



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205

HON. RONALD M. GEORGE
*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

MR. WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

EXECUTIVE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

HON. RICHARD D. HUFFMAN
Chair

HON. JAMES MICHAEL WELCH
Vice-chair

*Hon. Lee Smalley Edmon
Hon. Mary Ann O'Malley
Mr. Frederick K. Ohlrich
Mr. James N. Penrod
Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Hon. Winifred Younge Smith
Hon. Kenneth K. So*

May 11, 2010

Hon. Steve White
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
720 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Judge White:

I am writing in response to the April 6, 2010, letter to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) regarding the Superior Court of Sacramento County's (Court's) intent to discontinue hosting services for the Court's California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V3 application through the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) and to, instead, locally host these services. This proposed action constitutes a significant departure from existing Judicial Council policy strongly favoring a unified statewide technology infrastructure. Since the AOC does not have authority to act contrary to stated council policy or to modify council policy, this matter was referred to the Judicial Council Executive and Planning Committee (Executive Committee) for consideration.

At its meeting yesterday, members of the Executive Committee considered the Court's April 6, 2010, letter and the issues raised therein. The Executive Committee understands the Court's desire to develop its own local hosting capability is based on concerns about the quality and performance of the hosting services presently provided through the CCTC. At the same time, it was noted that the Court actively sought to participate in CCTC hosting, and that the council has incurred significant costs and dedicated substantial resources for that purpose. In addition, the Executive Committee understands the Court will incur substantial expense to develop local hosting even though the Court hopes to achieve some measure of cost savings over time.

The Executive Committee is sensitive to the Court's need for reliable, high quality performance of hosting services that meet its functional objectives,

including the need for access to CCMS database information for reporting purposes. At the same time, however, the Executive Committee is mindful of the longstanding goal of the Judicial Council—beginning with adoption of its *Tactical Plan for Court Technology* in 2002 and continuing with its strategic plan, *Justice in Focus: The Strategic Plan for California's Judicial Branch, 2006–2012*—of a unified approach to the development and implementation of statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives, including a statewide technology center for use by all courts.

Because the intended action by the Court would be contrary to the council's stated goal and to legislative direction to the council with regard to statewide technology infrastructure initiatives, the Executive Committee's view is that the council should have the opportunity to consider and respond to the Court's concerns before the Court takes action to effect any transfer of CCMS hosting from the CCTC. This view is supported by the very recent report by the Office of the State Chief Information Officer (OCIO) that was released on April 23, 2010—the OCIO's *Report of the California Case Management System*—that contains specific recommendations pertinent to continued and expanded use of the CCTC for CCMS hosting services. Specifically, the report recommends that CCMS be deployed “from a central data center.” The report also includes a recommendation that speaks to the Court's stated concern about accessibility to data, namely, that courts using the CCTC “should be given database access and the ability to build query reports just as counties that self-host have database access.” (See *Report*, page 22.)

The Court's letter to the AOC of its intent to transfer CCMS hosting from the CCTC to a local data center was sent before issuance of the OCIO's report and recommendations. That fact, in addition to the very serious policy and fiscal implications of a decision by a superior court to withdraw from a statewide administrative infrastructure initiative, underlies the Executive Committee's decision to direct the Court and the AOC as follows:

1. The Executive Committee directs the Court to maintain the *status quo* with regard to use of the CCTC for hosting CCMS-related applications pending consideration by the Judicial Council of the Court's stated intent to transfer such services from the CCTC to a local data center. Specifically, the Executive Committee directs the Court to defer equipment purchases, staff hiring, and all other activities requiring the dedication of economic resources pending council consideration.
2. In the interim, the Executive Committee directs the AOC to work with the Court to address the Court's concerns about quality and performance of CCMS-related hosting services provided through the CCTC, and to review the Court's analysis of potential costs and savings that may be realized were the Court to transfer such services from the CCTC to a local data center. The Executive Committee further directs the AOC to present to the Judicial Council at its next business meeting a report that addresses the Court's concerns, actions taken and actions planned to address those concerns, the


Hon. Steve White
May 11, 2010
Page 3

policy and fiscal implications of courts withdrawing from statewide administrative infrastructure initiatives, and any related material that will help inform the council's decision-making.

The above action is taken on behalf of the Judicial Council as authorized by rule 10.11(a) of the California Rules of Court and, with respect to item 1 above, with the expectation that the Court will cooperate as required by article VI, section 6(f) of the California Constitution and Government Code section 68505. The AOC is hereby informed of the Executive Committee's direction by copy of this letter to the Administrative Director of the Courts.

The Executive Committee anticipates the Court and the AOC will engage in productive discussions on these issues in advance of the next Judicial Council business meeting (now scheduled for June 25, 2010). If those discussions result in resolution of issues that obviate the need for council consideration of the Court's April 6, 2010, letter, please inform me promptly so that the Executive Committee may perform its agenda-setting duties regarding the upcoming Judicial Council business meeting.

Sincerely,


RICHARD D. HUFFMAN
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

RDH/MMR/atg

cc: Members of the Executive and Planning Committee
Members of the Judicial Council of California
William C. Vickrey, Administrative Director of the Courts
Dennis B. Jones, Executive Officer, Superior Court of Sacramento County