



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# CIRCULATING ORDER MEMORANDUM TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Circulating Order Number: CO-20-03

---

**Title**

Judicial Council: Approval of Judicial Council Discussion Agenda Item 20-082 Pending from the March 24, 2020 Business Meeting (Cancelled)

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Recommended by**

Hon. Marsha G. Slough, Chair  
Executive and Planning Committee

**Action Requested**

VOTING MEMBERS ONLY: Vote and return by responding to the email. Additionally, return original signature page.

**Please Respond By**

April 15, 2020, 12:00 p.m.

**Date of Report**

April 8, 2020

**Contact**

Amber Barnett, 916-263-1398  
[amber.barnett@jud.ca.gov](mailto:amber.barnett@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The chair of the Executive and Planning Committee recommends the Judicial Council approve Discussion Agenda Item 20-082, *Language Access Plan: Signage and Technology Grant Program, Fiscal Year 2019–20: Requests and Proposed Allocations*. This item was submitted for the March 24, 2020 Judicial Council meeting, which was cancelled in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Judicial Council report in conjunction with this agenda item is attached.

### Recommendation

The chair of the Executive and Planning Committee recommends the Judicial Council approve the recommendations outlined in Item 20-082, *Language Access Plan: Signage and Technology Grant Program, Fiscal Year 2019–20: Requests and Proposed Allocations*, and Attachment A.

**Analysis/Rationale**

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, and in her role as Chair of the Judicial Council of California, Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye cancelled the Judicial Council meeting scheduled for March 24, 2020. The Judicial Council is therefore asked to approve the attached Judicial Council report by circulating order to allow implementation of the recommendations outlined in the report and Attachment A, and the execution of intra-branch agreements with each awarded court.

**Attachments and Links**

1. Voting instructions, at page 3
2. Voting and signature pages, at pages 4–5
3. Report: *Language Access Plan: Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2019–20: Requests and Proposed Allocations*, at pages 6–22

## ***Instructions for Review and Action by Circulating Order***

### **Voting members**

- Please indicate your **vote** by replying to the email message with “I approve,” “I disapprove,” or “I abstain” **by 12:00 p.m., April 15, 2020.**
- If you are unable to reply by **April 15, 2020**, please do so as soon as possible thereafter.
- Additionally, **return the original** signature page to Judicial Council and Trial Court Leadership, Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, 94102-3688. **Please keep a copy for your records.**

### **Advisory members**

The circulating order is being emailed to you for your information only. There is no need to sign or return any documents.

## **Instructions for Review and Action by Circulating Order**

### **Voting members**

- Please reply to the email message with “I approve,” “I disapprove,” or “I abstain,” by **12:00 p.m., April 15, 2020**.
- If you are unable to reply by **April 15, 2020**, please do so as soon as possible thereafter.

### **Advisory members**

The circulating order is being emailed to you for your information only. There is no need to sign or return any documents.

**CIRCULATING ORDER  
Judicial Council of California  
Voting and Signature Pages**

Effective immediately, the Judicial Council approves recommendations outlined in Judicial Council Discussion Agenda Item 20-082.

My vote is as follows:

Approve       Disapprove       Abstain

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Marla O. Anderson

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Richard Bloom

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
C. Todd Bottke

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Stacy Boulware Eurie

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Kyle S. Brodie

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ming W. Chin

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Jonathan B. Conklin

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Samuel K. Feng

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Brad R. Hill

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Rachel W. Hill

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Harold W. Hopp

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Harry E. Hull, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Hannah-Beth Jackson

My vote is as follows:

Approve       Disapprove       Abstain

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Patrick M. Kelly

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Dalila Corral Lyons

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Gretchen Nelson

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Maxwell V. Pritt


\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
David M. Rubin

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Marsha G. Slough

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Eric C. Taylor

Date: April 16, 2020

Attest:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrative Director and  
Secretary of the Judicial Council



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*Item No. 20-082*

For business meeting on March 24, 2020

---

**Title**

Language Access Plan: Signage and  
Technology Grant Program, FY 2019–20:  
Requests and Proposed Allocations

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Recommended by**

Advisory Committee on Providing Access  
and Fairness  
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair  
Hon. Luis A. Lavin, Cochair  
Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Chair, Language  
Access Subcommittee

Information Technology Advisory  
Committee

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair  
Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice-Chair

**Agenda Item Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

March 24, 2020

**Date of Report**

February 13, 2020

**Contact**

Douglas G. Denton, Principal Manager  
415-865-7870  
[douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov](mailto:douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov)

Danielle M. McCurry, Senior Analyst  
415-865-7677  
[danielle.mccurry@jud.ca.gov](mailto:danielle.mccurry@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The 2018 Budget Act included \$2.55 million ongoing funding for language access signage and technology infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council. In September 2019, the Judicial Council approved a grant program to disburse this funding to the trial courts on an annual basis (up to \$1 million per year for language access signage grants, and up to \$1.35 million per year for language access technology grants). Courts were able to apply for both signage and technology needs. The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF) and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommend approving the proposed grant award recommendations and directing

Language Access Services (LAS) staff of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts to draft and execute intra-branch agreements (IBAs) with awarded courts for fiscal year (FY) 2019–20.

## **Recommendation**

The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective March 24, 2020:

1. Approve the proposed Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2019–20: Requests and Proposed Allocations memorandum; and
2. Direct LAS staff to work with Branch Accounting and Procurement to draft and execute intra-branch agreements with each awarded court.

The proposed recommendations and summary of the requests for funding are included as Attachment A.

## **Relevant Previous Council Action**

In January 2015, the Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* (Language Access Plan, or LAP). The LAP provides recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access for all of California’s approximately 7 million limited-English-proficient (LEP) residents and potential court users.

On September 24, 2019, the Judicial Council adopted a process for Language Access Signage and Technology Grants and directed LAS staff to solicit and review grant applications and develop recommendations for review and approval by PAF, ITAC, and the Judicial Council.<sup>1</sup>

## **Analysis/Rationale**

Effective March 2019, PAF’s Language Access Subcommittee has worked to ensure the continuation of efforts to achieve and maintain access to justice for California’s LEP court users. PAF and the subcommittee partner with ITAC, as appropriate, on technology issues.

To support judicial branch language access expansion efforts, the 2018 Budget Act included ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.55 million per year for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs. Of the \$1,550,000 for technology, \$200,000 is dedicated to the Judicial Council for upgrades to the online Language Access Toolkit and other council language access infrastructure support (such as translation costs for statewide forms, web content, and other multilingual resources for LEP court users). The amount available to trial courts for technology is, therefore, \$1,350,000 each year.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Judicial Council report for the September 24, 2019 business meeting at <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7675626&GUID=F2CCA714-356A-41B7-82B5-05C058CE0D6E>.

The goals of the Signage and Technology Grant program follow:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help LEP court users to navigate the courthouse.
- Assist courts that may need equipment or software that will facilitate communication with LEP court users and the courts.
- Allocate funds to as many trial courts as possible within the given budget to support language access signage and technology initiatives.
- Fund enhancements that provide LEP court users with greater access to the courts and to information in their language.
- Encourage courts to establish for grant funding an ongoing plan that coordinates with other facilities planning and/or with planned or ongoing technology initiatives that support language access as a core service of the court.

Following approval by the council, the grant program was launched by LAS staff in October 2019, with applications due from interested courts by November 2019. The deadline to apply was extended to December 3, 2019, in order to give courts additional time to finalize project ideas and requests for funding.

Once applications were received, potential grantees were determined by Judicial Council staff, who worked closely with the Executive Office and followed the priorities established for the first year in the grant process overview approved by the council. Recommendations for grantees were formed by staff working with the Executive Office prior to advisory body approval.

A total of 29 trial courts requested funding and submitted project request forms (see Attachment A). Nineteen (19) of the 29 courts requested funding in both signage and technology categories. Five (5) courts requested funding in the signage category only, and five (5) courts requested funding in the technology category only. Of the 29 courts that applied for grant funding, there was representation from the northern, southern, and central regions of the state (Attachment A).

Under the grant program, no more than \$100,000 is allocated to any one court for signage, and no more than \$135,000 is allocated to any one court for technology, unless total requests are lower than the annual allocation. This required minor reductions for signage, as noted below.

***Signage requests under \$50,000:*** Each of these requests was fully funded, except for that of the Superior Court of Del Norte County. After the application deadline, the court subsequently lowered the amount of its request after receiving a quote from the vendor.

***Signage requests \$50,000 and over:*** Courts were awarded up to 90% of the amounts for these requests to stay near the \$1,000,000 allocation for signage. Further reductions were made for courts where the 90% award exceeded the typical costs for consultation evaluations and/or static signage.

**Technology requests:** Technology projects were limited to no more than \$135,000 for each court under the grant guidelines. For technology, four (4) courts received the maximum amount allowed, and all other courts were able to be funded at the full amounts requested under \$135,000. The total allowable requests were under the \$1,350,000 allocation for technology, which resulted in remaining funding of \$37,773.05. This funding will be set aside as a contingency fund to be used in case of need; for example, to help offset unforeseen cost increases for individual technology projects. LAS staff will work closely with the awarded courts to help track progress, identify any additional funding needs that can be covered by the contingency fund, and support completion of individual projects.

Staff's recommendation is to allocate a total of \$1,000,000.00 for signage grants and a total of \$1,312,266.95 for technology grants to the courts, and hold the remaining \$37,773.05 as a contingency fund to help offset unforeseen cost increases for individual technology projects. The proposed allocation will provide grant funding to all 29 courts that applied in the grant program's first year. A table showing the detail by court is attached to this report.

### **Policy implications**

Under the grant program, courts will be able to apply for funding for audio or video remote solutions, including video remote interpreting (VRI), if permitted by their memorandums of understanding and any other agreements between court administration and court employees or independent contractors. All courts, including courts that participate in the grant program and request funding for VRI equipment, will be asked to follow the council's VRI guidelines for spoken language–interpreted events.<sup>2</sup> Doing so will help to ensure proper use of VRI solutions in the courts, because VRI is still an emerging technology and must be carefully implemented by individual courts to ensure due process for LEP court users.

### **Comments**

The proposed allocations were reviewed and approved by PAF in January 2020, and by ITAC and the Judicial Council Technology Committee (JCTC) in February 2020.

### **Alternatives considered**

A variety of disbursement methodologies exist for ongoing funding. However, a determination was made to disburse the funding as a grant program to help the council identify and fund local needs, establish priorities, encourage courts to develop plans for ongoing funding, assist courts with uniform practices, and establish a mechanism to highlight progress and best practices each year.

### **Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

Funding will assist courts with language access signage and technology initiatives. Because funding is ongoing for the trial courts, individual courts will be encouraged to establish an

---

<sup>2</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (Mar. 15, 2019), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf).

ongoing plan for grant funding that coordinates with other facilities or technology initiatives planned or underway in their court to support language access. For FY 2020–21, LAS staff will start the next grant application cycle this spring to allow courts more time to apply.

All courts that submitted Signage and Technology Grant requests for FY 2019–20 will be notified as to whether they will receive funding. Intra-branch agreements (IBAs) for the signage and technology grant requests that are funded are expected to be delivered to the court executive officers for signatory approval and returned to the Judicial Council prior to April 30, 2020. Funds must be encumbered by the court in the current fiscal year, and the court must inform the Judicial Council that funding for the project has been encumbered by June 30, 2020. If the reimbursement request and invoices to support the requested reimbursement amount are not received by December 31, 2020, grant funding for the cost of the project will be unavailable for reimbursement to the court.

LAS staff works regularly with court language access representatives to identify best practices and innovations taking place in language access, including in the areas of signage and technology. A report will be prepared at the completion of each grant year to identify successful signage and technology projects, which will allow the branch to share best practices and innovations with courts statewide and with the public.

## **Attachments**

1. Attachment A: Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2019–20: Requests and Proposed Allocations memorandum



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
 Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

### MEMORANDUM

**Date**

January 13, 2020

**Action Requested**

Please Review

**To**

Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair  
 Hon. Luis A. Lavin, Cochair  
 Advisory Committee on Providing Access  
 and Fairness  
 Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Chair, Language  
 Access Subcommittee

**Deadline**

N/A

**Contact**

Douglas G. Denton  
 415-865-7870  
[douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov](mailto:douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov)

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair  
 Hon. Louis R. Mauro, Vice-Chair  
 Information Technology Advisory Committee

Danielle M. McCurry  
 Senior Analyst, Language Access Services  
 415-865-7677  
[danielle.mccurry@jud.ca.gov](mailto:danielle.mccurry@jud.ca.gov)

**From**

Douglas G. Denton  
 Principal Manager, Language Access Services  
 Center for Families, Children & the Courts

**Subject**

Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY  
 2019–20: Requests and Proposed Allocations

#### Background

The 2018 Budget Act included ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.35 million per year for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts. In September 2019, the Judicial Council approved a grant program to disburse this funding on an annual basis. Trial courts were able to apply for grant funding for both signage and technology needs. On October 15, 2019, for fiscal year (FY) 2019–

20, Language Access Services (LAS) staff released a grant program packet, which included a memorandum to courts on how to request funding and a project request form. The deadline for courts to submit completed project request forms for signage or technology grants was December 3, 2019.

### **Objectives of Grant Program**

The goals of the Signage and Technology Grant Program are to:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help limited-English-proficient (LEP) court users to navigate the courthouse;
- Assist courts that need equipment or software that will facilitate communication with LEP court users and the courts;
- Allocate funds to as many trial courts as possible within the given budget to support language access signage and technology initiatives;
- Fund enhancements that provide LEP court users with greater access to the courts and to information in their language; and
- Encourage courts to establish grant funding for an ongoing plan that coordinates with other facilities planning and/or with planned or ongoing technology initiatives that support language access as a core service of the court.

### **Application Timing and Process**

- Applications were due at close of business Tuesday, December 3, 2019.
- Recommendations on the allocation will be considered by the Judicial Council at its March 2020 meeting.
- All courts that submit signage and technology grant requests will be notified as to whether they will receive funding.
- Intra-branch agreements for the signage and technology grant requests that are funded are expected to be delivered to the court executive officers for signatory approval and returned to the Judicial Council prior to April 30, 2020.

**Prioritization Categories**

*Signage Grants*

Priority	Project
1	Plain language editing and professional translation of signage language that is unavailable in the <i>Glossary of Signage Terms and Icons</i> (at <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lap-toolkit-Glossary_of_Signage_Terms_and_Icons.xlsx">www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lap-toolkit-Glossary_of_Signage_Terms_and_Icons.xlsx</a> )
2	Development of multilingual wayfinding strategies, including electronic displays with automated maps, orientation guides with multilingual interface, and/or other types of multilingual electronic signage
3	Investment in multilingual nonelectronic signage (paper, plaques, etc.)
4	Equipment and startup costs for an automated queue-management system that will contain multilingual information

*Technology Grants*

Priority	Project
1	Interpreter equipment, including upgraded headsets and other communication equipment for interpreters (for example, wireless transmitters and receivers, charging stations, and carrying cases)
2	Telephonic/video remote solutions equipment for LEP assistance, both inside and outside the courtroom (for example, speakerphones and equipment for video remote appearances, video remote interpreting, counter assistance, or other self-help remote assistance, including tablets, computer equipment, and monitors) <sup>1</sup>
3	Scheduling software for language access services, multilingual avatars for LEP court users, or other software that allows for accurate multilingual communication between the LEP court user and the court
4	Multilingual videos for LEP court users, including translation costs
5	Audio-visual systems upgrades, broadband service, and/or other infrastructure enhancements (must directly relate to services provided to LEP court users)
6	Multilingual kiosks

<sup>1</sup> Courts that participate in the grant program and request funding for video remote interpreting equipment will be asked to agree to follow the council’s *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language–Interpreted Events* (Mar. 15, 2019), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/vri-guidelines.pdf).

## **Number of Requests and Prioritization Metrics**

A total of 29 trial courts requested funding and submitted project request forms (see attached). Nineteen (19) of the 29 courts requested funding in both signage and technology categories. Five (5) courts requested funding in the signage category only, and five (5) courts requested funding in the technology category only. A summary of the funding requests by prioritization category is outlined below, along with an indication on whether the project can be funded.

### ***Signage Grants***

**Priority #1:** Plain language editing and professional translation of signage language that is unavailable in the *Glossary of Signage Terms and Icons*: 9 requested projects (9 can be funded).

**Priority #2:** Development of multilingual wayfinding strategies: 14 requested projects (14 can be funded).

**Priority #3:** Investment in multilingual nonelectronic signage: 6 requested projects (6 can be funded).

**Priority #4:** Equipment and startup costs for an automated queue-management system that will contain multilingual information: 1 requested project (1 can be funded).

### ***Technology Grants***

**Priority #1:** Interpreter equipment: 18 requested projects (18 can be funded).

**Priority #2:** Telephonic/video remote solutions for inside and outside the courtroom: 8 requested projects (8 can be funded).

**Priority #3:** Scheduling or other software; multilingual avatars: 6 requested projects (6 can be funded).

**Priority #4:** Multilingual videos: 1 requested project (1 can be funded).

**Priority #5:** Audio-visual systems upgrades, broadband service, and/or other infrastructure enhancements: 1 requested project (1 can be funded).

**Priority #6:** Multilingual kiosks: 4 requested projects (4 can be funded).

**Statewide Representation**

Of the 29 courts that applied for grant funding, there was representation from the northern, southern, and central regions of the state. Court sizes varied with six (6) small, nine (9) small/medium, eight (8) medium, and six (6) large courts applying for funding.

Court Size*	Number of Courts that Applied	Number that Applied for Signage	Number that Applied for Technology
Small	6	5	3
Small/Medium	9	7	9
Medium	8	6	6
Large	6	6	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>

\*Court size based on small (2–5 judges), small/medium (6–15 judges), medium (16–47 judges), large (48 judges or more).

**Supplemental Questions**

Courts were also asked two supplemental questions on the project request form to determine interest in (1) exploring voice-to-text translation software as part of a statewide pilot, and (2) becoming part of a video remote interpreting program as a provider and/or receiver court.

Thirty-one (31) courts responded to the supplemental questions. Seventeen (17) courts expressed interest in joining a statewide pilot program to explore voice-to-text translation software. Fifteen (15) courts expressed interest in potentially becoming part of a video remote interpreting program (1 as a provider court, 4 as receiver courts, and 10 as provider/receiver courts).

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff’s recommendation is to allocate a total of \$1,000,000.00 for signage grants and a total of \$1,312,266.95 for technology grants to the courts. The proposed allocation will provide grant funding to all 29 courts that applied in the grant program’s first year. A table showing the detail by court is attached to this memorandum.

**Methodology for Reductions**

Under the grant program, no more than \$100,000 is allocated to any one court for signage, and no more than \$135,000 is allocated to any one court for technology, unless total requests are lower than the annual allocation. The required minor reductions for signage are noted below.

**Signage Requests.** Under \$50,000: Each of these requests were fully funded, except for the Superior Court of Del Norte County. After the application deadline, the court subsequently lowered the amount of its request after receiving a quote from the vendor.

\$50,000 and up: Courts were awarded up to 90% of the amounts for these requests to stay near the \$1,000,000 allocation for signage. Further reductions were made for courts where the 90% award exceeded the typical costs for consultation evaluations and/or static signage.

**Technology Requests.** Technology projects were limited to no more than \$135,000 for each court under the grant guidelines. For technology, four (4) courts received the maximum amount allowed, and all other courts were able to be funded at the full amounts requested under \$135,000. The total allowable requests were under the \$1,350,000 allocation for technology, which resulted in extra funding of \$37,773.05. This additional funding will be set aside as a contingency fund to be used in case of need; for example, to help offset unforeseen cost increases for individual technology projects. LAS staff will work closely with the awarded courts to help track progress, identify any additional funding needs that can be covered by the contingency fund, and support completion of individual projects.

A more formalized rubric was not required for the current grant applications but may be required in future years to score applications based on prioritization.

## **Next Steps**

Following approval by the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, Information Technology Advisory Committee, and Judicial Council Technology Committee, LAS staff will present the proposed allocations to the Judicial Council for its review and approval in March 2020. Upon approval by the Judicial Council, LAS staff will notify courts of the approved allocations and will post the awards to the Language Access webpage. LAS staff will also work with Branch Accounting and Procurement staff to draft and execute intra-branch agreements (IBAs) with each court for their projects.

## **Attachments**

1. FY 2019–20 Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Requests and Proposed Awards

DGD/DMM

cc: Robert Oyung, Chief Operating Officer, Judicial Council  
Heather Pettit, Director and Chief Information Officer, Information Technology, Judicial Council  
Charlene Depner, Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, Judicial Council  
Don Will, Assistant Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, Judicial Council

## SIGNAGE GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Signage Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
1	ALAMEDA	600 new or upgraded wayfinding and regulatory signs throughout all courthouses. <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 90,000.00
2	AMADOR	Consultant to develop LEP signage and wayfinding strategies.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
3	BUTTE	Update existing signage. Adding new signage in Spanish (static). <i>Note: Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 57,023.47
4	DEL NORTE	New static signage in Spanish and Hmong. <i>Note: Court reduced their request to \$2000 after initial submission based on quote from vendor.</i>	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
5	FRESNO	Digital wayfinding system throughout main courthouse location.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 44,622.44	\$ 44,622.44
6	IMPERIAL	Electronic wayfinding system in English and Spanish.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00
7	INYO	Informational and wayfinding signage (static).	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
8	KERN	Updating/replacing improperly translated signage.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 1,973.09	\$ 1,973.09
9	KINGS	#1: Enhancing existing static wayfinding signage in English and Spanish.	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 1,965.00	\$ 1,965.00
		#2: Install multilingual electronic wayfinding signage.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 29,965.00	\$ 29,965.00
		#3: Improve current customer queuing system with multilingual options.	Priority 4 (Software)	\$ 20,933.00	\$ 20,933.00
10	LASSEN	Multilingual court information and services signage for courthouse.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
11	LOS ANGELES	Consultant to evaluate wayfinding and signage system for six (6) of 38 facilities. <i>Note: Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 85,000.00
12	MADERA	Multilingual digital signage displays for wayfinding & general information.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 43,833.49	\$ 43,833.49
13	MERCED	#1: Consultant to evaluate signage needs for LEP users. <i>Note: Court requested \$100K for all 3 projects. Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 75,000.00
		#2: Replace/update notices with electronic signage in English and Spanish (includes electronic signs, monitors and software).	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)		
		#3 Add multilingual signage for Self-Help Center (static).	Priority 3 (Non-electronic Signage)		

## SIGNAGE GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Signage Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
14	ORANGE	#1: Multilingual electronic wayfinding displays in five courthouses (20 displays). <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 84,200.00	\$ 75,780.00
		#2: Convert 546 temporary/paper signs into permanent signs (i.e. mounted plastic signs).	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 13,650.00	\$ 13,650.00
15	SACRAMENTO	#1: Provide signage to assist LEP court users in the process of securing an interpreter.	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 7,700.00	\$ 7,700.00
		#2: Update the posted Advisement of Rights signage.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 1,700.00	\$ 1,700.00
		#3: Update the content of the check in kiosk system for interpreter services.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 4,300.00
16	SAN FRANCISCO	Consultant to evaluate and develop signage strategy. Install digital, multilingual wayfinding kiosks. <i>Note: LAS staff has identified this as two projects; however court did not separate on request form. Potential award reduced to be comparable to courts with similar requests.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 85,000.00
17	SAN JOAQUIN	Extend digital courtroom calendar to include multilingual wayfinding and general court information displays. <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 63,730.00	\$ 57,357.00
18	SANTA BARBARA	Implement digital, multilingual wayfinding system. <i>Note: After the deadline, the CEO requested to amend to \$100K for signage, resulting in a 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 90,000.00
19	SANTA CLARA	#1: Multilingual digital signage for docket display and wayfinding solutions (Vendor: CourtWays). <i>Note: Court requested \$100K for both projects. 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 90,000.00
		#2: Multilingual rotating signage for digital displays and case docket listings that include hearing listings.	Priority 2 (Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies)		
20	SANTA CRUZ	Replacement of all legacy signage with modern multilingual signage. <i>Note: 10 percent reduction.</i>	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 57,023.47
21	SOLANO	Update multilingual static signage for non courtroom offices.	Priority 3 (Non-electronic signage)	\$ 19,817.93	\$ 19,817.93
22	STANISLAUS	Replace approximately 76 existing signs. Currently available only in English.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 6,184.00	\$ 6,184.00
23	YUBA	Replace English-only signs with English & Spanish.	Priority 1 (Translation of Signage)	\$ 4,072.11	\$ 4,072.11
<b>TOTALS:</b>				<b>\$ 1,158,746.06</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000.00</b>
				<b>\$ (158,746.06)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

TECHNOLOGY GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Technology Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
1	ALAMEDA	#1: Modify the physical court infrastructure to accommodate telephonic interpretation for all court locations.	Priority 5 (Infrastructure Enhancements)	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 6,500.00
		#2: Purchase of wireless equipment for simultaneous interpretation and extension equipment for telephonic interpretation services.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 6,200.00	\$ 6,200.00
		#3: Create a multilingual smartphone application to assist LEP Court Users with wayfinding.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 38,848.00	\$ 38,848.00
		#4: Integrate the interpreter management system (Shiftboard) and the traffic case management system (TCMS) to assign interpreters in traffic cases.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 29,000.00	\$ 29,000.00
2	AMADOR	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment for courtroom.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 4,094.00	\$ 4,094.00
		#2: Self-help multilingual kiosk for court lobby.	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
3	BUTTE	Add interactive screen for multi-use Language Access Wayfinding solutions.	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
4	COLUSA	Interpreter headsets and wireless assistive listening transmitters, receivers, lanyards, and carrying cases.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 2,300.00
5	IMPERIAL	Purchase four (4) sets of portable remote video conferencing equipment and two additional wireless transmitters and receiver sets.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 5,500.00
6	KERN	Purchase interpreter headsets for all courtrooms.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 30,704.24	\$ 30,704.24
7	KINGS	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment and upgrade headsets in all courtrooms.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 12,337.42	\$ 12,337.42
		#2: Multilingual Arraignment video translation.	Priority 4 (Multilingual Videos)	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00
8	LASSEN	Purchase interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
9	LOS ANGELES	Purchasing and implementing video remote interpreting technology for three (3) facilities.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
10	MADERA	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment (4 sets).	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 7,468.58	\$ 7,468.58
		#2: Tablets for internal communications between interpreters and staff (to include accessories).	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 8,935.12	\$ 8,935.12
11	MARIN	Replacement of interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 23,080.00	\$ 23,080.00
12	MERCED	#1: Upgrade interpreter equipment/transmitters. <i>Note: Court requested \$135K for both projects.</i>	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00

TECHNOLOGY GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Technology Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
		#2: Upgrade phone tree to offer Spanish language options.	Priority 3 (Software)		
13	ORANGE	Purchase 100 tablets, 10 laptops and software to be used by interpreters for internal communications.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
14	PLACER	#1: Purchase new VRI Hardware.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 20,700.00	\$ 20,700.00
		#2: Convert existing kiosk to a multilingual kiosk.	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 15,640.00	\$ 15,640.00
15	SACRAMENTO	#1: Purchase interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 13,300.00	\$ 13,300.00
		#2: Purchase automated scheduling software for language access services.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
16	SAN FRANCISCO	#1: Replace interpreter equipment. 63 devices.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 70,000.00	\$ 70,000.00
		#2: Purchase five (5) tablets for real-time tablet language assistance at the public counters. <i>Note: Amount requested includes Language Line Interpreter On Wheels and tablets. Also includes \$30k to modify the public counters to accommodate the tablets.</i>	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
17	SAN MATEO	#1: Replace outdated interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 56,250.00	\$ 56,250.00
		#2: Purchase interpreter scheduling and invoicing solution.	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
18	SANTA BARBARA	The signage project is delivered on a technological platform. <i>Note: Court requested over the maximum. Proposed award is maximum award available through the grant.</i>	Priority 3 (Software)	\$ 175,000.00	\$ 135,000.00
19	SANTA CLARA	#1: Purchase upgraded interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 20,679.48	\$ 20,679.48
		#2: Digital signage/wayfinding kiosk. Software development, hardware, displays (with project management and installation)	Priority 6 (Multilingual Kiosks)	\$ 97,097.50	\$ 97,097.50
20	SANTA CRUZ	Replace interpreter equipment for all court locations.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 45,746.00	\$ 45,746.00
21	SHASTA	#1: Purchase updated interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 18,469.11	\$ 18,469.11
		#2: Purchase tablets for different points of contact outside of the courtroom to provide assistance (e.g. communicate and inform LEPs of services available).	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 15,787.50	\$ 15,787.50

TECHNOLOGY GRANT REQUESTS | ALLOCATIONS - FY 2019/2020

	Trial Court	Technology Project Description	GRANT PRIORITY	Requested Allocation	Proposed Allocation
22	<b>SOLANO</b>	Purchase interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
23	<b>STANISLAUS</b>	#1: Purchase additional interpreter equipment.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 3,369.00	\$ 3,369.00
		#2: Purchase seven (7) tablets and tablet mounts for online translation services.	Priority 2 (Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions)	\$ 3,126.00	\$ 3,126.00
24	<b>TULARE</b>	Upgrade interpreter equipment to Infrared Assistive Listening System.	Priority 1 (Interpreter Equipment)	\$ 53,635.00	\$ 53,635.00
<b>TOTALS:</b>				<b>\$ 1,352,266.95</b>	<b>\$ 1,312,266.95</b>

<b>\$ (2,266.95)</b>	<b>\$ 37,733.05</b>
----------------------	---------------------

FY 2019/2020 SIGNAGE TECHNOLOGY GRANT  
**TOTAL AWARDS BY COURT**

COUNTY	SIGNAGE AWARD	TECHNOLOGY AWARD	Total Award	Total Request
1. ALAMEDA	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 80,548.00	\$ 170,548.00	\$ 180,548.00
2. AMADOR	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 29,094.00	\$ 49,094.00	\$ 49,094.00
3. BUTTE	\$ 57,023.47	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 67,023.47	\$ 110,000.00
4. COLUSA	N/A	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 2,300.00
5. DEL NORTE	\$ 2,000.00	N/A	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
6. FRESNO	\$ 44,622.44	N/A	\$ 44,622.44	\$ 44,622.44
7. IMPERIAL	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 9,600.00	\$ 9,600.00
8. INYO	\$ 10,000.00	N/A	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
9. KERN	\$ 1,973.09	\$ 30,704.24	\$ 32,677.33	\$ 32,677.33
10. KINGS	\$ 52,863.00	\$ 14,837.42	\$ 67,700.42	\$ 67,700.42
11. LASSEN	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 7,000.00
12. LOS ANGELES	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 220,000.00	\$ 235,000.00
13. MADERA	\$ 43,833.49	\$ 16,403.70	\$ 60,237.19	\$ 60,237.19
14. MARIN	N/A	\$ 23,080.00	\$ 23,080.00	\$ 23,080.00
15. MERCED	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 210,000.00	\$ 235,000.00
16. ORANGE	\$ 89,430.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 224,430.00	\$ 232,850.00
17. PLACER	N/A	\$ 36,340.00	\$ 36,340.00	\$ 36,340.00
18. SACRAMENTO	\$ 13,700.00	\$ 43,300.00	\$ 57,000.00	\$ 57,000.00
19. SAN FRANCISCO	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 205,000.00	\$ 220,000.00
20. SAN JOAQUIN	\$ 57,357.00	N/A	\$ 57,357.00	\$ 63,730.00
21. SAN MATEO	N/A	\$ 81,250.00	\$ 81,250.00	\$ 81,250.00
22. SANTA BARBARA	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 225,000.00	\$ 275,000.00
23. SANTA CLARA	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 117,776.98	\$ 207,776.98	\$ 217,776.98
24. SANTA CRUZ	\$ 57,023.47	\$ 45,746.00	\$ 102,769.47	\$ 110,746.00
25. SHASTA	N/A	\$ 34,256.61	\$ 34,256.61	\$ 34,256.61
26. SOLANO	\$ 19,817.93	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 34,817.93	\$ 34,817.93
27. STANISLAUS	\$ 6,184.00	\$ 6,495.00	\$ 12,679.00	\$ 12,679.00
28. TULARE	N/A	\$ 53,635.00	\$ 53,635.00	\$ 53,635.00
29. YUBA	\$ 4,072.11	N/A	\$ 4,072.11	\$ 4,072.11
	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,312,266.95	\$ 2,312,266.95	\$ 2,511,013.01