do the deposits no longer verify the daily closeout and balance function.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	Court stamps are not secured overnight at three locations.	C	I	We agree that stamps should be secured overnight and will implement as soon as possible at all locations.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Photo ID is not required for credit card payments at one location.	C	I	We agree that photo ID should be required for credit card payments at all locations and will implement as soon as possible.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Access to safe is not limited to supervisors and managers at three locations.	C	I	Safe access should be limited to supervisors, managers and designated lead clerks if necessary. We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	The safe remains unlocked throughout the entire day or for extended lengths of time at four locations.	C	I	The safe should remain locked throughout the entire day at all locations. We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	No locations had a receipt notice posted at the time of our review.	C	I	The 3rd floor of the Stockton courthouse now has a receipt notice posted for the public. We will work with all locations to implement.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Fee waiver notice not posted at the time of our review at one location.	C	I	The 3rd floor of the Stockton courthouse now has a fee waiver notice posted for the public. We will work with all locations to implement.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	HR poster not posted at the time of our review at one location.	C	I	We received updated Fed and State Law posters on 2/2/11 and were posted at all court locations by 2/11/11.	HR Manager	February 2011
		Log	HR poster incomplete or outdated at the time of our review at three locations.	C	I	Updated posters were provided to all court locations by 2/11/11. A follow up will be conducted to make sure all posters are visible to staff.	HR Manager	May 2011
		Log	Log and summary of occupational injuries and illnesses incomplete or not displayed at the time of our review at eight locations.	C	I	A copy of the required OSHA reports and logs are available in the HR office. OSHA 300A Summary of Work Related Injuries and Illnesses were provided to all Court Managers for posting in their department on 5/16/11.	HR Manager	May 2011
		Log	Clerks keep cash bags in their unlocked desk drawer during the day at one location.	C	I	Clerks must keep cash bags locked up whether they are in the safe, their cash drawer at the counter or at their desk. We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Not all clerks assigned to cashier are given cash bags since the majority of transactions are done via check. As a result, cashiers must leave their window to get change from the accounting unit when needed at one location.	C	I	We have returned to the policy that all cashiers for the day check out cash bags. Select supervisors have been given change bags to eliminate the need for cashiers to go to accounting for change.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	One court location does not maintain a drop box payment log.	I	I	We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Public access to cashiers is not restricted at one location.	I	I	As an under resourced court, we are unable to provide restricted public access to cashiers in the form of glass partitions at the counter. When the court is adequately funded, the court will do so.	Business Services Manager	If funding allows, FY 2013-14 When new building is built
		Log	Clerk did not complete all required information on the "Daily Cash Count" form at one location.	C	I	We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Arrangement of offices at four locations is not designed to prevent employees who handle cash from having access to accounting records, such as daily closeout reports and bank deposit packages.	I	I	Unfortunately our court locations have limited space for employees in our current facilities. Fortunately, each of the 4 locations where this issue was identified will be getting new/remodeled facilities over the next few years. Once these new facilities are completed the court will be in a much better position to facilitate compliance to this issue.	Court Management	FY 2014-15 - May be closing locations - will update when funds are available

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	Main accounting does not note in its manual receipts book log when it receives used manual receipt books.	C		The court is recreating the log for its manual receipt books in Excel and will include on this log the date it receives used manual receipt books back from managers/supervisors.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	The Court does not always note the CMS receipt number on manual receipts per its own policy.	C		We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	One court location had completed manual receipt books that it had not turned in to main accounting.	C		We will work with all locations to comply.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	Court is using County-issued manual receipt books.	C		Due to limited resources the court will wait until the next time we need to order manual receipt books to get our own. Current supply could last anywhere from one year to 18 months.	CFO	FY 2013-14
		Log	One court location secures non-court funds, a personal party fund, in its safe.	C		The box for the employee's picnic/party fund raised money will be removed from the safe and kept in the employee's locked desk drawer. According to the custodian, the money has always been in her drawer but the box was in the safe empty.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	One court location has a \$9.09 overage fund that is not listed on main accounting's list of change and petty cash funds for each court location.	C		Main accounting will check into the origination of these funds and determine a course of action based on our findings.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	Main accounting does not retain voided original receipts and cashier closeout reports from one Court location as required by the FIN Manual.	C		The court has contacted the managers/supervisors at the locations mentioned and corrected the issue.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	The Fiscal Technician who prepares the deposit at the main courthouse location also performs the incompatible functions of processing voids for another Court location as well as verifying the daily closeout for all clerks within the main courthouse location.	C		Another fiscal technician is now preparing the deposits that does not process voids for any Court location. Also, cashier supervisors are now verifying the daily closeout for all clerks, including the counting of the cash.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	An overage/shortage form, similar to the one used in the Traffic division, is not used in the Criminal division. As a result, the overage fund did not vouch to the Criminal division's tracking sheet. The overage fund was over 66 cents.	C		The staff will be reminded to use the Overage/Shortage form when they are out of balance.	Criminal Supervisor	May 2011
		Log	There is no periodic supervisory review of the overage funds for the Criminal and Traffic divisions in order to vouch the overage funds to supporting documentation such as tracking sheets.	C		The court will ensure supervisory review of the overage fund for the Criminal and Traffic division.	CFO	May 2011
6	Information Systems							
	6.1		The Court Needs to Strengthen Its Procedures for Controlling Access to Sensitive Electronic Data Records					
		6	At the time of our review, the Court did not have a current MOU with DMV.	I		After contacting the DMV, the Court learned that the DMV had abolished MOU's for government end users. Instead agencies submit a 60+ page Security Requirement Package. After the DMV reviews and approves the package, in lieu of the MOU that was sent out for signatures, they send an approval letter to the agency, no signatures required. The agency must re-apply every 4 years.	Business Services Manager & Court Manager Of Traffic Division	FY 2012/13

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		6	The Court does not require its employees who have access to sensitive DMV data to complete Form INF1128 as required by DMV.		C	The Court is adding the Information Security Statement, Form INF 1128 to the new employee orientation packet that new employees are given when hired. Human Resources will make sure employees sign the forms and signed forms will be kept in each employee's personnel file. HR will see to it that the forms are reviewed and signed annually.	HR Manager	March 2011
		6	The Court does not have a formal process to delete DMV user IDs. The County ISD automatically deletes DMV user IDs after 60 days of inactivity.		C	The Court will develop a check list of all items given to staff when hired such as keys, employee IDs, parking passes etc and court equipment issued for their jobs such as laptops and cell phones if applicable. This list will also include all court data systems the employee has access to, i.e.: DMV, CJS, V3, SAP, E-mail. Human Resources will keep the list in the employee's personnel file. When an employee terminates employment HR will work with the employee's manager to make sure everything on the list assigned to that employee is returned and that access to all court systems is inactivated. There will be one person designated for each data system to manage activation/deactivation. The employee's manager will be responsible for notifying this person to deactivate the employee's access.	HR Manager; Court Managers	March 2011
		6	The Court's DMV user ID list contained 65 people who were not employed by the Court at the time of our review.		C	See response above.	HR Manager; Court Managers	March 2011
		6	The Court does not monitor DMV query and transaction activity to detect inappropriate access to DMV data. As a result, the Court was unaware that one Court employee researched herself and could not provide a legitimate business reason for another person that was searched.		C	If there is a complaint of misuse of DMV, the County IT Department can run a report that gives us the following information - who accessed the information, date and time access was made, what transaction code was used, what information they inquired on. The Court will ask the County IT Department to run a quarterly report of all DMV transactions for the purpose of an internal audit.	Criminal, Traffic, and Juvenile Delinquency Manager	January 2011
		6	A DMV hold was not placed for two FTA cases reviewed where a DMV hold should have been placed.		C	We will continue to work, with the County IT Department to make sure this issue is resolved.	Criminal, Traffic, and Juvenile Delinquency Manager	January 2011
	6.2		Information System User Account Requirements Should Be Strengthened					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		14	The Court does not have written IT policies and procedures. As a result, it does not have written policies and procedures that address issues concerning the creation, deletion, and modification of user IDs and password management.	I		<p>Agree: While the Court does have some minimal written IT policies and procedures, they do not address the creation, deletion or modification of user ID's and password management. The IT manager position was filled a couple of months ago, and will work to create written policies concerning the creation, deletion and modification of user ID's within the next six months. However, it should be noted that the Court has an outdated Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 network domain that has very limited features when it comes to password management. The outdated network platform does not have the capability to log users off for periods of inactivity, it does not allow us to disable accounts after invalid log-in attempts. The platform also does not allow us the capability to force users to change their passwords after a fixed period of time. Furthermore, the platform does not allow us the capability to force syntax and type of character set or password length.</p> <p>The Court's previous IT Manager did initiate plans to upgrade the Court's network platform to a Microsoft Active Directory platform, with that plan possibly coming to fruition in fiscal year 2011-2012. However, with extremely limited financial resources available to our Court, there is some concern that the migration to an active directory platform may be beyond the resources available to the Court. There have been other issues that have arisen in regards to additional server upgrades that will need to be made that have made this project problematic for a court with limited fiscal resources. The IT department will continue to plan the migration to the newer network platform, however, with current fiscal limitations, no date of completion is available at this time.</p>	Supervising Information Systems (IS) Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
		14	The Court's network system, as well as its CJIS/AMOS CMS and ShowMe CMS, do not require users to change the initial password after initial sign-on.	I		<p>Agree: The Court's Programming and Systems Analyst will work to incorporate forcing users to change passwords periodically, force syntax requirements and password lengths. We are not certain that all of these controls can be implemented due to the age of the ShowMe code, or the ability to modify the code accordingly. We will investigate the capabilities of the current system and work on adding these security features with a possible completion period of six months.</p> <p>The outdated Microsoft Windows NT4.0 network platform does not have the capability to require users to change passwords periodically, force syntax requirements and control password lengths.</p>	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not enforce restrictions on password syntax, such as not using the same character consecutively and requiring the use of more than one type of character set (numbers, letters, symbols, etc.)	I		See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
		14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not require an appropriate minimum password length.	I		See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
		14	The Court's network system, as well as its CJIS/AMOS CMS and ShowMe CMS, do not require passwords to be changed periodically.	I		See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
		14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not disable user accounts after a number of invalid sign-on attempts.	I		See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
		14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not place time restrictions on user accounts for a specified period of inactivity.	I		Agree: The outdated Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 network domain does not have the capability to allow user accounts to be disabled after a number of invalid sign-on attempts or after a period of inactivity. The ShowMe CMS user accounts can possibly be modified to disable the user after a number of invalid sign-on attempts or after a period of inactivity. The Court's Programming and Systems Analyst will work on adding these security features with a possible completion period of six months.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
		14	The Court's network system, as well as its ShowMe CMS, do not disable user accounts after a period of inactivity.	I		See response above.	Supervising IS Analyst	If funding permits, FY 2013-14
	6.3		The Court Needs to Improve Its Calculations and Distributions of Court Collections					
		15	For the three DUI and Reckless Driving cases reviewed, the 20% State Surcharge was derived from the reduced base fine rather than the original base fine causing the 20% State Surcharge to be understated.	I		We agree with the audit findings and are currently working with the County to make the recommended distribution corrections to address items 1 through 11. In addition, over the next several months we will be reviewing other court collection case types to ensure we are complying with the Uniform Bail and Penalty Schedule. We would like to note that the Court uses the County's case management system (AMOS) for traffic and criminal distributions. AMOS is a 25+ year old case management system that is out dated and inflexible. As a result, making complicated distribution changes is difficult, time consuming and sometimes impossible. If County programmers are unable to make mandated legislative changes to distributions in the system, court and county accounting staff must create Excel spreadsheets to do the more complicated second and sometimes third distributions.	Court Management Analyst	December 2011
		15	The Court's CMS is not configured to calculate the 30% railroad fine distribution pursuant to PC 1463.12.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	December 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		15	For one of the two child seat cases reviewed, the Court transposed the education program and loaner program distribution percentages.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one unattended child case reviewed, there is no evidence of the 70/15/15 split pursuant to VC 15630, causing the County distribution, and ultimately the 50/50 MOE, to be overstated.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	The Court's State/County domestic violence fee distribution is 67%/37% instead of 66.67%/33.33%, thereby understating the State distribution by \$1.33 for each domestic violence fee assessed.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one Health and Safety case reviewed, the 75%/25% split pursuant to H&S 11502 is not evident.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one Fish and Game case reviewed, the \$15 Secret Witness penalty pursuant to F&G 12021 was not assessed.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For one of the two red light cases reviewed, the ICNA portion of the State Court Facilities Construction Fund distribution was not reduced by the 30% red light allocation pursuant to PC 1463.11. Also, the two DNA penalty assessments are overstated by \$1 each.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the second red light case reviewed, the Court incorrectly included the 20% State Surcharge in calculating the 30% red light allocation pursuant to VC 42007.3.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the three traffic violator school cases reviewed, the Court does not include the DNA penalty assessments pursuant to GC 76104.6 and GC 76140.7 in its distribution of the traffic violator school fee assessed pursuant to VC 42007.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		15	For the one child seat traffic school case reviewed, the Court distributed the base fine and penalty assessments to the code used for traffic school cases. However, child seat traffic school cases are distributed the same as a child seat bail forfeiture case.	I		See response above.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		Log	The Court's network system and ShowMe CMS; do not limit the ability to re-use passwords.	I		Network system is old technology and does not have that capability. ShowMe CMS may have capability, Programmer will assess this function.	Information Systems and Programming Analyst / ShowMe Analyst / ShowMe	December 1, 2013
		Log	The Court's network system and ShowMe CMS; do not limit the number of concurrent logins.	I		Network system is old technology and does not have that capability. ShowMe CMS may have capability, Programmer will assess this function.	Information Systems and Programming Analyst / ShowMe Analyst / ShowMe	December 1, 2013
		Log	The Court does not use power cut-off switches or water and smoke detectors in its computer room.	I		The County is responsible for this building, not the Court. The Court is not aware that these devices are available. We will investigate the possibility of installing these devices. However, existing asbestos in building may limit the ability to install these devices for the court.	Supervising IS Analyst	FY 2013-14

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	Emergency lighting is not available in the Court's computer room.	I		The County is responsible for this building, not the Court. The Court is not aware that these devices are available. We will investigate the possibility of installing these devices. However, existing asbestos in building may limit the ability to install these devices for the court.	Supervising IS Analyst	FY 2011-12
		Log	Although most computer equipment is stored off the floor, some servers are on the floor of the computer room, which is located in the basement.	I		Court will move two servers off of the floor and relocate on to cart.	Supervising IS Analyst	May 2011
		Log	The computer room does not have flood alarms installed.	I		The County is responsible for this building, not the Court. The Court is not aware that these devices are available. We will investigate the possibility of installing these devices. However, existing asbestos in building may limit the ability to install these devices for the court.	Supervising IS Analyst	FY 2013-14
		Log	In 4 of 15 cases reviewed, the variance between the actual total bail and the standard total bail was not prorated among the penalty assessments causing the base fine distribution to the county and city, as well as the 20% State Surcharge, to be either understated or overstated.	I		We agree with the findings. We are working with the County to correct these errors.	Court Management Analyst	June 1, 2013
		Log	The Court delayed for at least seven months implementation of the penalty assessment and fee increases pursuant to SB 1407.		C	It was not the court's decision to delay implementation of SB1407. The case management system that must be updated when these increases occur is owned by the County and is 25 years old. As a result, the Court must rely on the County to make any programming changes. Depending on their workload, the County is not always able to make the changes quickly and often has to bring back retired programmers to work on changes due to the obsolete nature of the system.	Court Management Analyst	We are now in compliance with SB 1407.
7 Banking and Treasury								
	7.1	8	The Court Needs to Reconcile Its Trust Account Balances The Court acknowledged that it is not current with trust account reconciliations. Specifically, according to the Court, since converting from its ShowMe CMS to CCMS V3 in April 2008, it has not been able to perform reconciliations due to problems the Court accounting unit has experienced with CCMS V3 system reports. For example, according to the Court, the CCMS V3 system report does not always list all deposits for particular cases. So, to determine whether the total stated on the system report is accurate, the Court needs to go through the case history and tally all deposits made. The Court is currently working with the AOC CCMS V3 project team to address this issue, among others it is experiencing with CCMS V3.		C	We are working with the AOC CCMS V3 project team and have made great progress. While the reports still have some errors, the majority of the Trust Detail Report errors have been fixed.	Court Management Analyst	January 2011
		8	In the meantime, the Court is working on reconciling its trust accounts through developing a report of its own using information in the ShowMe CMS as well as information in CCMS V3. However, the Court currently has one part-time Court employee working on developing this report. Therefore, the Court expects that it will be well into the 2011 calendar year before it becomes current in its trust account reconciliations.		C	We have developed reports that will allow us to reconcile our trust accounts. We continue to have our retired Fiscal Services Supervisor working part time to help bring current our trust reconciliations. Once she is comfortable with the accuracy of the reconciliations using the V3 reports we will begin to redirect staff to assist her in expediting the trust reconciliations.	Court Management Analyst	January 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	Our review of the segregation of duties matrix revealed that for the Court's e-file bank account, the same person who controls the check stock also prepares checks.		C	The court will have one of our lead accounting technicians control the check stock so the person who prepares the checks will have only controlled access.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	The Court did not report a County bank account to the AOC.	C		The Court did not report a County bank account to the AOC because it is not the Court's bank account. The account is a consolidation of funds from all County departments. The Court has a fund balance with the County because the County still processes the Court's payroll and provides county services that the court pays for. All Court/County transactions are recorded monthly in the AOC's financial system. In the future we will report the Court's year-end fund balance in the County's bank account to the AOC.	CFO	June 2011
8 Court Security	8.1		The Court Needs to Strengthen Its Processes Regarding Court Security					
	2		The Court has not submitted its Comprehensive Court Security Plan to the Judicial Council for review and approval since Fiscal Year 2007-2008.	I		We agree with the audit findings and are currently taking corrective actions. Below are our responses to the two security audit issues: In conjunction with the San Joaquin County Sheriff, we submitted our updated Security Plan to the Administrative Office of the Court's Office of Emergency Response and Security Division (ERS) in June 2010. The ERS had concerns regarding our plan, and returned it for revision. We intend to resubmit our plan by the end of November 2010.	Court Executive Officer (CEO)	May 1, 2013
	2		Sheriff does not submit copies of invoices supporting equipment and travel costs billed to the Court.	C		We have contacted the Sheriff and requested supporting documentation for the equipment and travel costs billed in fiscal year 09/10. We expect to have the appropriate documentation by the end of November 2010. Additionally, we have asked the Sheriff to include supporting documentation for new equipment and travel costs billed to the court starting July 1, 2010.	Court Management Analyst	November 2010
		Log	At two locations, the emergency manual has not been updated within the past 12 months and only addresses bomb threats.	C		The Court is currently working with Court Managers responsible for their respective areas to update all manuals. In addition the Court has provided a desktop emergency guide to all staff.	Respective Court Manager	April 2012
		Log	One location only has an Injury and Illness Prevention Program manual.	C		The Court is currently working with Court Managers responsible for their respective areas to update all manuals. In addition the Court has provided a desktop emergency guide to all staff.	Respective Court Manager	April 2012
		Log	At the time of our review, employees at one court location did not have copies of the emergency manual.	C		The Court is currently working with Court Managers responsible for their respective areas to update all manuals. In addition the Court has provided a desktop emergency guide to all staff.	Respective Court Manager	April 2012

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	At one location, the DA and Public Defender have access to the court's work area including the cash drawer and case files where juvenile exhibits are kept.	C	I	Access is not allowed when JJC is not present.	Respective Court Manager	May 2011
		Log	At the time of our review, building evacuation drills had not been conducted within the last 12 months at six locations.	C	I	Several Court locations have had several real-time evacuations. Court administration will work with Court Managers to facilitate evacuations drills.	Respective Court Manager	January 2012
		Log	At the time of our review, fire suppression and/or fire control systems have not been tested within the last 12 months at one location.	I		This log does not specify which location; however, the Court will ask the AOC's FMU to ensure that systems are tested as required/needed.	AOC Facilities Management Unit & Court's Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	At the time of our review, smoke detectors had not been tested within the last 12 months at one location.	I		The Court will work with the AOC's FMU to resolve this issue.	AOC Facilities Management Unit & Court's Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	Fire extinguishers are not well marked at two locations.	I		The Court will work with the AOC's FMU to resolve this issue.	AOC Facilities Management Unit & Court's Business Services Manager	December 2012
		Log	One court location does not have a method to quickly alert employees of the need to evacuate the building.	C	I	The facility in question will be undergoing renovations during FY 11/12. It is anticipated that the AOC's OCCM will include an alarm that will provide the necessary alerts to evacuate the building.	Respective Court Manager	FY 2011-12
		Log	Three court locations do not have a key nest.	C	I	The Court will work with managers to determine which sites need key nest.	Business Services Manager	December 2011
		Log	Not all court keys are stamped "Do Not Duplicate" at two locations.	C	I	Most of the keys were handed down to the Court from the County when the court facilities transfers between Counties and the State took place. From this point on the Court will make every effort to ensure keys are stamped "Do Not Duplicate." We are also using Fab keys which are easier to inactivate.	Business Services Manager	May 2011
9 Procurement								
	9.1	11	The Court Can Further Improve Its Procurement Practices Out of 29 Cal Card transactions reviewed, the Court could not provide a purchase requisition for 20 transactions, one of which exceeded the \$1,500 per transaction limit stated in the FIN Manual. In addition, the purchase requisitions for two other Cal Card transactions were not sign-approved.	C	I	The Court does require the submittal of approved requisitions prior to procurement of goods or services. The Court acknowledges that there have been instances of purchase card transactions, and court ordered services, that which a requisition was not submitted prior to the purchase. Immediate action is being taken to ensure all staff adheres to the TCFPP. This action will be ongoing in the form of reminders and monitoring.	Business Services Manager	July 2011
		11	The Court's current approval matrix does not reflect the Court's policy of following the FIN Manual's suggested approval thresholds for the trial court procurements. As a result, purchase requisitions for five of the 29 Cal Card transactions reviewed were approved by a court manager not listed on the Court's current approval matrix.	C	I	The Court agrees that this is an issue, and will take immediate action to monitor and remind card holders as well as accounting staff of TCFPP policy requirements.	CFO and Business Services Manager	July 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		11	The Court did not have documented evidence that a purchase requisition was prepared and properly approved for all 20 expenditures reviewed.	C	I	The Court does require the resubmission of approved requisitions prior to procurement of goods or services. The Court acknowledges that there have been instances of purchase card transactions, and court ordered services, that which a requisition was not submitted prior to the purchase. Immediate action is being taken to ensure all staff adheres to the TCFPP. This action will be ongoing in the form of reminders and monitoring.	Business Services Manager	July 2011
		11	At the time of our review, the Court could not provide documentation supporting the procurement process used for 14 of the 20 expenditures reviewed. Subsequently, the Court asserted that it did not know the procurement process for two procurements, another eight procurements were either competitive or sole source and the document retention period had expired for seven of the eight procurements, and the remaining four procurements utilized State master agreements or were mini purchases that did not require procurement files.	C	I	The Court recognizes the necessity to improve past practices of documenting procurement files, and has made considerable improvement the past several years. The Court continues to improve procurement practices to align practices with the TCFPP and to ensure good stewardship of public funds. With regards to the two of the fourteen (14) procurements singled out by the auditor, the following applies: Two of the unknown procurement methods are related to past practices that have been corrected. One of the two was a result of County procurement practice prior to the Court/County separation; however, the Court has evaluated the procurement and found that during these challenging times, the provider has developed into an effective and reliable source and has worked with the Court to minimize annual cost increases.	Business Services Manager	July 2011
10 Contracts		Log	Two contracts related to court security contained a contractor termination clause other than for cause.	I		Yes, these contracts were developed prior to the Court & County separation and have remained in effect. At present the Court has good relationships with both entities and determined that the other than cause clause would not adversely affect these relationships or cause the Court harm; however, the Business Services Manager will evaluate the clause with the Court's CEO to determine if a change is necessary.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	The MOU related to providing space for the Self-Help Center did not contain a contract change clause or a confidentiality clause.	I		This MOU will be reviewed and discussed with the Court's CEO to determine if any changes need to be made.	Business Services Manager	December 1, 2012
		Log	Access to contract, bid, and vendor files is not limited to minimize the potential for misplaced or lost files.	I		Due to facility restraints, the Court has minimal secure filling space for contract, bid and vendor files. The new courthouse scheduled to be completed in 2015 will address this issue. In the interim, the Court will seek avenues to minimize access to these files.	Business Services Manager	December 2015 - when new courthouse is built
		Log	The Court acknowledged that its MOU with the County does not include costs of services provided or anticipated service outcomes as required by Government Code §77212(d)(1).	I		This is correct. This issue memo log will be discussed with the Court's CEO to determine any changes the CEO desires.	Business Services Manager	December 2012 - working with AOC Audit division
11 Accounts Payable	11.1		The Court Should Strengthen Its Petty Cash Procedures					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		7	The Family Law location commingles its \$100 petty cash fund with its \$250 change fund, does not maintain a log of petty cash expenditures, does not retain original receipts to support petty cash disbursements, and makes the commingled fund accessible to all cashiers when change is needed.	C	I	The Family Law location has separated its \$100 petty cash from the \$250 change fund and has been given a locking cash box for the petty cash fund. The main courthouse location has ordered a locking cash box for the petty cash fund. The Family Law location is now retaining receipts to support its disbursements.	CFO	January 2011
		7	The Lodi, Tracy, and main courthouse locations keep their petty cash fund in the same safe as their daily receipts, cash difference fund, and change fund.	C	I	Each of these other locations have only 1 safe to keep all of these items secured. Rest assured, all items are kept separately in either locked boxes or bags to prevent co-mingling.	CFO	January 2011
		7	The Accounting Unit does not perform a periodic reconciliation of the Court's petty cash funds.	C	I	The Accounting Unit will perform quarterly reconciliations of the petty cash and change funds at all Court locations.	CFO	September 2011
		7	The Lodi and Tracy locations do not utilize the Petty Cash Receipt form or some other form documenting disbursements from the petty cash fund and containing information specified in the FIN Manual. As a result, a \$4 petty cash reimbursement at the Court's Lodi location was for a \$3.74 expenditure and the location could not account for the 26 cent difference.	C	I	The Accounting Unit will be working with all branch locations on using the Petty Cash Receipt form to document disbursements from petty cash and to maintain a log of petty cash disbursements.	CFO	September 2011
		7	One petty cash expenditure at the main courthouse location, \$237.75 for stamped envelopes, exceeds the \$100 per petty cash transaction threshold and there was no evidence of CEO or designee pre-approval.	C	I	We will no longer be issuing petty cash for stamped envelopes since the cost exceeds the \$100 petty cash threshold.	CFO	January 2011
		7	The petty cash fund at the main courthouse exceeds the required \$200 total limit. Specifically, the main courthouse location has a \$750 petty cash fund. We reviewed the petty cash expenditures for fiscal year 2009-2010 to determine the average monthly use of petty cash. After taking out the petty cash transactions exceeding the \$100 per petty cash transaction threshold, we found that the average monthly petty cash use was about \$52. Therefore, the Court should consider reducing its petty cash fund.	C	I	The main courthouse will reduce the petty cash fund to \$200 and eliminate all disbursements exceeding the \$100 threshold.	CFO	January 2011
	11.2		Court Travel and Business Meal Expense Reimbursement Procedures Need Improvement					

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		10	Three out of eight travel expense claims reviewed were not signed approved and a fourth was not approved by the appropriate-level supervisor. Further, the Court could not demonstrate prior approval for out-of-state travel related to the fourth travel expense claim.		C	The court agrees with this audit finding and will implement the following changes: a.) All Judges travel claims must have an approval signature from either the Presiding Judge or the Assistant Presiding Judge before payment. b.) Presiding Judge travel claims must have the approval signature from the Assistant Presiding Judge and Assistant Presiding Judge travel claims must have the approval signature from the Presiding Judge before payment. c.) All travel claims of court staff must be approved by their immediate manager or a higher level manager before payment. The Court Executive Officer's travel claims must be approved by either the Presiding Judge or the Assistant presiding Judge. d.) Accounts payable approval staff will make sure the appropriate signatures are on the travel claim forms prior to posting in SAP.	CFO	January 2011
		10	For two business-related meals reviewed, the Court could not provide completed business-related meal expense forms. Therefore, we could not determine the location or cost-per-person for one of the two meals reviewed. Further, the Court could not provide prior approval for the two business-related meals reviewed.		C	The court agrees with this audit finding and will implement the following procedure. The court has created a Business Related Meals Form and will provide it to all managers to complete in the event there is a need to incur this type of expense in the future.	CFO	January 2011
		Log	The Court does not ensure that individuals who operate a vehicle on Court business attend the defensive driver's training class every four years.		C	The Court acknowledges this issue log, and will begin a process to ensure drivers are trained every four years.	HR Analyst II	June 12, 2012
		Log	The single transaction limits for 4 of 6 Cal Cards exceed the \$1,500 limit stated in the FIN Manual.		C	The court will review the transaction limits for Cal Cards and reduce the transaction limits to those recommended by the TCFPP if applicable.	CFO	May 2011
		Log	The Court indicates that it does not complete Form SF-274, Supervisor Review of Motor Vehicle Accident, in the event of a vehicle accident.		C	The Court does complete the SF-270, but was not familiar with the SF-274 and will ensure the SF-274 is completed in addition to the SF-270.	Respective - Supervisor and Manager	January 2012
		Log	The Court did not use the most appropriate general ledger account for two of the 30 invoices reviewed.		C	The court uses GL 921704 in cost center 392190 to track our summer youth program, regardless of the type of expense because it is a "special event". Because the costs associated with this are only a few hundred dollars, we did not set up a WBS to track. In the future we will do so.	CFO	July 2011
		Log	Nine of 30 invoices reviewed did not demonstrate that the Court performed a three-point match of the invoice to a purchase agreement, such as a purchase order or contract, and to proof of receipt and acceptance of goods or services, such as a packing slip or acknowledgment that acceptable goods or services were received.		C	The Court agrees with the issue that we are not applying the 3 point match policy with some of our contract and blanket POs. Accounts Payable will immediately request, prior to payment, acceptance documentation from the person requesting the procurement good or service.	CFO	The parking garage changed ownership. Working on agreement, will be completed 12/31/12
		Log	Accounts payable files for one of 30 invoices reviewed did not contain purchase agreements; therefore, we were unable to determine whether payments were made in accordance with a purchase agreement.		I	The Court agrees that one invoice did not contain a purchase agreement. The Court will work to develop a purchase agreement with the City of Stockton for our employee parking. The City has not wanted to do this in the past.	CFO	The parking garage changed ownership. Working on agreement, will be completed 12/31/12

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	One court interpreter mileage claim used a P.O. Box address, instead of a business or residence address, which makes it difficult for the Court to verify the claimed mileage.	C		The interpreter coordinator will ask that the interpreter put her street address, in addition to her PO Box, on future claims.	CFO	June 2011
		Log	Two court reporter transcript invoices were not paid according to rates established in Government Code section 69950. As a result, the two invoices were underpaid by at least \$1,290.	C		The Court agrees with the underpayment of the court reporter transcript invoices. The court reporters were not aware that the requirement of 5 ASCILs on death penalty cases had been changed to 6. Because they were unsure they created the 6 cds but only charged the Court for 5.	CFO	June 2011
12 Fixed Assets Management								
	12.1	9	The Court Could Improve Its Tracking and Reporting of Court Assets The Court acknowledged that it does not have a list of court-owned computer software and may not have been in compliance with all software vendor licensing agreements. However, the Court stated that had entered into a new agreement to bring it into compliance with the licensing agreements.		C	The Court agrees with the audit team's recommendations/assessment. Our responses are as follows: The court has entered into a software licensing agreement as of May 14, 2010. This licensing agreement provides the Court third party assistance and online tools to manage software licensing. These management control tools include methods of periodically comparing installed software against licensing terms.	Information Systems Manager	May 2010
		9	Our review of four expenditures classified as inventory items revealed that not all inventory items purchased were listed on the Court's inventory list. Specifically, one printer/copier was not on the list.		C	The Court, prior to the audit, had been, and will continue working to improve staff understanding of the importance of fixed asset management. Constant communication with outlying court locations and training is essential to full cooperation. The Court's goal is to maintain compliance with the Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures and to establish other internal methods to improve cooperation such as training for all trial court staff involved in the acquisition, recording, transfer and disposal of fixed assets.	Business Services Manager	July 2009 and ongoing
		9	Out of the 98 inventory items selected for "floor-to-list" verification, 19 inventory items were not found on the inventory list. Also, 10 of the 19 inventory items did not have an asset ID tag. In addition, the 79 inventory items listed, the inventory list did not accurately reflect the description for one inventory item. Further, the inventory list did not accurately reflect the location for 11 of the 79 inventory items found on the inventory list.		C	See response above.	Business Services Manager	July 2009 and ongoing
		Log	The Court does not have a process to periodically identify and dispose of obsolete IT equipment, such as identifying broken or obsolete equipment during its annual inventory.		C	The Court has implemented processes to follow the TCFPP for asset disposal. However internally, the process is not always followed by staff creating the perception of no process. The Court continues to work with staff to ensure TCFPP asset disposal processes are always followed.	Business Services Manager	January 2012

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		Log	The Court's inventory list did not accurately reflect the location for one of the 11 fixed assets selected to review.	C		The Court appreciates these comments and does continue to improve upon its current practices. Some items do have generally described locations due to shared equipment; however, we do understand that being more specific greatly assist with inventory. Because the fixed asset inventory requires cooperation of all staff, it is often difficult to maintain a completely accurate inventory of the Court's 4,300+ tagged items.	Business Services Manager	January 2012
		Log	Out of the 67 inventory items selected for "list-to-floor" verification, we could not locate three inventory items. In addition, of the 64 inventory items located, the Court's inventory list did not completely or accurately reflect the identifying information or description for six inventory items. Further, the inventory list did not accurately reflect the location for nine of the 64 inventory items located.	C		The Court appreciates these comments and does continue to improve upon its current practices. Some items do have generally described locations due to shared equipment; however, we do understand that being more specific greatly assist with inventory. Because the fixed asset inventory requires cooperation of all staff, it is often difficult to maintain a completely accurate inventory of the Court's 4,300+ tagged items.	Business Services Manager	January 2012
			No issues to report.					
			No issues to report.					
13 Audits								
14 Records Retention								
15 Domestic Violence		Log	The Court assessed the PC 1202.44 Probation Revocation Restitution Fine in 2 of 3 cases reviewed where probation was not granted.	C	1	This was an error made by staff and was resolved with further training.	Criminal, Traffic, and Juvenile Delinquency Manager	May 2011
		Log	The Court assessed the PC 1203.097(a)(5) Domestic Violence Probation fine in all 3 cases reviewed where probation was not granted.	C	1	This was an error made by staff and was resolved with further training.	Criminal, Traffic, and Juvenile Delinquency Manager	May 2011
16 Exhibits	16.1		Improvements Can Be Made to Strengthen Accountability Over Exhibits					
		5	The Court does not have a court-wide exhibit handling operations manual.	C	1	The court will develop a court wide Exhibit Manual to standardize all handling, accepting, tracking, safeguarding, and disposal of exhibits.	Court Records Manager	November 2010
		5	One Court location does not have a process in place to document transfer of exhibits to the exhibit closet.	C	1	See response above.	Court Records Manager	November 2010
		5	Not all exhibits documented in court records were found at one Court location.	C	1	See response above.	Court Records Manager	November 2010
		5	The location of exhibits secured in interim locations during trial is not noted in either the CMS or the manual card system at the main courthouse.	C	1	The court will install and train the appropriate court branch staff in the use of the ACCESS-Exhibit Tracking Database currently used in the Stockton Court Branch as well as a secondary manual tracking system for all exhibits.	Court Records Manager	January 2011
		5	The main courthouse does not always require that all biological evidence be properly sealed per local rule prior to accepting as an exhibit.	C	1	The court will ensure that all assigned staff will be properly trained on the safe handling of highly sensitive items such as guns, drugs, money and hazardous or biological materials.	Court Records Manager	January 2011

FUNCTION	RPT NO.	ISSUE MEMO	ISSUE	I	C	COURT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
		5	All Court locations do not perform exhibit room or exhibit closet inspections.	C	1	The court will perform quarterly inspections of all exhibit lockers, storage areas as well as yearly inventory of all exhibits to ensure that exhibits are being properly stored, tracked and disposed. This will be implemented by January 31, 2011.	Court Records Manager	January 2011
		5	Two Court locations do not perform a periodic inventory of their exhibit closet.	C	1	See response above.	Court Records Manager	January 2011
		5	The Court does not conduct a complete inventory of its exhibits at one location. Consequently, the manual card tracking system at this location did not accurately reflect all of the exhibits on hand for 3 of the 15 criminal cases reviewed.	C	1	See response above.	Court Records Manager	January 2011
		Log	Exhibits at one Court location were not destroyed in a timely manner per government code.	C	1	All branch court locations have been provided an identical exhibit manual that will enable them to properly dispose of exhibits. Each court location will follow through with the destruction process as they can, given our severe budget cuts and lack of staff resources.	Court Managers	January 2012
17	Bail		No issues to report.					

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

CASEFLOW/COURTROOM PROCESSING

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R1	Trial by Declaration in Absentia Process	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing a Trial by Declaration in Absentia process pursuant to VC 40903 for eligible traffic citations. Eliminating open arraignment traffic court. 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. 	Short – CRITICAL	Efficiencies and Savings - Implementation of the trial in absentia process expedites adjudication of cases decreasing backlogs and the number of calendar settings. 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	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: The court estimates it will be able to finalize its evaluation and begin implementation in approximately 6 months.				
COURT UPDATE					
R1	Implementation Date: In progress. A judicial committee, that includes key management staff, has been formed to review all aspects of this recommendation. Further analysis is being completed. The court anticipates a decision to be made within the next 4 months. Cost Savings/Court Expense:				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R2	Outsourcing of Traffic Citation Data Entry	Evaluate the cost/benefit of outsourcing Citation Processing. 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.	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.

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT RESPONSE	
R2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) The Court will adopt the CART recommendations of evaluating the cost/benefit of outsourcing Citation Processing. Timeframe for implementation: The Court estimates the timeframe for evaluating and implementing to be at least 6 months, but no more than 1 year.
COURT UPDATE	
R2	Implementation Date: Cost Savings/Court Expense:

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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

COURT RESPONSE	
R3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (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. Timeframe for implementation: The court estimates it will be able to evaluate and implement in approximately 2 to 3 months.
COURT UPDATE	
R3	Implementation Date: In evaluating this recommendation, it became clear there exists a general return to court <i>guideline</i> that has been in place since 2000. Over the years, those guidelines have been updated. Most recently newer guidelines were adopted as the court's policy on 12/5/12. Cost Savings/Court Expense: As the court has had this in practice for many years, any efficiencies or savings will be minimal.

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R4	Family Law Case Processing	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.	Short	Efficiencies and savings	None

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT RESPONSE	
R4	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court Does not Adopt Recommendation (Provide reason(s) for not adopting Recommendation)</p> <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.</p> <p>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	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R5	Traffic Correspondence	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.	Short	Savings - between one and two clerical FTEs currently handle this correspondence. These staff could be deployed to other important duties.	None

COURT RESPONSE	
R5	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</p> <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. Timeframe for implementation: This new process will be in place on or before July 1, 2012.</p>

COURT UPDATE	
R5	<p>Implementation Date: 7/1/12</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: Annualized savings estimate is \$20,426. However, since the CART Review, the court has had to lay off an additional 13 staff so many time savings associated with this recommendation has been redirected to other duties left vacated by the layoffs.</p>

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R6	Implementation Date: May 2012 Cost Savings/Court Expense: Analysis completed and we have determined that our current way of doing business is the most cost effective.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.	Short	Savings - Reduced printing and postage costs; staff time savings	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: Implementation within the next 30 days.				
COURT UPDATE					
R7	Implementation Date: 7/1/12 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates approximately \$234 of savings related to copies and approximately \$2,550 in staff costs annually. Staff time saved in implementing this recommendation would be redirected to other important duties.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R8	Juvenile Traffic Infraction Processing	Explore shifting some juvenile infraction citations to adult traffic processing	Short	Efficiencies	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T. 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. 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. 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.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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
COURT RESPONSE					
R9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R9	Implementation Date: This is an ongoing process. Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court has used this process for several years and will continue to do so. There are no savings associated as it is a current practice.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R10	Family Law Case Management	Evaluate the courts efforts to ensure the implementation of case management to assist the Court and litigants to efficiently conclude their family law proceedings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Short	Efficiencies - There would be significant efficiencies derived from implementing case management, including many more cases reaching full disposition.	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. 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. The court will adopt a process to setting CMC hearings as a tracking mechanism to ensure proper adjudication of FL cases. Timeframe for implementation: The court can begin scheduling CMC dates by July 1, 2012.				
COURT UPDATE					
R10	Implementation Date: This recommendation was partially implemented on 7/1/12. CMS programming still in development. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Undetermined at this time as not yet fully implemented.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R11	Family Law - Department of Child Support Services Stipulation Process	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.	Short	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.	None – The court responded that they believe there is an associated cost.
COURT RESPONSE					
R11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

	Timeframe for implementation: We believe this could take place by August 1, 2012.
COURT UPDATE	
R11	Implementation Date: 8/1/12 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates approximately 8 hours per month would be saved for an annualized savings of \$3,771. However, the court also had a one-time expense associated with programmatic changes to its CMS in the amount of \$1,088.

CIVIL ASSESSMENT

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R12	Civil Assessment Program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase Civil Assessment collections by including “failure to pay” traffic cases Require all Petitions to Vacate civil assessment be filed ex-parte and not addressed at subsequent court hearings. 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. 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. 	<p>Short – CRITICAL</p> <p>Short – CRITICAL</p> <p>Short – CRITICAL</p>	<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>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.</p>	<p>The court would need to work with the county on any programming changes to CJIS (criminal/traffic system).</p>

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT RESPONSE	
R12.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation 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. Timeframe for implementation: 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
R12.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: Implementation of the recommendation would be in conjunction with the changes to the overall Civil Assessment Program.
R12.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated Timeframe for implementation) The first part of this recommendation will require judicial by-in. Timeframe for implementation: Implementation of the recommendation would be in conjunction with the changes to the overall Civil Assessment Program. 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.
R12.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) This recommendation will require judicial by-in. Timeframe for implementation: 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.
COURT UPDATE	
R12.1 thru R12.4	Implementation Date: R12.1 and R12.4 were implemented on 1-2-13. R12.2 and R12.3 are in progress – estimated implementation date 3/1/13. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Based on FY11-12 civil assessment revenue collections, the court estimates a projected revenue estimate of \$325,000 per year. Significant CMS programming changes need to be made by the county to our old case management system. It is not clear at this time if those changes can be made. The implementation of a civil assessment program is presently being done using a manual process.

COLLECTIONS

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R13	Installment Payments	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.	short	Efficiency – this would save countless staff hours on a task that can be handled more globally through CJIS table maintenance.	None.
COURT RESPONSE					
R13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

	already follow the recommendation and have done so since the inception of CJIS (1988).
COURT UPDATE	
R13	Implementation Date: 1988 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court already follows the recommendation – no cost savings.

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.	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"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	Timeframe for implementation: At a minimum 1 year.				

COURT UPDATE					
R14	Implementation Date: In Progress. The court has already had discussions and will continue to meet with the county and our third party vendor regarding the collection of all fees and fines. Cost Savings/Court Expense:				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.

COURT RESPONSE					
R15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	Timeframe for implementation: Implementation within 1 year.				

COURT UPDATE					
R15	Implementation Date: 11/2/12 – The court met with the county and our third party vendor for collections. The new civil assessment cases will be sent to the third party vendor for collections. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Because the program is still in its infancy, we do not have sufficient data to make a reasonable projection.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R16	Accounts Receivable System	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.	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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Evaluation and analysis of this recommendation will have to be fully investigated to determine the full costs of implementation. Timeframe for implementation: The Court estimates that it will take between 6 months to 1 year for evaluation and potential implementation.				
COURT UPDATE					
R16	Implementation Date: The court will implement this recommendation when it migrates on to a new case management system. The court will be using the soon to be completed statewide Master Services Agreement for CMS vendors and estimates a complete migration to its new CMS in approximately 18 months. Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court will be able to fully assess any costs or increased revenue once the court had determined with vendor it will be using to implement a new CMS.				

COUNTY JUSTICE PARTNERS

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R17	County Justice Partners	It is recommended that the court stop performing DOJ audits of CLETS records for protective orders.	Short	Savings - Many hours of staff time per month will be saved from eliminating this task.	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: Implementation by July 1, 2012.				
COURT UPDATE					
R17	Implementation Date: 8/1/12 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates an annualized savings of approximately \$1,650. Clerk time saved will be redirected to other important duties.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R18	County Justice Partners	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.	Short	Savings - While there may not be time savings, this change will mitigate risk for the court.	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	Timeframe for implementation: We anticipate it will take 6 months to implement this recommendation.				
COURT UPDATE					
R18	Implementation Date: 12/1/12. Cost Savings/Court Expense: The county has made modifications to the interface which has significantly reduced the number of errors on complaints.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R19	County Justice Partners	It is recommended that the court stop making a copy of each transfer-in case file for DA's Office	Short	Savings - By terminating this practice, hours of staff time and the cost of paper and toner will be saved.	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
	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. Timeframe for implementation: Implementation on or before July 1, 2012.				
COURT UPDATE					
R19	Implementation Date: 7/1/12 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates approximately \$589 would be saved annually in staff time as well as \$18 in copy costs.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R20	County Justice Partners	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.	Short	Revenue and savings - If the court charges for the priors, the revenue could be significant. 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
COURT RESPONSE					
R20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: Implementation by July 1, 2012.				
COURT UPDATE					
R20	Implementation Date: 9/10/12 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates approximately \$69,958 in annual staff time savings if the copies were not made free of charge. The court estimates approximately \$5,766 in new revenue as a charge for copies and certification of priors.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R21	County Justice Partners	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.	Short	Savings - Hours of staff time, form costs, paper and toner would be saved by eliminating this practice.	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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,				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

	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. Timeframe for implementation: Eliminating the distribution of copies to most law and justice agencies will begin immediately. Please see Recommendation 59 for information regarding juvenile case management system.
COURT UPDATE	
R21	Implementation Date: May 2012 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates approximately \$10,213 of annualized savings in staff time as well as \$78 of costs for copies.

COURT REPORTERS

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R22	Court Reporters – Transcript Reimbursement	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.	Short	Savings- Savings may be significant if many reporters are out of compliance.	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
R22	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. Timeframe for implementation: The court will follow-up with CART members to obtain samples of billing and claim forms.				
COURT UPDATE					
R22	Implementation Date: As of 10/1/12, the preliminary hearing date will be added to invoices. Cost Savings/Court Expense: No savings as court was already in compliance with PC 869.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R23	Court Reporters – utilization of word count versus folio rate	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. Many courts have an established standard that sets a fixed number of folios per page.	Short	Savings – 30% savings estimated at \$150,000	None

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

		It is recommended that an actual word count be implemented for determining the amount paid for each transcript.			
COURT RESPONSE					
R23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)			
		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. Timeframe for implementation: Implementation will take place within 6 months.			
COURT UPDATE					
R23		Implementation Date: GC 69950 (new legislation in the budget act of 2012) prohibits changes at this time. Cost Savings/Court Expense:			

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R24	Court Reporters – Court reporter fees	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.	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
COURT RESPONSE					
R24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)			
		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. Timeframe for implementation: 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.			
COURT UPDATE					
R24		Implementation Date: 8/23/12 - Effective 10/1/12, we will no longer provide official court reporters in any civil courtroom. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Existing court reporter resources will be used where required by law.			

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R25	Court Reporters Resources	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.	Short	Savings – reduction in the number of court reporters resources needed.	Costs for Electronic Recording equipment is approximately \$1,000 per courtroom.
COURT RESPONSE					
R25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: Implementation within 6 months.				
COURT UPDATE					
R25	Implementation Date: 8/23/12 - Effective 10/1/12, we will no longer provide official court reporters in any civil courtroom. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Existing court reporter resources will be used where required by law.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R26	Court Reporters – notes storage	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.	Short	Savings - The benefits of not having to store, move, destroy and track hundreds of boxes of reporter notes would be significant	Small cost - the one-time cost to purchase ACORN is less than \$5,000. The annual service fee is approximately \$500 per month.

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT RESPONSE	
R26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: Effective July 1, 2012.
COURT UPDATE	
R26	Implementation Date: We investigated the use of an in-house electronic storage warehouse, which will have very little or no cost to the court. On 11/15/12 we rolled out this new electronic storage system for our court reporters. Cost Savings/Court Expense: The only expense to the court was some staff time spent in exploring and implementing this option. The court also projects a one-time expense for destruction of notes for approximately \$2,800.

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.	Short	Savings - would be \$10,000 - \$20,000 per year.	None

COURT RESPONSE	
R27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: Effective July 1, 2012.
COURT UPDATE	
R27	Implementation Date: 7/1/12 – we will use up existing supply and will not make future purchases. Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court has not purchased paper in the last 4 years. Two boxes remain in the supply and there are only 2 reporters who still use paper while all the others use electronic storage.

FACILITIES

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R28	Facilities	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).	Medium	Savings and efficiency - Savings from closing branch courts would be immediate and would help the court manage its diminished staff resources.	Cost of moving staff and equipment.

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT RESPONSE	
R28	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Court Does not Adopt Recommendation (Provide reason(s) for not adopting Recommendation)</u></p> <p>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.</p> <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 1st floor. The court was able to lease the 1st 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 2nd 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 2nd floor of 540 is our inability to support the lease costs. The court cannot pay for the lease costs associated with leasing the 2nd floor or the 1st 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> <p>2/3/13 Update: The court continues to object to closing branch courts and sees no statewide policy regarding branch court closures. However, due to our fiscal emergency we are closing the Lodi Branch Court effective 3/4/13.</p>

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.
COURT RESPONSE					
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)				
R29	<p>We have explored the recommendation and have concluded that such a move at this time is not feasible.</p> <p>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.</p>				
COURT UPDATE					
R29	<p>Implementation Date: May 2012 – We have explored the recommendation and have concluded that such a move at this time is not feasible.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense:</p>				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

FEES

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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
COURT RESPONSE					
R30	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T. We do assess the \$10.00 Administrative Assessment to both the 40508(a)s and 40508(b)s, whether the FTAs/FTPs are added electronically or manually.				
COURT UPDATE					
R30	Implementation Date: After further investigation, it was determined that the court was only charging for one of the \$10 assessment fees. Programmatic changes to the courts 30 year old CMS was completed and in production as of 12/17/12. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Because the program is still in its infancy, we do not have sufficient data to make a reasonable projection. (However, for the time period of 12/17/12 through 1/28/13, the court added this fee to 931 citations. Only 2% of those citations where this fee was applied have paid with a total of \$210 collected.)				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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
COURT RESPONSE					
R31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation 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.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT UPDATE	
R31	<p>Implementation Date: 7/1/12</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: Projected increase in revenue is approximately \$6,450. From 7/1/12 through 1/28/13, the court collected \$3,635, which is an increase of \$1,221 over the same time period last fiscal year.</p>

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R32	Fees	Ensure judicial officers are imposing PC1305 Bail Bond Forfeiture Set Aside Fee. Consider increasing fee based on cost.	Short	Revenue - Annual increase = \$20-\$30K	CJIS Programming changes will be billed to the court.

COURT RESPONSE	
R32	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u></p> <p>The court's CEO received approval from the Executive Committee on May 1, 2012 to increase the fee based on actual costs.</p> <p><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.</p>
COURT UPDATE	
R32	<p>Implementation Date: 3/4/13 – The fees based on costs have been determined to be \$69 and \$126.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court projects revenue for the current fiscal year to be approximately \$2,000. Potential full year revenues could be as high as \$8,000.</p>

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R33	Fees	Impose GC70617(a) Motion Fee on criminal and traffic hearings. Santa Clara imposes the fee when Bond Agents and Others request a hearing.	Short	Revenue - Annual increase = \$10K	CJIS Programming changes will be billed to the court.

COURT RESPONSE	
R33	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u></p> <p>The court's CEO received approval from the Executive Committee on May 1, 2012 to impose this fee.</p> <p><u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> Programming changes will need to be completed. It is estimated this could take up 60 days to implement.</p>
COURT UPDATE	
R33	<p>Implementation Date: 3/4/13 - Pursuant to GC70617(a) the motion fee is \$60.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates the revenue for the current fiscal year to be approximately \$1,000.</p>

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R34	Fees	Notify County re: VC16028/PC1463.22 Financial Responsibility (\$17.50) revenue due to the Court.	Short	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.	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R34	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u> 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. Timeframe for implementation: It is anticipated the court will complete by the close of Fiscal Year 2012-2013.				
COURT UPDATE					
R34	Implementation Date: 6/30/13. The court has had discussions with the county regarding this revenue. Discussions and negotiations are ongoing but expect to be completed by the end of the fiscal year. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Unknown at this time.				
#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R35	Fees	Impose PC1205 Stay Fee on fines imposed in Court.	Short	Revenue .	None
COURT RESPONSE					
R35	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Prior to receiving C.A.R.T.'s recommendations, Court received Executive Committee approval to implement the recommendation</u> 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. Timeframe for implementation: The court anticipates programming changes and training of staff could be completed and implemented no later than July 1, 2012.				
COURT UPDATE					
R35	Implementation Date: 7/1/12 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The courts early projection (7/1/12) was approximately \$2,430 in new revenue for the current fiscal year. For the period of 7/1/12 through 1/31/13 the court has collected \$2,475 in revenue. We now project a total of \$4,200 could be collected by the end of the current fiscal year.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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"/> Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.				
	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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R36	Implementation Date: 7/1/97. Cost Savings/Court Expense:				

FINANCIAL

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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
COURT RESPONSE					
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation				
R37	The Court will adopt the CART Team recommendations of having all county charges currently being paid by the court to the county audited. 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. 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. 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. Timeframe for implementation: The court estimates it will be able implement the recommendation in 6 months to 1 year.				
COURT UPDATE					
R37	Implementation Date: Pursuant to GC77212, notice was given to San Joaquin County on 12/18/12. Effective 7/1/13, the court will no longer be part of the county's A87 charges and will be direct billed for services from the county. Cost Savings/Court Expense: This may not result in actual savings but will provide the court with current (real time) expense information which will allow the court to make better business decisions.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R38	Bail Exoneration and Refund Checks Processing	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.	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
COURT RESPONSE					
R38	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u> 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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R38	<u>Implementation Date:</u> This recommendation was partially completed and implemented on 9/1/12. The court estimates full completion by 6/30/13. <u>Cost Savings/Court Expense:</u> The court is projecting annual staff time savings of approximately \$1,124.				

GRANTS

#	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
COURT RESPONSE					
R39	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</u> 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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R39	<u>Implementation Date:</u> The court has met with the director of our local DCSS office. The court has also made numerous follow-up phone calls with no response. The court has sought the assistance of AOC lead staff that in turn has made contact with the State Department of Child Support Services. A final/updated plan of cooperation is in progress. Estimated completion is 3/1/13. <u>Cost Savings/Court Expense:</u> Potential revenue and reimbursement to the court are estimated to be \$3,100 to \$24,500.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

MISCELLANEOUS

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R40	Passport Processing	It is recommended that the court review passport processing to determine whether revenue earned is worth the effort.	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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R40	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u> The Court has been reviewing our passport processing to determine whether revenue earned is worth the effort. Timeframe for implementation: Review within 6 months.				
COURT UPDATE					
R40	Implementation Date: 9/25/12 Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court has completed its analysis and has determined that it will continue to process passports at this time. We will re-evaluate again in February 2013.				

PURCHASING

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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
COURT RESPONSE					
R41	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</u> 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.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT UPDATE	
R41	<p>Implementation Date: Since 2003, the court has routinely reviewed its purchasing practices in an effort to keep costs low. This is an ongoing process for the court.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: Savings have varied year to year. At this point, the only savings left that could be achieved are any associated ongoing OE&E for staff that have been laid off.</p>

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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

COURT RESPONSE	
R42	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T.</p> <p>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 we find our cost for the Image Master toner to be less than Staples sustainable earth brand.</p>

COURT UPDATE	
R42	<p>Implementation Date: This is an example of how the court has continued to find ways to save money.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: Any savings achieved have already been negated due to ongoing budget cuts.</p>

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT RESPONSE	
R43	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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.
COURT UPDATE	
R43	Implementation Date: Ongoing Cost Savings/Court Expense: Savings and expense will depend on future needs for replacement of equipment.

RECORDS

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R44	Records/Filing/ Exhibits	Conduct an overall review of current records and exhibit management and purge program to identify efficiencies to be realized by modifying existing practices. Specific recommendations include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize paper sorting tools where needed when pre-sorting items to be filed. 2. 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. 3. 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.). 4. Utilize bar code labels on every active file and create bar codes for court locations to assist with file tracking. 5. Develop records destruction and purging program. 6. 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. 	Medium	Savings, efficiencies, and cost avoidance.	None

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

		<p>7. 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.</p> <p>8. The noticing and destruction of exhibits and corresponding processes may also need to be refined.</p> <p>9. Both an index of cases filed and cases destroyed should be maintained and accessible to juvenile staff.</p> <p>10. 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.</p> <p>11. Order file folders with pockets (staff are manually creating pocket by cutting card stock and taping it to the file folder)</p> <p>12. 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.</p> <p>13. Target sheets in files may provide easier access to certain documents and more consistency in how files are maintained (Juvenile Dependency).</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

COURT RESPONSE

R44.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: 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.
R44.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: 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.
R44.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: 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.
R44.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: Implementation between 6 months to 1 year.

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

R44.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T. 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.
R44.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: 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.
R44.7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: The Court will research possible methods to clearly identify warrant status from disposed cases. Implementation between 6 months to 1 year.
R44.8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T. The court already has a simplified process for noticing and destroying exhibits. The current back log is due to insufficient staffing.
R44.9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: Implementation between 6 months to 1 year.
R44.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: The court will explore additional possibilities of file organization and plans to have this research completed and in place in 2-3 months.
R44.11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: 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.
R44.12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation implemented by Court well before C.A.R.T. 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 is ordered via E-mail or phone call.
R44.13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Timeframe for implementation: Implementation within 6 months.
COURT UPDATE	
R44.1 Thru R44.13	Implementation Date: All of these recommendations, 44.1 through 44.13 have an implementation date of 6 months to 1 year. Our records management division will do its best to completely implement these recommendations timely. However, with the reductions in staff, timely implementation may prove to be difficult. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Yet to be determined.

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

STAFFING

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.	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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R45	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court Does not Adopt Recommendation (Provide reason(s) for not adopting Recommendation)				
	<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 1st and 3rd floors (Traffic & 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 & 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>				
COURT UPDATE					
R45	<p>Implementation Date: 6/18/12 – For the Stockton branch, all mail is opened by 2 people on the 3rd floor, which eliminated the need for a 3rd person to assist with this process. This change allowed us to spend no money while also putting us in compliance with the AOC Audit recommendation of a 2 person mail team.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates an annualized savings of \$81,702 for the staff time associated with this task.</p>				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

TECHNOLOGY

#	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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R46	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u> 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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R46	<u>Implementation Date:</u> The IT Manager was selected on 6/12/12 and began employment with the court on 7/2/12. <u>Cost Savings/Court Expense:</u> The court has an approximate annual position cost of \$150,000.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R47	Infrastructure	It is recommended that the court replace 15 individual servers with 3 servers running VMWare virtualization.	Short - CRITICAL	Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems.	Cost for implementation approx. \$81,000.
COURT RESPONSE					
R47	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</u> 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. <u>Timeframe for implementation:</u> The servers will be purchased within the next 2 months.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT UPDATE	
R47	<p>Implementation Date: The court purchased 3 servers on 6/19/12. All have been deployed except for one. We will migrate the remaining server once we have completed the Win7 desktop deployment. Win7 desktop deployment is expected to be completed by 2/28/13.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates the cost of server purchase, deployment and migration to be approximately \$81,500.</p>

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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	Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal investment estimated to be \$81,000.

COURT RESPONSE	
R48	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Timeframe for implementation: The court expects, where financially feasible, to complete all items within the next 6 months to 1 year.</p>

COURT UPDATE	
R48	<p>Implementation Date: The court purchased 3 servers on 6/19/12. Deployment completed 12/31/12.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates the cost of server purchase, deployment and migration to be approximately \$81,500.</p>

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R49	Infrastructure	Move IBM Filenet Hosting and Support to the AOC / CCTC	Short - CRITICAL	Critical need for court wide infrastructure of systems –	Unknown

COURT RESPONSE	
R49	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation)</p> <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>Timeframe for implementation: Implementation of this recommendation or any modification of this recommendation may take a few months of planning.</p>

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

COURT UPDATE					
R49	Implementation Date: Further analysis was completed on 9/26/12 and the court will not adopt this recommendation as the cost of the CCTC hosting will be an additional cost to the court. Cost Savings/Court Expense:				
#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION 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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R50	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) Once our new IT manager is hired, he or she will ensure an audit of all software licenses is completed. Timeframe for implementation: Completion is estimated to be within the next 6 months.				
COURT UPDATE					
R50	Implementation Date: This process began 7/1/12 and is ongoing. Our IT manager continually assesses software licensing to determine if cost and need are appropriate. Cost Savings/Court Expense: The court estimates that as much as \$75,000 annually could be saved.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R51	Infrastructure	Move Hosting of Public Access Website to AOC CCTC / CCMS Secure Portal, or replace the Current Server that is locally Hosting the Website.	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	The cost of moving public access / on-line case information

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

				technologies.	searches to the CCTC Secure Portal is unknown.
COURT RESPONSE					
R51	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: Several months of planning for this recommendation or any modification of this recommendation may be necessary prior to implementation.				
COURT UPDATE					
R51	Implementation Date: On August 9, 2012, the court replaced the server that hosted our website. Cost Savings/Court Expense: An existing newer server was repurposed for our website which eliminated the need for the old IBM AS400 server. The only cost to the court was approximately 16 hours of staff time to test and migrate the website to the repurposed server.				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R52	Electronic Traffic Citations	Identify cost for further implementation of electronic Traffic citations and seek out grant funding. Sources could include Department of Transportation.	Medium	Efficiencies	Cost for implementation could be \$100K but may be covered by grant funding sources.
COURT RESPONSE					
R52	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) The court recognizes the efficiencies e-citations bring to the court. The court already has the 2 nd 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. Timeframe for implementation: The court expects it may take up to 1 year or more to fully explore, apply and implement a program of this nature.				
COURT UPDATE					
R52	Implementation Date: Cost Savings/Court Expense:				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R53	Website	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.	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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R53	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: A project of this magnitude, given the courts diminished staff and financial resources, may take a year or more to fully implement.				
COURT UPDATE					
R53	Implementation Date: June 2013 is the expected completion of this project. Cost Savings/Court Expense: No costs or financial resources, other than staff time, have been expended by the court to complete this recommendation.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
54	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"> 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 billed by transaction. The Court spends \$1.5M per year on CJIS. 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. 	Long-term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1: New case management system could result in reduction of yearly maintenance cost from \$1.5M per year to \$60K per year. Option 2: the long-term savings and greater control of the database are significant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Option 2: By moving CJIS to a SQL platform, the transition would take about 9 months to complete, cost between \$1.5 and \$2 M, 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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R54	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R54	<p>Implementation Date: The court will be using the \$916,000 loan provided by the Judicial Council in December 2011 to replace the CJIS case management system (CMS). The court will be using the statewide Master Services Agreement for CMS vendors that is expected to be completed in February 2013. The court has already had discussions with the county regarding the court’s intent to get off of the county’s main frame CJIS system. The court expects that the full deployment of a new case management system could take up to 18 months.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Court Expense: The cost of a new CMS is unknown at this time. However, preliminary estimates show that a newer system will cost the court far less that what is paid to the county annually. Today, the court annually pays the county \$1.5 million and a newer system could cost as much as \$500,000 annually, leaving the court with a potential \$1.0 million savings each year.</p>				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R55	Juvenile Delinquency Case Management System	It is recommended that the court consider options for implementing a Juvenile delinquency case management system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the short-term, utilize the ShowMe Case management system currently utilized by family law and juvenile dependency. In the long-term there may be value in assessing the CMS vendor that the Probation department uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short – for ShowMe option Long – for Probation option. 	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.
COURT RESPONSE					
R55	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: Implementation can be completed within six months for the short-term recommendation. For the long-term recommendation, assessment can be completed within 1 year.				
COURT UPDATE					
R55	Implementation Date: The court will be including a juvenile delinquency case management system when it implements R54. Cost Savings/Court Expense:				

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R56	E-filing	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.	Medium	Savings - Detailed ROI analysis would need to be performed to determine specific savings.	Initial investment of approximately \$150K one time for implementation.
COURT RESPONSE					
R56	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: The analysis to be completed between 12 and 18 months.				
COURT UPDATE					
R56	Implementation Date: Cost Savings/Court Expense:				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT

Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R57	Document Imaging	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.	Medium	Savings and Efficiencies - Detailed ROI analysis would need to be performed to determine specific savings.	Since DMS is already in place, cost would only be for document scanners - potentially \$20K.
COURT RESPONSE					
R57	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendation with Modifications (If Yes, Explain Modifications and provide estimated timeframe for implementation) 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. Timeframe for implementation: The analysis to be completed between 12 and 18 months.				
COURT UPDATE					
R57	Implementation Date: Cost Savings/Court Expense:				
#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R58	Telephone System	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.	Long-Term	Savings and efficiencies	May include initial costs that may be required to ultimately realize savings.
COURT RESPONSE					
R58	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Court identified the recommendation prior to C.A.R.T. and is in the process of implementing the recommendation 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.				
COURT UPDATE					
R58	Implementation Date: The court is still working on this project. If the court is able to implement prior to moving to the new courthouse, it will do so within the next 18 months. Cost Savings/Court Expense: Exact costs and/or savings are unknown at this time.				

TABLE 1: SAN JOAQUIN CART TRACKING DOCUMENT
Updated 2/4/2013

#	SUBJECT AREA	RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME	SAVINGS, EFFICIENCIES, REVENUE	ASSOCIATED COST
R59	Juvenile Dependency Technology Infrastructure	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).	Short	Efficiencies	Cost to upgrade technical environment.
COURT RESPONSE					
R59	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopts Recommendations as stated (If Adopting Recommendation, provide estimated timeframe for implementation) The issue identified is a result of a failing network print server. We agree a more reliable alternative can be found. Timeframe for implementation: An assessment can be completed within 30 days of the project start date.				
COURT UPDATE					
R59	Implementation Date: Outdated equipment was replaced on 7/1/12. Cost Savings/Court Expense: There was no cost to the court. The simple fix was to install a new driver for the computers to connect to a different/operational and more convenient printer.				