



MEETING AGENDA
8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., Friday, June 20, 2014
Tampa, FL

Note: By Wednesday, June 18, materials will be available at:

<http://www.flcourts.org/administration-funding/court-funding-budget/trial-court-budget-commission/>

Welcome and Roll Call

- | | | |
|------|---|-------------|
| I. | Approval of June 4, 2014, Minutes | 8:30-8:35 |
| II. | Status of FY 2013-14 Budget | 8:35-8:45 |
| | A. Reclassification Actions | |
| | B. Positions Vacant More than 180 Days | |
| | C. Operating Budgets | |
| | D. Conflict Counsel Cases over the Flat Fee | |
| | E. Foreclosure Backlog Reduction Initiative | |
| III. | Special Pay Issue for Court Employees Appropriated in FY 2014-15 | 8:45-10:15 |
| | Break | 10:15-10:25 |
| IV. | FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments | 10:25-11:00 |
| | A. FTE Re-Allocation: Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers and General Magistrates | |
| | B. Maintain Existing Allotments: Court Administration, Case Management, Law Clerks, and Operating Budgets | |
| | C. Revise Non-Due Process Allotments: Senior Judge Days, Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers, Additional Compensation to County Judges, and Mediation | |
| | D. Revise Due Process Contractual Allotments: Court Interpreting, Expert Witnesses, Court Reporting, and Cost Recovery | |

IV. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments (Continued)

E. Statewide Allotments

1. Continuing Allotments
2. National Center for State Courts Projects
3. Integrated Case Management System Funding Request (Eighth, Tenth, Fourteenth, and Eighteenth Judicial Circuits)

F. Allotments for Special Appropriations

1. Post-Adjudicatory Expansion Drug Courts
2. Veterans' Courts
3. Problem-Solving Courts Education and Training
4. Criminal Mental Health Treatment Services
5. Vivitrol/Naltrexone to Treat Alcohol- or Opioid-Addicted Offenders
6. 24x7 Sobriety Monitoring Program
7. Domestic Violence Active Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) Technology

V. FY 2014-15 Budget and Pay Policies: Payroll Projection Timeline 11:00-11:05

VI. Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup Status Report 11:05-11:15

VII. FY 2015-16 Legislative Budget Request (LBR) 11:15-11:45

A. LBR Timeline

B. Priorities/Strategies

VIII. Report from Chief Justice Designee to Clerks of Court Operations Corporation 11:45-11:50

IX. Other Business 11:50-12:00

Adjourn

Next Meeting: Tuesday, August 26 (8:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.), Orlando

Agenda Item I. Approval of June 4, 2014, Minutes

Item I.: Approval of June 4, 2014, Minutes

DRAFT

Trial Court Budget Commission Meeting Minutes June 4, 2014



Attendance – Members Present

The Honorable Margaret Steinbeck, Chair
The Honorable Mark Mahon, Vice Chair
The Honorable Catherine Brunson
The Honorable Ronald Ficarrotta
Mr. Tom Genung
Ms. Sandra Lonergan
The Honorable Thomas McGrady
The Honorable Wayne Miller
The Honorable Debra Nelson
The Honorable Gregory Parker
The Honorable Belvin Perry, Jr
Ms. Kathy Pugh

The Honorable James McCune
The Honorable Robert Roundtree
The Honorable Olin Shinholser
Mr. Grant Slayden
The Honorable Elijah Smiley
Mr. Walt Smith
The Honorable Bertila Soto
The Honorable John Stargel
The Honorable Terry Terrell
The Honorable Patricia Thomas
Mr. Mark Weinberg

Attendance – Members Absent

Ms. Robin Wright

Special Note: It is recommended that these minutes be used in conjunction with the meeting materials.

Agenda Item I: Welcome and Approval of Meeting Minutes

Judge Steinbeck called the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) meeting to order at 11:01 a.m. The roll was taken with a quorum present. Judge Steinbeck recognized as attending, Judge Susan Schaeffer, TCBC Chair Emeritus and former member Judge Joe Farina. She also introduced the incoming state courts administrator, PK Jameson.

Judge Steinbeck presented the draft meeting minutes from the April 7, 2014, TCBC meeting and asked if there were any changes necessary before approval. Judge Stargel moved to approve the minutes as drafted, with a second from Judge Nelson. The motion passed without objection.

Agenda Item II: Status of FY 2013-14 Budget

A. Salary Budgets

Dorothy Wilson provided an overview of the trial court salary budgets for FY 2013-14 as of May 29, 2014. Ms. Wilson noted the trial courts begin each fiscal year with a salary deficit and savings generated through lapse of vacant positions is used to cover the deficit. The current General Revenue and State Courts Revenue Trust Fund combined projections estimated \$283,107 or .09% under the authorized salary appropriation at year end. As previously projected, the deficit was made up with lapse savings. Both the Administrative Trust Fund and the Federal Grants Trust Fund are under the salary appropriation by \$30,099 and \$187,811, respectively.

B. State Courts Revenue Trust Fund

Dorothy Wilson provided an overview of the State Courts Revenue Trust Fund (SCRTF) cash balance through May 31, 2014, for FY 2013-14. The cash balance at year end was estimated at \$1.2 million. The balance included \$1.8 million appropriated in the FY 2014-15 General Appropriations Act (HB 5001) to mitigate the FY 2013-14 revenue deficit. Ms. Wilson noted the hold back of General Revenue (GR) funds prevented additional shifting of expenditures onto the SCRTF. She also noted that the chief justice submitted a FY 2014-15 appropriations release plan seeking to release 100% of GR salary appropriations due to insufficient cash balance in the SCRTF to cover July payroll and the July GR Service Charge.

Kris Slayden provided an overview of the Office of the State Courts Administrator's (OSCA) projected revenue deficit. The OSCA estimate includes a 4% shortfall rate for June revenues which equals \$316,211. The estimated ending cash balance deficit was (\$859,356); however, after applying the \$1.8 million from the back of bill appropriations, the adjusted ending cash balance was estimated at \$940,644.

C. End of Year Spending Plans

Judge Steinbeck stated that as reported, the revenue deficit was covered and she encouraged circuits that implemented spending restrictions to address their needs.

Agenda Item III: FY 2014-15 GAA and Implementing/Conforming Bills: Gubernatorial Action, Final Appropriations, and Implementation Activities

Dorothy Wilson reviewed two items vetoed by the governor. At the next TCBC meeting, the legislative intent will be discussed on the specialty issues funded in the trial court budget. Judge Steinbeck added that the specialty issues were not a part of the trial courts' legislative budget request.

Theresa Westerfield noted the pay issue was not vetoed and there were no changes in benefits or to the authority to pay Florida Bar dues.

Eric Maclure provided a brief review of House Bill 5003 which compliments and assists with implementing the General Appropriations Act (GAA). He also reviewed Senate Bill 2510 relating to court-appointed counsel, a conforming bill which also compliments the GAA.

Agenda Item IV: Foreclosure Backlog Reduction Initiative

Alex Krivosheyev provided an overview of the Foreclosure Backlog Reduction Initiative for FY 2013-14. As of April 30, 2014, tremendous progress has been made with 185,823 of the 329,171 backlogged cases reduced. Four issues were presented to the members for action.

A. FY 2014-15 Allocations

\$6.3 million in foreclosure funds are available for FY 2014-15, with an additional \$2.3 million estimated to be available from unspent funds in FY 2013-14, for a total of \$8.6 million. Two options for allocation were provided to the members for consideration. Judge Roundtree moved to approve the FY 2014-15 allocations based on continuation funding for those circuits that were not estimated to have unspent balances of over \$100,000 in FY 2013-14. Circuits that were estimated to have unspent balances in FY 2013-14 in excess of \$100,000 were allocated resources as they indicated would be needed for FY 2014-15. Additionally, include continued executive direction funding in the amount of \$43,829 to support the Foreclosure Performance Indicators Dashboard. Tom Genung seconded and the motion passed unanimously. As a result of Executive Committee discussions, Judge Steinbeck requested a mid-year assessment be conducted to re-evaluate needs and to ensure the funds are being used where needed.

B. 3rd Circuit Request for Additional Technology Resources

The 3rd Circuit requested an additional \$55,000 in funding for their aiSmartBench implementation. Judge Perry moved to approve the request. Judge Ficarotta seconded and the motion passed without objection.

C. Overtime Pay and Pay Above the Minimum

For FY 2013-14, the TCBC approved overtime pay and compensation above the minimum hourly rate for Other Personal Services (OPS) staff as long as circuits stayed within their allocation. Judge Roundtree motioned to approve continuation for FY 2014-15. Judge Soto seconded and the motion passed without objection.

D. Distributing Recommended Allocations into Operating Categories

The Funding Methodology Committee recommended the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) staff work with the circuits to distribute their recommended FY 2014-15 circuit allocations into the various operating categories to ensure circuits have maximum flexibility in choosing the types of resources that would be most effective in reducing the backlog. Because the full amount that is left over from the current year will not be known

until after June 30th, it is further recommended the circuits receive their allocation in two stages. In June a portion of the allocation based on the \$6.3 million funding for FY 2014-15, and in August the remainder of the allocations based on the actual amount carried forward from FY 2013-14. Judge Roundtree motioned to approve the allocations as presented and the two stage distribution process. Tom Genung seconded and the motion passed without objection.

Agenda Item V: Pay Issues for Court System Employees

Theresa Westerfield provided an overview of the two pay issues filed and noted that the across the board competitive pay adjustment issue was not funded.

A. Implementation of FY 2014-15 Special Pay Issue: Status Report

Ms. Westerfield reported the legislature provided first-year funding of the two-year implementation request of the equity and retention issue to address salary issues affecting the State Courts System. Proviso language in the General Appropriations Act (GAA) requires that the funds be used for employee position classification salary adjustments to encourage retention, provide salary equity between the judicial branch and other governmental entities, and provide market-based adjustments for recurring employee recruitment problems. This funding cannot be used for across-the-board or individual merit increases, and not all classes will be adjusted. The minimum salaries of affected classes will be adjusted and therefore, not everyone in that class will be adjusted if earning above the minimum. Proviso languages requires the funds to be appropriated proportionately within the State Courts System based on the number of full-time equivalent positions, excluding judges. Judge Steinbeck noted that a draft plan for the trial courts will be presented the June 20th TCBC meeting for comment. The revised plan will be presented in August for approval. The plan for the entire State Courts System will be submitted to the chief justice for approval and then submitted to the Legislative Budget Commission (LBC) for approval. At this time, there is no scheduled meeting of the LBC. Therefore, the exact implementation date for the adjustment is yet to be determined.

B. Performance-Based, Lump Sum Bonuses Authorized During 2013 Legislative Session: Status Report

Dorothy Wilson referenced an email just received notifying that the performance-based, lump sum bonus funding will be available on June 18th, the day before payroll runs. The funding will be equal to the plan submitted. Theresa Westerfield added that affected employees may now be notified. Those employees will receive their funds on June 25th and taxes will be taken out of the total amount. There was no language in the GAA that included the state's payment of the employee portion of taxes or FICA.

Adjournment

With no other business before the commission, the meeting adjourned at 12:22 a.m.

II. A. Status of FY 2013-14 Budget: Reclassification Actions

**Agenda Item II. A.: Trial Court FY 2013-14
Reclassifications and Other Personnel Actions
as of June 10, 2014**

Circuit	Number of Reclasses Requested	Dollar Amount of Requests	Status of Requests as of June 10, 2014	Dollar Amount of Approved Requests	Dollar Amount of Pending Reclass Requests
1	1	2,866	approved	2,866	
2					
3	2	5,108	2 approved	5,108	
4					
5	1	27,550	approved	8,327	
6	1	4,300	approved	4,300	
7	2 (1 had been pending from FY 12/13)	56,026	2 approved	56,026	
8					
9	1	6,693	approved	6,693	
10	1	15,956	approved	15,956	
11	2	5,363	1 approved; 1 - requested a review of position with no specific class requested - approved for a reclass	14,479	
12	1	2,725	approved	2,725	
13					
14					
15	2	11,672	2 approved	11,672	
16					
17	1	(10,006)	approved	(10,006)	
18	5	42,837	3 approved; 2 - pending classification analysis	15,138	27,699
19	2	18,624	2 approved	18,624	
20	1	6,507	approved	6,507	
Total	22	196,221		158,415	27,699
Total Approved and Pending				186,114	

Other Personnel Actions: \$6,865 for 3 Lead Workers in the 9th (approved); \$2,516 for 1 Lead Worker in the 9th (pending classification analysis); \$1,959 for 1 Lead Worker in the 15th (approved); \$2,069 for 1 Lead Worker in the 19th (approved); \$1,895 for 1 Leadworker in the 19th (pending classification analysis); and \$1,985 for 1 Lead Worker in the 12th. \$2,439 for 2 Demotion Retain Salary in the the 17th; \$2,240 for Demotion Retain Salary (partial) in the the 11th; \$1,220 for Demotion Retain Salary in the 12th; \$4,201 for Demotion Retain Salary in the 13th; \$868 for 2 Demotion Retain Salary in the the 15th; \$134 for Demotion Retain Salary (partial) in the the 5th; \$1,337 for Demotion Retain Salary in the 6th; \$259 for Demotion Retain Salary in the 7th; and \$511 for Demotion Retain Salary in the 9th. (Nine of the eleven "Demotion Retain Salary" actions, in the amount of \$10,521, were for Circuit JAs demoted to County JA.)

II. B. Status of FY 2013-14 Budget: Positions Vacant More than 180 Days

Agenda Item II. B: Vacancies over 180 days as of 6/10/14

Circuit	Cost Center	Cost Center Name	Position #	Class Title	FTE	# of Days Vacant	Date Position Vacant	Base Rate
11th Circuit	210	CIRC CTS - 11TH CIRC - CT. ADMIN.	009436	TRIAL COURT TECHNOLOGY OFFICER ¹	1.00	395	05/11/2013	\$74,876.64
13th Circuit	131	Court Interpreting Services	010498	COURT INTERPRETER ²	1.00	185	12/07/2013	\$37,756.20
14th Circuit	258	14TH CIRC TRIAL CT LAW CLERK PRGM	008959	TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK ³	1.00	194	11/28/2013	\$43,403.40
15th Circuit	129	Court Reporting Services	010616	ELECTRONIC TRANSCRIBER ⁴	1.00	282	09/01/2013	\$26,658.48

¹The 11th Circuit has completed interviews and is checking references on a selected candidate.

²The 13th Circuit originally advertised this position vacancy in January 2014 and has identified, and plans to extend an offer to, an existing certified contractual interpreter who submitted an application for the position. However, this certified candidate is not available until September 2, 2014, due to existing contractual interpreter assignments and commitments to the 13th and surrounding circuits.

³The 14th Circuit has offered the position to a candidate who will take the Bar in July and start on August 11, 2014.

⁴The 15th Circuit "had difficulties filing the transcriptionist position primarily because the salary is so low, \$26,658" and plans to submit a letter to the TCBC requesting an exception for a higher base.

Actions and results for initial advertising:

- Posted on Circuit website (open until filled) - 9/13
- Pulled from Circuit website - 1/14
- Advertised in 20 (plus) locations including AAERT, National Center for State Courts, and at local Colleges and Technical Institutions
- Received 13 application packages; no one qualified; no one selected.

Actions and results for re-advertisement on 3/14:

- 14 applications received as of June 10, 2014
- Court Reporting Manager/HR re-reviewing applications on 6/13 - Initial review yielded no qualified applicants
- Advertised in 20 (plus) locations including AAERT, National Center for State Courts, and at local Colleges and Technical Institutions and at a job fair in March 2014.

II. C. Status of FY 2013-14 Budget: Operating Budgets

Trial Court Budget Commission
June 20, 2014
Tampa, Florida

Item II.C.: Operating Budgets

The data below represents the status of the FY 2013-14 operating budgets as of May 31, 2014.

Category	Budget Entity	Appropriation	Expended/ Encumbered	Remaining Balance	% Expended/ Encumbered
Other Personnel Services	Circuit	966,291	717,985	248,306	74.30%
Expenses	Circuit	5,316,686	3,648,771	1,667,915	68.63%
	County	2,284,710	1,893,094	391,616	82.86%
	Total	7,601,396	5,541,865	2,059,531	72.91%
Operating Capital Outlay	Circuit	339,849	317,155	22,694	93.32%
Contracted Services	Circuit	6,645,846	2,285,603	4,360,243	34.39%
	County	121,448	88,880	32,568	73.18%
	Total	6,767,294	2,374,483	4,392,811	35.09%
Lease/Lease Purchase	Circuit	178,555	138,311	40,244	77.46%
	County	31,615	28,387	3,228	89.79%
	Total	210,170	166,698	43,472	79.32%
Other Data Processing Services	Circuit	97,902	97,902	0	100.00%

Trial Court Budget Commission
June 20, 2014
Tampa, Florida

Item II.C.: Operating Budgets

The data below represents the status of the FY 2013-14 operating budgets as of May 31, 2014.

Category	Appropriation	Expended/ Encumbered	Remaining Balance	% Expended/ Encumbered
Additional Compensation to County Judges	72,938	52,123	20,815	71.46%
Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers	1,955,768	1,592,520	363,248	81.43%
Mediation Services	3,182,759	2,385,896	796,863	74.96%
Due Process - Expert Witness	6,700,638	5,683,252	1,017,386	84.82%
Due Process - Court Reporting	8,441,002	6,934,742	1,506,260	82.16%
Due Process - Court Interpreting	2,831,970	2,207,038	624,932	77.93%
Due Process - Conflict Cases Over the Flat Fee	2,040,200	2,010,593	29,607	98.55%
Total Due Process	20,013,810	16,835,625	3,178,185	84.12%

Note: Operating Budget excludes foreclosure funds.

Trial Court Budget Commission

June 20, 2014

Tampa, Florida

Item II.C.: Operating Budgets

The data below represents the status of the FY 2013-14 operating budgets as of May 31, 2014.

Senior Judge Activity Summary						
Regular Senior Judge Allocation						
May 2014						
Court	Initial Days Allotted	Previous Month Remaining Allotment Balance	Current Month Days Transferred	Current Month Days Served	Current Month Ending Allotment Balance	Percent Remaining
1st Judicial Circuit	243	83	-	10	73	30.04%
2nd Judicial Circuit	162	100	-	21	79	48.77%
3rd Judicial Circuit	89	73	-	8	65	73.03%
4th Judicial Circuit	237	42	-	22	20	8.44%
5th Judicial Circuit	542	276	-	8	268	49.45%
6th Judicial Circuit	441	89	-	19	70	15.87%
7th Judicial Circuit	285	117	-	1	116	40.70%
8th Judicial Circuit	146	40	-	13	27	18.49%
9th Judicial Circuit	430	131	-	38	93	21.63%
10th Judicial Circuit	258	48	-	15	33	12.79%
11th Judicial Circuit	778	304	-	50	254	32.65%
12th Judicial Circuit	195	98	-	10	88	45.13%
13th Judicial Circuit	397	66	10	16	60	15.11%
14th Judicial Circuit	134	105	-	3	102	76.12%
15th Judicial Circuit	346	143	(10)	8	125	36.13%
16th Judicial Circuit	46	17	-	1	16	34.78%
17th Judicial Circuit	550	280	-	33	247	44.91%
18th Judicial Circuit	276	92	-	12	80	28.99%
19th Judicial Circuit	190	79	-	9	70	36.84%
20th Judicial Circuit	329	135	-	35	100	30.40%
Reserve	50	629	-	-	629	0.00%
GRAND TOTAL	6,124	2,947	-	332	2,615	42.70%

Trial Court Budget Commission

June 20, 2014

Tampa, Florida

Item II.C.: Operating Budgets

The data below represents the status of the FY 2013-14 operating budgets as of May 31, 2014.

Senior Judge Activity Summary						
Foreclosure Senior Judge Allocation						
May 2014						
Court	Initial Days Allotted	Previous Month Remaining Allotment Balance	Current Month Days Transferred	Current Month Days Served	Current Month Ending Allotment Balance	Percent Remaining
1st Judicial Circuit	221	47	-	19	28	12.67%
2nd Judicial Circuit	120	33	-	13	20	16.67%
3rd Judicial Circuit	-	-	-	-	-	
4th Judicial Circuit	1,132	215	-	100	115	10.16%
5th Judicial Circuit	340	59	-	23	36	10.59%
6th Judicial Circuit	330	67	-	31	36	10.91%
7th Judicial Circuit	225	45	-	2	43	19.11%
8th Judicial Circuit	-	-	-	-	-	
9th Judicial Circuit	600	168	-	72	96	16.00%
10th Judicial Circuit	150	47	-	15	32	21.33%
11th Judicial Circuit	644	95	-	48	47	7.30%
12th Judicial Circuit	240	66	-	22	44	18.33%
13th Judicial Circuit	849	168	-	17	151	17.79%
14th Judicial Circuit	144	30	-	10	20	13.89%
15th Judicial Circuit	519	131	-	34	97	18.69%
16th Judicial Circuit	120	19	-	8	11	9.17%
17th Judicial Circuit	449	80	-	20	60	13.36%
18th Judicial Circuit	401	171	-	32	139	34.66%
19th Judicial Circuit	150	32	-	14	18	12.00%
20th Judicial Circuit	342	56	-	33	23	6.73%
Reserve	-	-	-	-	-	
GRAND TOTAL	6,976	1,529	-	513	1,016	14.56%

II. D. Status of FY 2013-14 Budget: Conflict Counsel Cases over the Flat Fee

Trial Court Budget Commission Meeting June 20, 2014

Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee for Conflict Counsel Criminal Cases
FY 2008/09 through FY 2013/14 Annualized

Circuit	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2008/09	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2009/10	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2010/11	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2011/12	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2012/13	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2013/14 Annualized*	Difference between FY 2013/14 and FY 2012/13
1	\$37,405	\$32,048	\$148,368	\$296,281	\$243,023	\$108,067	(\$134,956)
2	\$9,328	\$46,778	\$2,250	\$25,370	\$22,310	\$0	(\$22,310)
3	\$14,880	\$3,345	\$4,215	\$99,388	\$12,623	\$48,082	\$35,460
4	\$175,782	\$508,102	\$1,082,531	\$569,386	\$418,630	\$554,907	\$136,277
5	\$23,240	\$64,141	\$71,200	\$445,559	\$93,359	\$313,792	\$220,433
6	\$6,058	\$72,676	\$186,588	\$112,345	\$219,744	\$451,839	\$232,095
7	\$126,160	\$69,819	\$76,698	\$178,148	\$282,231	\$143,181	(\$139,050)
8	\$21,363	\$68,572	\$98,770	\$48,669	\$67,165	\$48,492	(\$18,673)
9	\$10,104	\$45,547	\$18,828	\$72,658	\$29,235	\$46,823	\$17,588
10	\$50,735	\$62,727	\$221,063	\$616,746	\$62,162	\$352,242	\$290,080
11	\$161,635	\$526,888	\$1,008,927	\$1,410,618	\$1,644,640	\$2,234,680	\$590,040
12	\$37,034	\$38,087	\$96,825	\$167,775	\$263,017	\$259,337	(\$3,680)
13	\$14,705	\$113,070	\$502,964	\$571,502	\$356,374	\$289,116	(\$67,258)
14	\$34,527	\$10,203	\$66,055	\$93,279	\$85,469	\$2,280	(\$83,189)
15	\$65,875	\$154,345	\$454,039	\$1,039,109	\$498,671	\$391,256	(\$107,416)
16	\$0	\$0	\$1,078	\$0	\$0	\$8,570	\$8,570
17	\$232,890	\$504,275	\$572,326	\$974,248	\$410,698	\$723,080	\$312,382
18	\$1,500	\$11,491	\$5,028	\$50,398	\$17,527	\$43,552	\$26,025
19	\$16,283	\$75,354	\$23,708	\$123,060	\$211,494	\$396,443	\$184,950
20	\$30,855	\$197,284	\$239,775	\$174,358	\$419,605	\$477,296	\$57,691
Total	\$1,070,356	\$2,604,750	\$4,881,233	\$7,068,895	\$5,357,975	\$6,893,033	\$1,535,057

Source: Data provided by the Justice Administrative Commission.

*Annualized using July through April 2014 data.

Trial Court Budget Commission Meeting June 20, 2014

Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee for Conflict Counsel Criminal Cases
Monthly FY 2013/14

Circuit	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee July 2013*	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee August 2013	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee September 2013	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee October 2013	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee November 2013	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee December 2013	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee January 2014	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee February 2014	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee March 2014	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee April 2014	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2013/14 YTD	Total Amount Paid Over the Flat Fee FY 2013/14 Annualized
1	\$30,665	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,538	\$15,162	\$0	\$0	\$36,630	\$93,994	\$108,067.22
2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	\$0	\$15,655	\$10,888	\$2,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,066	\$5,960	\$0	\$40,069	\$48,082
4	\$29,810	\$1,670	\$5,690	\$32,773	\$82,222	\$79,655	\$75,046	\$29,500	\$0	\$123,070	\$459,435	\$554,907
5	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$48,322	\$51,700	\$0	\$89,844	\$54,600	\$259,466	\$313,792
6	\$18,630	\$0	\$1,027	\$38,263	\$163,640	\$27,660	\$44,423	\$176	\$40,872	\$38,384	\$373,073	\$451,839
7	\$0	\$8,455	\$11,675	\$0	\$22,470	\$15,000	\$10,198	\$15,000	\$36,520	\$0	\$119,318	\$143,181
8	\$25,839	\$4,560	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,975	\$0	\$2,000	\$44,373	\$48,492
9	\$0	\$18,127	\$0	\$20,893	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$39,019	\$46,823
10	\$131,730	\$40,600	\$77,510	\$21,056	\$0	\$0	\$25,965	\$4,038	\$11,250	\$0	\$312,149	\$352,242
11	\$482,924	\$114,783	\$220,932	\$116,831	\$153,125	\$256,752	\$144,619	\$101,782	\$95,259	\$229,173	\$1,916,179	\$2,234,680
12	\$29,568	\$18,173	\$112,838	\$19,783	\$5,460	\$3,343	\$10,700	\$0	\$7,798	\$9,900	\$217,561	\$259,337
13	\$68,610	\$35,668	\$0	\$25,300	\$35,318	\$0	\$10,800	\$29,968	\$43,361	\$0	\$249,024	\$289,116
14	\$2,280	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,280	\$2,280
15	\$16,128	\$27,828	\$14,803	\$100,152	\$13,296	\$21,445	\$21,623	\$7,170	\$18,080	\$82,527	\$323,050	\$391,256
16	\$0	\$7,141	(\$7,141)	\$7,141	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,141	\$8,570
17	\$35,120	\$51,658	\$180,480	\$95,673	\$0	\$16,360	\$44,775	\$62,520	\$42,653	\$68,759	\$597,996	\$723,080
18	\$0	\$2,600	\$0	\$0	\$5,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$28,394	\$36,294	\$43,552
19	\$22,543	\$0	\$26,970	\$101,243	\$23,555	\$19,822	\$398	\$0	\$72,065	\$61,868	\$328,461	\$396,443
20	\$4,843	\$0	\$10,280	\$9,903	\$16,443	\$115,685	\$135,585	\$17,820	\$54,370	\$26,468	\$391,395	\$477,296
Total	\$913,686	\$346,915	\$665,950	\$591,509	\$520,827	\$615,581	\$590,992	\$285,014	\$518,030	\$761,771	\$5,810,276	\$6,893,033

Source: Data provided by the Justice Administrative Commission.

* July 2013 includes payments that ordinarily would have been made from FY 2013/14 funds but instead were paid using OSCA FY 2012/13 funding authority.

JAC - Criminal Conflict Attorney

Payments Over the Flat Fee

FY 2013/14

July 2013 - April 2014

Expenditure Summary				
CIRCUIT	Capital Cases	RICO Cases	Other Cases	TOTAL*
1	\$43,898	\$0	\$50,097	\$93,995
2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	\$0	\$0	\$40,069	\$40,069
4	\$211,541	\$23,925	\$223,969	\$459,435
5	\$173,306	\$56,430	\$29,730	\$259,466
6	\$310,295	\$4,320	\$58,459	\$373,074
7	\$66,520	\$0	\$52,798	\$119,318
8	\$0	\$0	\$44,373	\$44,373
9	\$0	\$0	\$39,019	\$39,019
10	\$249,840	\$0	\$62,309	\$312,149
11	\$1,153,430	\$158,903	\$603,846	\$1,916,179
12	\$15,040	\$145,865	\$56,656	\$217,561
13	\$84,949	\$63,373	\$100,702	\$249,024
14	\$0	\$0	\$2,280	\$2,280
15	\$10,130	\$208,123	\$104,798	\$323,051
16	\$0	\$0	\$7,141	\$7,141
17	\$310,724	\$20,280	\$266,992	\$597,996
18	\$0	\$0	\$36,294	\$36,294
19	\$52,870	\$217,898	\$57,694	\$328,462
20	\$311,200	\$0	\$80,195	\$391,395
TOTAL*	\$2,993,743	\$899,117	\$1,917,417	\$5,810,277

Statewide Conflict Counsel Payment Over the Flat Fee Pool				
CIRCUIT	Expenditure Allowance	Other Case Types Expenditures	Circuit Transfers to Date	Monthly (Over) / Under Allowance*
1	\$79,336	\$50,097		\$29,240
2	\$15,896	\$0		\$15,896
3	\$6,610	\$40,069	\$32,499	(\$960)
4	\$165,774	\$223,969	\$58,195	\$0
5	\$83,999	\$29,730		\$54,269
6	\$56,974	\$58,459		(\$1,485)
7	\$58,564	\$52,798		\$5,767
8	\$52,470	\$44,373		\$8,097
9	\$24,071	\$39,019	\$14,948	\$0
10	\$41,659	\$62,309	\$20,650	\$0
11	\$600,916	\$603,846		(\$2,930)
12	\$96,907	\$56,656		\$40,252
13	\$77,056	\$100,702	\$23,647	\$0
14	\$87,685	\$2,280		\$85,405
15	\$202,251	\$104,798		\$97,454
16	\$359	\$7,141	\$6,782	\$0
17	\$362,222	\$266,992		\$95,230
18	\$13,628	\$36,294		(\$22,666)
19	\$39,349	\$57,694	\$16,590	(\$1,755)
20	\$130,253	\$80,195		\$50,058
TOTAL*	\$2,195,979	\$1,917,417	\$173,309	\$451,872

Note: Data provided by the Justice Administrative Commission.

*Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

II. E. Status of FY 2013-14 Budget: Foreclosure Backlog Reduction Initiative

State Courts System

FY 2013-14 Foreclosure Backlog Reduction Initiative

Cost Center 375 - All Funds

As of May 31, 2014

Circuit	Allotment	Expenditures/Encumbrances							% of Allotment Expended/ Encumbered
		Other Personal Services	Expenses	Compensation to Senior Judges	Contracted Services	Lease/Lease Purchase	Data Processing Services	Total	
0	201,513	0	39,016	0	0	0	70,605	109,621	54.40%
1	860,648	175,036	0	60,383	0	0	233,324	468,743	54.46%
2	541,409	69,561	2,203	30,892	0	0	167,438	270,094	49.89%
3	166,287	79,495	23,128	0	0	0	40,000	142,624	85.77%
4	926,242	175,951	7,190	319,567	0	0	313,478	816,187	88.12%
5	1,372,631	282,636	379	95,515	0	0	201,529	580,059	42.26%
6	1,260,827	538,914	19,789	102,972	0	0	151,619	813,294	64.50%
7	903,598	147,441	10,458	63,203	0	0	0	221,102	24.47%
8	699,125	49,705	0	0	58,800	0	325,896	434,401	62.13%
9	867,931	464,638	19,785	165,110	0	0	44,000	693,533	79.91%
10	270,663	149,587	12,755	37,638	0	0	0	199,980	73.89%
11	2,607,141	771,149	61,559	204,858	0	2,063	502,154	1,541,782	59.14%
12	443,867	241,690	27,991	62,138	0	0	0	331,819	74.76%
13	830,201	225,521	2,126	246,777	35,214	0	152,907	662,545	79.81%
14	410,394	55,213	3,475	40,479	0	0	130,678	229,843	56.01%
15	1,110,924	460,951	15,037	145,287	0	0	273,816	895,090	80.57%
16	171,206	43,022	4,579	37,638	8,378	0	11,167	104,784	61.20%
17	1,719,683	492,966	5,515	132,798	0	0	484,153	1,115,432	64.86%
18	803,860	305,909	30,299	74,211	0	0	78,111	488,531	60.77%
19	557,424	206,393	14,165	42,964	0	0	108,919	372,441	66.81%
20	641,511	208,294	43,481	101,551	0	0	86,975	440,301	68.64%
Total	17,367,087	5,144,073	342,930	1,963,980	102,392	2,063	3,376,768	10,932,207	62.95%

Trial Court Budget Commission

Meeting June 20, 2014

FY 2013/14 Allocated Technology Resources and Status of Implementation

Circuit	FY 2012/13 Carry Forward Balance	FY 2013/14	Total	Status of Implementation
1	\$258,305	\$310,160	\$568,465	The Mentis solution has been implemented in Walton and Santa Rosa counties. It is anticipated that all divisions will be implemented in Escambia County in July 2014 and Okaloosa County in August 2014.
2	\$67,156	\$342,000	\$409,156	The Mentis solution has been implemented in Wakulla, Liberty, Franklin and Jefferson counties. It is anticipated that all divisions will be implemented in Gadsden County by the fall of 2014. Leon County is anticipated implementation in September 2014 for civil and August 2014 for criminal.
3*	\$40,000	\$55,000	\$95,000	The Mentis solution is anticipated to be implemented in all divisions for Columbia, Dixie, Hamilton, Lafayette, Madison and Suwannee Counties by July 2014. Taylor County implementation has not been scheduled at this time.
4	\$315,692	\$0	\$315,692	An in-house solution, C.O.R.E., has been implemented in Duval County. It is anticipated C.O.R.E. will be implemented in the civil division for Clay and Nassau counties in July 2014 and criminal divisions by September 2014.
5*	\$124,443	\$791,104	\$915,547	The Mentis solution has been implemented in Lake County. It is anticipated that Citrus, Hernando, Marion and Sumter Counties will be implemented in all divisions by September 2014.
6*	\$327,949	\$128,117	\$456,066	The JAWS solution is anticipated to be implemented in the civil division for Pinellas County in July 2014. Pasco County civil implementation has not been scheduled at this time. In the criminal divisions, both counties are anticipating implementation by December 2014.
7	\$0	\$574,300	\$574,300	Researching the Pioneer solution for circuit wide implementation. An implementation schedule will be developed when a contract is executed.
8*	\$129,350	\$510,000	\$639,350	The ICMS solution has been implemented in all divisions. The circuit is continuing to work on the system in the areas of , support, maintenance, bug fixes, improvements and the additions necessary to meet new CAPS requirements.
9*	\$44,000	\$0	\$44,000	The Mentis solution is anticipated to be implemented in all divisions for Orange County in June 2014 and in Osceola County by September 2014.
10*	\$0	\$0	\$0	The ICMS solution has been implemented in Hardee and Highlands County. It is anticipated Polk county will be implemented in all divisions by August 2014.
11	\$1,919	\$1,373,675	\$1,375,594	A contract was signed with Mentis. An implementation schedule has not been determined at this time.
12	\$0	\$0	\$0	The Pioneer solution has been implemented in Sarasota County. The Mentis solution has been implemented in Manatee County. Desoto County is anticipating Mentis implementation in all divisions by July 2014.
13	\$152,918	\$57,090	\$210,008	The JAWS solution has been implemented in all divisions.
14*	\$0	\$252,250	\$252,250	The ICMS solution has been implemented in all divisions.
15	\$150,403	\$169,500	\$319,903	The ICMS solution has been implemented in all divisions.
16*	\$15,362	\$10,000	\$25,362	The JAWS solution is anticipated to be implemented in the civil division in June 2014. The criminal division has not been scheduled at this time.
17	\$33,670	\$500,000	\$533,670	The 17th Circuit's in-house solution has been implemented in the civil division. The criminal division has not been scheduled at this time.
18*	\$1,064	\$119,000	\$120,064	The ICMS solution is anticipated to be implemented in Brevard County and an in-house solution in Seminole County, for the civil divisions, in June 2014 and August 2014 for the criminal division.
19	\$120,135	\$117,500	\$237,635	The Mentis solution has been implemented in Martin and Okeechobee counties. It is anticipated all divisions will be implemented in Indian River County in June 2014 and St. Lucie County in July 2014.
20	\$221,658	\$0	\$221,658	The Mentis solution has been implemented in Glades and Hendry counties. It is anticipated all divisions will be implemented in Lee County in July 2014 and Charlotte and Collier counties in October 2014.
TOTAL	\$2,004,024	\$5,309,696	\$7,313,720	-

*Circuit allocations modified from original proposal

III. Special Pay Issue for Court Employees Appropriated in FY 2014-15

Agenda Item III.: Special Pay Issue for Court Employees Appropriated in FY 2014-15

Background:

As part of its fiscal year 2014-15 Legislative Budget Request, the State Courts System (SCS) requested \$9,866,302 in recurring salary dollars branch-wide to address a wide range of salary issues affecting the SCS. It was noted that in order to retain highly skilled employees and to experience more equity with other government salaries, the SCS needs approximately \$18,828,193 in recurring salary dollars. However, recognizing the considerable size of such a request, a two-year implementation period was proposed. The request was made for a lump sum so that the SCS could develop its own plan. Staff of the Office of the State Courts Administrator conducted an analysis for legislative staff and legislators, but it was not a comprehensive analysis of every class in the SCS.

The Legislature appropriated \$8,132,614 in recurring dollars to fund the equity and retention issue. The General Appropriations Act specifies:

(2) SPECIAL PAY ISSUES

Effective July 1, 2014, recurring funds are appropriated in Specific Appropriation 1981 to:

(a) The judicial branch in the amount of \$5,589,397 from the General Revenue Fund and \$2,543,217 from trust funds for position classification salary adjustments for judicial branch employees, excluding judges, to encourage employee retention, provide equity adjustments to equalize salaries between the judicial branch and other governmental entities for similar positions and duties, and provide market-based adjustments necessary to remedy recurring employee recruitment problems for specific position classifications. The funds available for these adjustments shall be allocated proportionately among the circuit and county courts, the district courts of appeal, the Supreme Court, the Office of the State Courts Administrator, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission, based upon the total number of full-time-equivalent positions, excluding judges, employed by each of those components of the judicial branch. The Chief Justice, based upon recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Commission, District Court of Appeal Budget Commission, and the State Courts Administrator, shall submit a plan for such position classification salary adjustments pursuant to section 216.177(2), Florida Statutes.

Attached for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Commission are tables depicting options, methodologies, and corresponding costs, by employee group, for distributing the dollars.

III Item III. Special Pay Issue Spreadsheet to run totals of available pay issue dollars during meeting as TCBC develops policies
 Trial Courts

1	Rate Target	Dollar Target	Employee Group	Issue	Methodology	Notes
2	5,676,978.00	\$ 6,529,660.00				
3	Cost	Cost				Regular benefit costs are 15.02% of rate; Senior Management benefit costs are 28.79% of rate.
4			A. Law Clerks	retention, equity	See Options Chart.	
5			B. General Counsels	equity	See Options Chart as Law Clerk options are applied for calculating increases.	
6			C. Program Attorneys	equity	See Options Chart as Law Clerk options are applied for calculating increases.	
7			D. Judicial Assistants	retention, recruitment	See Options Chart.	
8			E. Trial Court Administrators	recruitment, equity	See attached background materials from 12/13/13 TCBC meeting with options, including a modified option.	
9			F. Trial Court Technology Officers	recruitment, equity	See Options Chart.	
10			G. Magistrates	equity	See Options Chart.	
11			H. Administrative Services Managers and Directors	equity, retention	See Options Chart.	
12			I. Budget Analysts, Managers and Specialists	retention, equity	See Chart.	
13			J. Chief Deputy Trial Court Administrators	equity	See Options Chart.	
14			K. Administrative Assistants	retention	Equalizing AA I to the proposed County JA minimum, as current AAI is equalized; applying current differences among levels of AA. See Chart.	
15			L. Human Resources - Specialists and Analysts	equity	See Chart.	
16			M. Case Manager positions	retention	See Chart.	

1	Rate Target	Dollar Target	Employee Group	Issue	Methodology	Notes
17			<i>N. Administrative Support - Magistrates</i>	equity, retention	Administrative Secretary I to Administrative Secretary II for Magistrates only. NO CHART-See NOTES	All positions affected to insure minimum 3% increase. Rate costs: 102,932.71 Dollar costs: \$118,393.21
19			O. Court Operations Analysts, Managers, Consultants	recruitment, equity, retention	See Chart.	
20			P. Certified Court Interpreters	recruitment	Increase minimums by 5%, including certified supervisory positions. See Chart.	
21			Q. Specific retention and/or recruitment issues to be addressed at circuit level		Options to be distributed at meeting	
			OTHER CLASSES to be calculated?			
22	5,676,978.00	\$6,529,660.00	Balance			

Groups of classes or a series of classes are based on problem classes identified over several years and on data provided to legislature and subsequently re-validated

bold italics indicate a class or series of classes shared with other levels of court

shaded cells indicate a class or series of classes traditionally "benchmarked"

yellow shaded cells indicate a class with Senior Management retirement benefits

III.A. TRIAL COURT LAW CLERKS

Option 1. Benchmark at 90% of the Supreme Court. (Supreme Court Staff Attorney proposed at \$50,908 and Supreme Court Senior Staff Attorney proposed at \$61,336.) This option does not include eligibility for a promotion to Senior Law Clerk at the end of year 5 nor to a new Career Staff Attorney class at the end of year 8.

PROPOSED PAY TRIAL COURT				
CURRENT		% OF CHANGE	PROPOSED	
CLASS TITLE	PAY		CLASS TITLE	PAY
LAW CLERK	\$43,403.40	5.8%	LAW CLERK	\$45,817.20
SENIOR LAW CLERK	\$47,504.40	16.2%	SENIOR LAW CLERK	\$55,202.40
257,661.40	RATE NEEDED		89 positions not affected; 119 affected	
\$296,362.14	DOLLARS NEEDED			

Option 2. Benchmark at 90% of the Supreme Court. (Supreme Court Staff Attorney proposed at \$50,908 and Supreme Court Senior Staff Attorney proposed at \$61,336.) Provide eligibility for a promotion to Senior Law Clerk at the end of year 5. Includes cost to sustain.

429,625.84	Rate Needed to Implement	45 positions not affected; 163 positions affected
\$494,155.64	Dollars Needed to Implement	Effective 7/1/14, 50 positions eligible for promotion; pay for 6 positions eligible for promotion not affected
808,634.22	Rate Needed to Sustain (assumes 25% annual turnover)	
\$930,091.08	Dollars Needed to Sustain	
\$1,238,260.06	Total Rate Needed for this Option	
\$1,424,246.72	Total Dollars Needed for this Option	

Option 3. Benchmark at 90% of the Supreme Court. (Supreme Court Staff Attorney proposed at \$50,908, Supreme Court Senior Staff Attorney proposed at \$61,336, and Supreme Court Career Attorney proposed at \$72,195.28.) Provide eligibility for a promotion to Senior Law Clerk at the end of year 5 and eligibility to a new Career Law Clerk class at the end of year 8. Includes cost to sustain.

PROPOSED PAY TRIAL COURT				
CURRENT		% OF CHANGE	PROPOSED	
CLASS TITLE	PAY		CLASS TITLE	PAY
LAW CLERK	\$43,403.40	6%	LAW CLERK	\$45,817.20
SENIOR LAW CLERK	\$47,504.40	16%	SENIOR LAW CLERK	\$55,202.40
		NEW	CAREER LAW CLERK	\$64,975.75

731,783.25 Rate Needed to Implement

33 positions not affected; 175 positions affected

Effective 7/1/14, 21 positions eligible for promotion to Senior Law Clerk and 38 positions eligible for promotion to Career Law Clerk; pay for 3 positions eligible for promotion not affected

\$841,697.09 Dollars Needed to Implement

1,937,040.96 Rate Needed to Sustain (assumes 25% annual turnover)

\$2,227,984.51 Dollars Needed to Sustain

\$2,668,824.21 Total Rate Needed for this Option

\$3,069,681.60 Total Dollars Needed for this Option

Option 4. Increasing the base rate of pay for the Trial Court Law Clerks to \$50,000 and maintaining the distance between the Trial Law Clerks and the Senior Trial Law Clerks at 9%.

PROPOSED PAY CHANGE				
PROPOSED		% OF CHANGE	PROPOSED	
CLASS TITLE	PAY		CLASS TITLE	PAY
TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	43,403.40	15.2%	TRIAL COURT LAWCLERK	50,000.00
SENIOR TRIAL COURT LAWCLERK	\$47,504.40	15.2%	SENIOR TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	\$54,724.28

758,701.98 RATE NEEDED
\$872,658.86 DOLLARS NEEDED

57 positions not affected; 151 positions affected

Option 5. Increasing the base rate of pay for the Trial Court Law Clerks to \$50,000 and maintaining the distance between the Trial Law Clerks and the Senior Trial Law Clerks at 9%. Provide eligibility for a promotion to Senior Law Clerk at the end of year 5. Includes cost to sustain.

885,276.08 RATE NEEDED
\$1,018,244.55 DOLLARS NEEDED

24 positions not affected; 184 positions affected
 50 positions eligible for promotion; pay for 6 positions eligible

352,127.28 Rate Needed to Sustain (assumes 25% annual turnover)
 \$405,016.80 Dollars Needed to Sustain

\$1,237,403.36 Total Rate Needed for this Option
\$1,423,261.35 Total Dollars Needed for this Option

Option 6. Increasing the base rate of pay for the Trial Court Law Clerks to 50,000 and maintaining the distance between the Trial Law Clerks and the Senior Trial Law Clerks at 9%. Provide eligibility for a promotion to Senior Law Clerk at the end of year 5. Create a new Career Attorney Trial Court class with a 15% difference between the Senior Law Clerk class and provide eligibility for a promotion to the new Career Law Clerk class at the end of year 8. Includes cost to sustain.

PROPOSED PAY CHANGE				
PROPOSED		% OF CHANGE	PROPOSED	
CLASS TITLE	PAY		CLASS TITLE	PAY
TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	43,403.40	15.2%	TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	50,000.00
SENIOR TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	\$47,504.40	15.2%	SENIOR TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	\$54,724.28
CAREER ATTORNEY TRIAL COURT	NEW		CAREER ATTORNEY TRIAL COURT	\$62,932.92

1,198,978.88 Rate Needed to Implement

12 positions not affected; 196 positions affected

\$1,379,065.51 Dollars Needed to Sustain

66 positions eligible for promotion; pay for 5 positions eligible

1,312,076.13 Rate Needed to Sustain (assumes 25% annual turnover)

\$1,509,149.96 Dollars Needed to Sustain

\$2,511,055.01 Total Rate Needed for this Option

\$2,888,215.47 Total Dollars Needed for this Option

III.B. GENERAL COUNSELS

OPTION 1: Increase the General Counsel minimum from \$81,259.04 to \$85,915.14. Utilizes the 5.6% increase proposed for new Law Clerk minimum increase.

\$9,041.46	rate needed	7 of 10 FTE not affected as over new minimum
\$10,399.49	dollars needed	

OPTION 2: Increase the General Counsel minimum from \$81,259.04 to \$93,725.62. Utilizes the 15.2% increase proposed for new Law Clerk minimum to be increased to \$50,000.

\$53,531.28	rate needed	4 of 10 FTE not affected as over new minimum
\$61,571.68	dollars needed	

III.C. PROGRAM ATTORNEYS

Option 1. Utilize same increase of 5.6% as that of Law Clerk Option 1 proposal. Increases Program Attorney minimum from \$45,303.72 to \$47,840.72.

2,537.00	rate needed	1 of 2 Program Attorneys not affected as over the proposed new minimum.
\$2,918.06	dollars needed	

Option 2. Utilize same increase of 15.2 % as that of Law Clerk Option 2 proposal. Increases Program Attorney minimum from \$45,303.72 to \$52,189.88.

8,431.72	rate needed	Both Program Attorneys are affected.
\$9,698.16	dollars needed	

III. D. TRIAL COURT JUDICIAL ASSISTANTS

OPTION 1: Using the Supreme Court Judicial Assistant base rate of pay of \$37,756.20 as the benchmark:
 Judicial Assistant - Circuit Court at 90% of the Supreme Court base rate of pay - \$33,980.58
 Judicial Assistant - County Court at 85% of the Supreme Court base rate of pay - \$32,092.77
 Increase base rate of pay to the new minimum.

1,686,206.08	rate needed	281 of 921 FTE not affected as over new minimum
\$1,939,474.23	dollars needed	

OPTION 2: Using the Supreme Court Judicial Assistant base rate of pay of \$37,756.20 as the benchmark:
 Judicial Assistant - Circuit Court at 90% of the Supreme Court base rate of pay - \$33,980.58
 Judicial Assistant - County Court at 85% of the Supreme Court base rate of pay - \$32,092.77
 Increase base rate of pay to the new minimum or 3% above current base, whichever is greater.
 (This option requires 344,347.74 in additional rate and \$396,068.77 in additional dollars.)

2,030,553.82	rate needed	All positions affected
\$2,335,543.00	dollars needed	

OPTION 3: Using the Supreme Court Judicial Assistant base rate of pay of \$37,756.20 as the benchmark:
 Judicial Assistant - Circuit Court at 90% of the Supreme Court base rate of pay - \$33,980.58
 Judicial Assistant - County Court at 85% of the Supreme Court base rate of pay - \$32,092.77
 Increase base rate of pay to the new minimum or 5% above current base, whichever is greater.
 (This option requires 605,162.37 in additional rate and \$696,057.76 in additional dollars.)

2,291,368.45	rate needed	All positions affected
\$2,635,531.99	dollars needed	

Background for Item III.E. Trial Court Administrators from 12/13/31 TCBC Meeting

**Trial Court Budget Commission
December 13, 2013
Tallahassee, Florida**

Item III. Personnel Committee Report – Recommendation on the Trial Court Administrator Salary Adjustment Proposal

Issue: Trial Court Budget Commission Chair, Judge Margaret O. Steinbeck, requested a recommendation from the TCBC Personnel Committee regarding a proposal from Eighth Circuit Chief Judge Robert E. Roundtree, Jr., to correct the salary problem of trial court administrators.

Discussion: The TCBC Personnel Committee met by conference call on November 19, 2013 and reviewed the following:

Attachment 1. Chief Judge Roundtree’s letter with salary survey of local government employers in the Eighth Circuit.

Chief Judge Roundtree noted in his letter that the current salary structure is “a huge obstacle to hiring a qualified person” for the trial court administrator position and that “the current policy prohibit[s] a competitive job search for a new administrator” in the Eighth Circuit’s current market. Chief Judge Roundtree also posited that “it is time to eliminate the tiered structure for Trial Court Administrators based on a circuit’s population,” noting: “Salary determination made on the basis of population size of a circuit rather than the job responsibilities and skills required do not seem appropriate. A Trial Court Administrator’s responsibilities and the management skills needed are similar regardless of circuit size.”

Attachment 2. Notes and comments received in reference to the trial court administrator class received by trial court administrators.

In October, trial court administrators and chief judges were asked for information regarding existing or anticipated recruitment and retention problems in various trial court classes. Sixteen circuits responded to the request. The class of trial court administrator was identified by 11 circuits and ranked number two (tied with trial court technology officer), out of 12 types of classes identified, in priority of concern.

Attachment 3. A chart reflecting mean (average), entry, experienced, and median (middle of) salaries for state government management positions.

Attachment 4. The rate of pay for Florida elected officers, members of commissions, and designated employees as set in the FY 2013-14 General Appropriations Act.

Attachment 5. Options considered at the Personnel Committee meeting (see Options A, B, and C below). (An option of not adjusting the current trial court administrator salaries was also presented.)

The Personnel Committee did not recommend any of the options presented at the meeting. The Committee requested another set of options for a vote by email, and those options are found at **Attachment 6** (see Options D, E, and F below). As a result of the email vote, the **Personnel Committee recommends either Option E or Option F**, neither of which eliminates the tiered salary structure for trial court administrators.

Items for Consideration:

1. Should the existing tiered salary structure for trial court administrators be eliminated?

Personnel Committee Recommendation: No

2. Should the salaries of trial court administrators as currently contained in the Budget and Pay Administration Memorandum for Fiscal Year 2013-14 be adjusted?

Personnel Committee Recommendation: Yes. Option E or Option F.

Option A. Increase all trial court administrator salaries to \$120,000 (8th Circuit proposal).

Option B. Increase all trial court administrator salaries to \$116,147 (current starting salary for “very large” circuit).

Option C. Increase trial court administrator salaries based on circuit size: small \$100,000; medium \$120,000; large \$135,000; very large \$150,000.

Option D. Increase trial court administrator salaries based on circuit size; benchmark to circuit judge salary: small to 80%, medium to 85%, large to 90%, and very large to 95%.

Option E. Increase trial court administrator salaries based on circuit size; benchmark to county judge salary: small to 80%, medium to 85%, large to 90%, and very large to 95%.

Option F. Increase trial court administrator salaries based on circuit size comparable to current salaries for executive positions in the state courts system.

Option G. Do not adjust the current trial court administrator salaries.

3. Should chief judges be able to hire a trial court administrator above base?

The Personnel Committee did not address due to the recommendation to adjust the salaries.

4. If a new salary structure is approved, should existing trial court administrator salaries be adjusted?

Personnel Recommendation: Yes

5. If a new salary structure is approved, when should it be effective?

Personnel Recommendation: As soon as possible (depending upon available salary dollars).

III.E. Trial Court Administrators

**Post-Personnel Committee Meeting Options Costed Out
(Attachment 6 for Agenda Item TCBC Meeting 12/13/13 Item III)
Dollar costs updated for increase in FY 14/15 benefits**

current starting salaries by circuit size

small	\$87,264
medium	\$95,990
large	\$105,589
very large	\$116,147

benchmark	Option D 80, 85, 90 & 95%, respectively by size, of circuit judge salary \$146,080	Option D Costed Out
small	\$116,864	\$112,162
medium	\$124,168	\$109,579
large	\$131,472	\$102,193
very large	\$138,776	\$31,643
	Rate	\$355,577
	Dollars	\$457,948

benchmark	Option E 80, 85, 90 & 95%, respectively by size, of county judge salary \$138,020	Option E Costed Out
small	\$110,416	\$79,922
medium	\$117,317	\$72,051
large	\$124,218	\$60,766
very large	\$131,119	\$16,329
	Rate	\$229,068
	Dollars	\$295,017

SCS Comparisons		Option F	Option F costed out
DCA Marshal	\$103,647	small \$104,000	\$50,615
Deputy State Ct. Admin.	\$109,208	medium \$115,000	\$61,106
Clerk - Supreme Court	\$120,000	large \$120,000	\$42,759
State Courts Admin.	\$135,877	very large \$130,000	\$14,091
		Rate	\$168,571
		Dollars	\$217,103

Issue was tabled at 12/13/13 meeting until dollars available. Judge Roundtree also proposed a modified Option E to start at \$110,500 for small circuit and then increase each size by 5%

Modified Option E	Modified Option E costed out	
small	\$110,500	\$80,342
medium	\$116,025	\$65,591
large	\$121,826	\$50,063
very large	\$127,918	\$9,927
	Rate	\$205,923
	Dollars	\$265,208

III.F. TRIAL COURT TECHNOLOGY OFFICERS

OPTION 1: Increase the TCTO minimum from \$74,876.64 to the statewide average of \$88,231.82. (Statewide average based on 16 agencies' salaries for six classifications: Director of Information Services, Director of Information Technology, Chief Information Officer, Information Systems Director, Information Systems Director II, and Information Systems and Services Administrator.)

\$141,748.18	rate needed	3 of 20 FTE not affected as over new minimum
\$163,038.76	dollars needed	

OPTION 2: Increase the TCTO minimum from \$74,876.64 to \$90,250.08, the mid-rank (Rank #15) of the

\$177,146.04	rate needed	2 of 20 FTE not affected as over new minimum
\$203,753.38	dollars needed	

III. G. MAGISTRATES

OPTION 1: Utilizing the difference between SCS average and the average salary of Department of Management Services Public Employee Relations Commission Hearing Officer, increase the Magistrate minimum by 12% (from \$73,795.08 to \$82,650.48). Maintain current percent difference to increase Administrative Magistrate from \$81,359.04 to \$90,915.52.

405,948.58	rate needed	24 Magistrates out of 88 and 3 Administrative Magistrates out of 7 are not affected as their salaries are over proposed new minimum.
\$466,922.06	dollars needed	

OPTION 2: Increase the Magistrate minimum from \$73,795.08 to \$91,968 (the average salary of Department of Management Services Public Employee Relations Commission Hearing Officer). Maintains current percent difference to increase Administrative Magistrate minimum from \$81,359.04 to \$101,164.80.

1,082,283.84	rate needed	13 Magistrates out of 88 and 1 Administrative Magistrate out of 7 are not affected as their salaries are over proposed new minimum.
\$1,244,842.87	dollars needed	

III. H. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES MANAGERS AND DIRECTORS

Option 1. Utilize the JAC comparable average salary (from comparables of eight class titles in four state agencies) to increase the current Administrative Services Director minimum from \$77,484.60 to \$80,467. Maintain the current 48% difference with the Administrative Services Manager class, increasing the minimum from \$52,444.80 to \$54,369.60.

14,498.64	rate needed	4 of 7 Director of Administrative Services positions and 4 of 10 Administrative Services Manager positions not affected as over new minimum
\$16,676.34	dollars needed	

Option 2. Utilize the JAC comparable average salary (from comparables of eight class titles in four state agencies) to increase the current Administrative Services Director minimum from \$77,484.60 to \$80,467. Decrease the current 48% difference with the Administrative Services Manager class to 24%, increasing the minimum for the Administrative Services Manager from \$52,444.80 to \$61,291.72.

\$59,053.24	rate needed	4 of 7 Director of Administrative Services positions and 3 of 10 Administrative Services Manager positions not affected as over new minimum
\$67,923.04	dollars needed	

III. I. BUDGET CLASSES

Increases the minimums by 11.96%, which is the average difference between SCS average Budget class serie's salaries and that of 19 executive branch agencies reviewed.

Budget Specialist minimum increased from \$34,559.04 to \$38,593.75		
4,034.71	rate needed	The 1 position in this class was affected.
\$4,640.72	dollars needed	

Budget Analyst minimum increased from \$43,193.52 to \$48,359.46		
15,504.24	rate needed	All 4 positions in this class were affected.
\$17,832.98	dollars needed	

Budget Manager minimum increased from \$49,947.12 to \$55,940.77		
5,993.65	rate needed	1 position out of the 3 positions was affected. 2 positions not affected as they are over the proposed new minimum.
\$6,893.90	dollars needed	

Budget Services Manager minimum increased from \$63,746.88 to \$71,371		
19,872.48	rate needed	All 3 positions in this class were affected
\$22,857.33	dollars needed	

Totals for all Budget class series		
45,405.08	rate needed	9 of the positions in the Budget class series were affected. 2 positions not affected as they are over the proposed new minimum.
\$52,224.92	dollars needed	

III J. CHIEF DEPUTY TRIAL COURT ADMINISTRATORS

Option 1. Utilize the average salary difference of 6.85% between SCS Chief classes and Chief classes in 31 legislative branch and executive branch agencies, increasing the minimum from \$77,484.60 to \$82,792.30.

23,613.52	rate needed	5 of 13 Chief Deputy positions not affected as their salaries are over proposed new minimum
\$30,411.85	dollars needed	

Option 2. Utilize the overall average salary of chief classes in 31 legislative branch and executive branch agencies, to increase the minimum from \$77,484.60 to \$83,618.

\$30,219.16	rate needed	5 of 13 Chief Deputy positions not affected as their salaries are over proposed new minimum
\$38,919.26	dollars needed	

III.K. ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT CLASSES

Equalizes the minimum of the Administrative Assistant I to that of the proposed new minimum of the County JA, as they are currently equalized. Maintains current differences between levels of Administrative Assistants.

Administrative Assistant I minimum increased from \$27,819.84 to \$32,092.77		
69,006.08	rate needed	27 of the 35 positions were affected; 8 of the positions were not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$79,370.79	dollars needed	

Administrative Assistant II minimum increased from \$30,320.04 to \$34,981.12		
70,288.08	rate needed	26 of the 30 positions were affected; 4 of the positions were not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$80,845.35	dollars needed	

Administrative Assistant III minimum increased from \$36,115.32 to \$41,627.53		
65,887.32	rate needed	24 of the 30 positions were affected; 6 of the positions were not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$75,783.60	dollars needed	

Totals for all Administrative Assistant class series		
205,181.48	rate needed	77 of the positions in the Administrative Assistant class series were affected. 19 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$235,999.74	dollars needed	

III.L. HUMAN RESOURCES CLASSES

Increases the minimums by 8.15%, which is the difference between SCS average human resources classes' salaries and those of 30 state agencies.

Personnel Technician minimum increased from \$30,320.04 to \$32,791.12		
3,542.12	rate needed	2 of 4 positions in this class were affected.
\$4,074.15	dollars needed	

Personnel Specialist minimum increased from \$33,076.56 to \$35,772.30		
4,215.27	rate needed	3 of the 5 positions in this class were affected.
\$4,848.40	dollars needed	

Personnel Management Analyst minimum increased from \$43,193.52 to \$46,713.79.		
4,744.58	rate needed	2 of the 6 positions in this class were affected.
\$5,457.22	dollars needed	

Human Resource Manager minimum increased from \$49,947.12 to \$54,017.81		
24,494.99	rate needed	7 of the 8 positions in this class were affected.
\$28,174.14	dollars needed	

Chief of Personnel Services minimum increased from \$63,746.88 to \$68,942.25		
8,442.78	rate needed	3 of the 6 positions in this class were affected.
\$9,710.89	dollars needed	

Totals for all Human Resources class series		
45,439.74	rate needed	17 of the positions in the Human Resources class series were affected. 12 positions not affected as they are over the proposed new minimum.
\$52,264.79	dollars needed	

III.M. CASE MANAGER CLASSES

Equalizes the Court Program Specialist I minimum to the new proposed minimum for the Administrative Assistant II class, as they are currently equalized. Equalizes the Court Program Specialist II minimum to the new proposed minimum for the Administrative Assistant III class, as they are currently equalized. Maintains current differences between the other case management classes.

Court Program Specialist I minimum increased from \$30,320.04 to \$34,981.12		
205,061.76	rate needed	68 position out of the 79 positions were affected. 11 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$235,862.04	dollars needed	

Court Program Specialist II minimum increased from \$36,115.32 to \$41,627.53		
576,188.20	rate needed	162 position out of the 176 positions were affected. 14 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$662,731.67	dollars needed	

Senior Court Program Specialist minimum increased from \$41,261.76 to \$47,559.45		
86,738.58	rate needed	18 position out of the 22 positions were affected. 4 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$99,766.71	dollars needed	

Family Court Manager minimum increased from \$49,947.12 to \$52,444.48		
16,973.92	rate needed	10 position out of the 17 positions were affected. 7 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$19,523.40	dollars needed	

Drug Court Manager minimum increased from \$47,569.08 to \$49,947.53		
8,070.97	rate needed	5 positions out of the 13 positions were affected. 8 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$9,283.23	dollars needed	

Totals for all Case Manager class series		
893,033.43	rate needed	263 of the positions out of 307 positions in the Case Manager class series were affected. 44 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$1,027,167.05	dollars needed	

III.O. COURT OPERATIONS SERIES

Increases the minimums by 6.17%, which is the difference between SCS average salary of operations analyst series and those of operations and business analysts in 32 legislative and executive branch agencies.

Court Analyst minimum increased from \$36,115.32 to \$38,343.64		
3,056.60	rate needed	The 2 positions in this class were affected.
\$3,515.70	dollars needed	

Court Operations Manager minimum increased from \$49,947.12 to \$53,028.86		
51,962.64	rate needed	24 positions out of the 38 positions were affected. 14 position were not affected as their salaries are over the new proposed minimum.
\$59,767.43	dollars needed	

Court Operations Consultant minimum increased from \$52,444.80 to \$55,680.64		
13,492.96	rate needed	7 positions out of the 16 positions were affected. 9 position were not affected as their salaries are over the new proposed minimum.
\$15,519.60	dollars needed	

Senior Court Operations Consultant minimum increased from \$60,711.24 to \$64,457.12		
9,237.72	rate needed	3 positions out of the 5 positions were affected. 2 position were not affected as their salaries are over the new proposed minimum.
\$10,625.23	dollars needed	

Totals for all Court Operations class series		
77,749.92	rate needed	36 of the 61 positions in the Court Operations class series were affected. 25 positions not affected as their salaries are over the proposed new minimum.
\$89,427.96	dollars needed	

III.P. CERTIFIED COURT INTEPRETERS AND SUPERVISORS

Increases the minimums by 5% for retention. (Option: Do not increase supervisory positions)

Certified Court Interpreters minimum increased from \$41,267.79 to \$43,331.15		
60,236.13	rate needed	51 of 56 positions were affected. 5 positions were not affects as the salaries were over the proposed new minimum.
\$69,283.60	dollars needed	

Assistant Supervising Court Interpreter minimum increased from \$45,303.72 to \$47,568.91		
2,265.19	rate needed	The one position in this class was affected.
\$2,605.42	dollars needed	

Supervising Court Interpreter minimum increased from \$52,444.80 to \$55,067.04		
12,686.64	rate needed	7 of 10 positions were affected. 3 positions were not affects as the incumbents are not certified.
\$14,592.17	dollars needed	

Totals for all Certified Court Interpreter class series		
75,187.96	rate needed	59 of the 67 positions in the Certified Court Interpreter class series were affected. 5 positions were not affects as the salaries were over the proposed new minimum and 3 positions were not affected as the incumbent is not certified.
\$86,481.19	dollars needed	

ITEM III. Status of Review of Circuit Classes

Class Title	Completed
ACCOUNTANT I	X
ACCOUNTANT II	X
ACCOUNTANT III	X
ACCOUNTANT IV	X
ACCOUNTING SERVICES SUPERVISOR	X
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I	✓
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II	✓
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III	✓
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING OFFICER	X
ADMINISTRATIVE MAGISTRATE	✓
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY I (Magistrates only)	✓
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES MANAGER	✓
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIRECTOR	
ASSISTANT SUPERVISING COURT INTERPRETER	✓
BUDGET ANALYST	✓
BUDGET MANAGER	✓
BUDGET SERVICES MANAGER	✓
BUDGET SPECIALIST	✓
CHIEF DEPUTY COURT ADMINISTRATOR	✓
CHIEF OF PERSONNEL SERVICES	✓
CLERICAL ASSISTANT	
COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST	X
COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR	X
COURT ANALYST	✓
COURT COUNSELOR	X
COURT INTERPRETER	
COURT INTERPRETER-CERTIFIED	✓
COURT OPERATIONS CONSULTANT	✓
COURT OPERATIONS MANAGER	✓

Class Title	Completed
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST I	✓
COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST II	✓
COURT REPORTER I	
COURT REPORTER II	
COURT STATISTICIAN	X
DIGITAL COURT REPORTER	
DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	✓
DIRECTOR OF CASE MANAGEMENT	
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS	
DRUG COURT MANAGER	✓
ELECTRONIC TRANSCRIBER	
FAMILY COURT MANAGER	✓
FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING MANAGER	
FISCAL ASSISTANT	X
GENERAL COUNSEL	✓
HEARING OFFICER	X
HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGER	✓
INFORMATION SYSTEMS CONSULTANT II	may be affected by ISS possible series adjustments
JUDICIAL ASSISTANT - CIRCUIT COURT	✓
MAGISTRATE	✓
MANAGER COURT REPORTING SERVICES	
MANAGER ELECTRONIC COURT REPORTING	
MEDIATION SERVICES COORDINATOR	
MEDIATOR-CIRCUIT/FAMILY	
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT ANALYST	✓
PERSONNEL SPECIALIST	✓
PERSONNEL TECHNICIAN	✓
PROGRAM ASSISTANT	
PROGRAM ATTORNEY	✓
PROGRAM COORDINATOR	
PURCHASING MANAGER	X

Class Title	Completed
PURCHASING SPECIALIST	X
PURCHASING TECHNICIAN	X
SCOPIST	
SECRETARY	
SECRETARY SPECIALIST	
SENIOR COURT OPERATIONS CONSULTANT	✓
SENIOR COURT PROGRAM SPECIALIST	✓
SENIOR PSYCHOLOGIST	
SENIOR SECRETARY	
SENIOR TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	✓
SUPERVISING COURT INTERPRETER	✓
TRAINING MANAGER	
TRIAL COURT ADMINISTRATOR	✓
TRIAL COURT LAW CLERK	✓
TRIAL COURT TECHNOLOGY OFFICER	✓

✓ indicates classes which are provided in spreadsheet for running totals.

X indicates either a class that can't be adjusted due to federal grant funding or a class where preliminary data, both pre-session and post-session, did not indicate equity problems.

Blanks indicate classes that have not been thoroughly analyzed.

IV.A. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments: FTE Re- Allocation: Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers and General Magistrates

Agenda Item IV.A.: Child Support Hearing Officers and General Magistrates

Background:

Each fiscal year the TCBC approves FTE allotments for the Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer (CSEHO) and General Magistrate (GM) elements. OSCA staff are directed to monitor vacancies in both categories throughout the fiscal year. According to established procedures (see **Attachment A**), when vacancies become available, staff are to recommend reallocating hearing officers/magistrates and administrative support FTE's based on the following: 1) maximum sustained net need based on workload, 2) the one-to-one ratio of hearing officer/magistrate to administrative support, 3) Department of Revenue (DOR) information where appropriate, and 4) circuit information. A minimum threshold of 0.5 FTE negative (excess) sustained net need must be met before reallocation will be considered. For reallocation of GM positions, the combined net need in both the GM and CSEHO categories should be considered. This information is submitted to the TCBC Executive Committee for consideration in allocations and reallocation of positions throughout the fiscal year.

At the April 7, 2014, meeting, the TCBC approved additional guidelines, as recommended by the FMC, for applying the approved policies for allocating/reallocating administrative support positions (see **Attachment B**).

Current Issue:

Circuit level FY 2014/15 FTE allotments need to be determined in both the CSEHO and GM categories. Each Circuit's Total Need and Proposed FTE Allotment are reflected in **Attachment C** (CSEHO) and **Attachment D** (GM).

Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers

Currently, there is a 0.75 FTE administrative secretary I position in reserve that the TCBC may wish to consider allocating to circuits that have the highest need for the resource (see **Attachment C**). Based on the procedures stated previously, the 10th Circuit has the greatest disparity in the one-to-one ratio between hearing officers and administrative support positions. The 10th Circuit was contacted and indicated it could utilize the 0.75 FTE administrative support position. Staff recommend allocating the 0.75 FTE administrative secretary I position currently in reserve to the 10th circuit.

Decision Needed:

Decision 1 – Approve/Do Not Approve staff recommendation.

Decision 2 – Direct staff to monitor vacancies in this element and reallocate hearing officer and administrative support FTE's according to the maximum sustained need in the charts approved in the FY 2014/15 allotments and current policies.

FMC Recommendation:

Approve staff's recommendation to allocate the 0.75 administrative support FTE, currently held in reserve, to the 10th Circuit. Direct staff to monitor vacancies in this element for possible reallocation, using the approved FY 2014/15 allotments and current policies. This information will be presented to the Executive Committee for decisions on reallocating positions.

General Magistrates

There are no resources in reserve in the general magistrates element that are available for allocation to the circuits.

Decision Needed:

Direct staff to monitor vacancies in this element and reallocate general magistrate and administrative support FTE's according to the maximum sustained need in the charts approved in the FY 2014/15 allotments and current policies.

FMC Recommendation:

Direct staff to monitor vacancies in this element for possible reallocation, using the approved FY 2014/15 allotments and current policies. This information will be presented to the Executive Committee for decisions on reallocating positions.

Jessie Emrich

From: Jessie Emrich
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2013 8:55 AM
To: Trial Court Administrators; Trial Court Chief Judges
Cc: Kristine Slayden; Alex Krivosheyev; Theresa Westerfield; Dorothy Wilson; Lisa Goodner
Subject: FY 2013-14 CSEHO/GM Allotments
Attachments: CSEHO_FY1314_TCBC.pdf; General Magistrates_FY1314_TCBC.pdf

Chief Judges/TCA's – Attached are the Fiscal Year 2013-14 circuit allotments for General Magistrates and Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers as approved at the June 18th TCBC meeting. These allocations were based on a 3 year maximum sustained workload methodology that indicates each circuit's net need for hearing officers and general magistrates. The administrative support net need for both elements is based on maintaining a 1:1 ratio of hearing officer/GM to support staff. These charts will be effective for the entire fiscal year. As a reminder, the procedures for reallocation of positions is listed below:

- 1) Reallocations will occur through attrition only - no filled positions will be reallocated.
- 2) Both elements will be monitored throughout the year for vacancies. Issues relating to vacant positions, as they become available, will be brought to the Executive Committee for final decision as to potential reallocation.
- 3) If you have a position that becomes vacant during the year **and** your circuit has a negative net need or uneven 1:1 ratio, as presented in the attached charts, please contact Kris Slayden, at slaydenk@flcourts.org, in Resource Planning, **and** Theresa Westerfield, at westerfieldt@flcourts.org, in Personnel as soon as possible. This will initiate the process for reallocating resources. The position must be held vacant until the process is complete. Only the portion of the position that is considered excess (as indicated by the negative net need or ratio) needs to be held vacant and will be considered for reallocation. A minimum excess net need of 0.5 FTE must be met for reallocation to occur. The Office of Personnel Services will work with your circuit to align the FTE portion of the position that you may fill.
- 4) Department of Revenue and affected circuits will be contacted for information to supplement the workload analysis.
- 5) OSCA staff will collect all relevant information and schedule a call with the Executive Committee for a decision on reallocation.
- 6) The Executive Committee's decision will then be forwarded to the affected circuits and to the appropriate OSCA staff in Resource Planning, Budget and Personnel for handling.

Please contact either Theresa or Kris if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Jessie

Jessie Emrich McMillan
Resource Planning
Office of the State Courts Administrator
500 S. Duval Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1900

Trial Court Budget Commission
April 7, 2014, Meeting
 GM/CSEHO Administrative Support Allocation Matrix

Reallocating Current Resources (Losing Positions)				
Example	GM/CSEHO to Support Ratio	Administrative Support Net Need based on Workload	Staff Recommendation	FMC Recommendation
	<i>Uneven Ratio</i>	<i>Negative</i>		
1	3.0 FTE : 4.0 FTE	-1.0	Yes	Yes
2	9.5 FTE : 8.5 FTE	-0.5	No	No
	<i>Even Ratio</i>	<i>Negative</i>		
3	1.5 FTE : 1.5 FTE	-0.5		Yes
	<i>Uneven Ratio</i>	<i>Positive</i>		
4	3.5 FTE : 4.0 FTE	1.5	No	No
5	2.5 FTE : 2.0 FTE	2.0	No	No
	<i>Even Ratio</i>	<i>Positive</i>		
6	2.0 FTE : 2.0 FTE	2.0	No	No

Allocating Additional Resources (Gaining Positions)				
Example	GM/CSEHO to Support Ratio	Administrative Support Net Need based on Workload	Staff Recommendation	FMC Recommendation
	<i>Uneven Ratio</i>	<i>Negative</i>		
7	3.0 FTE : 4.0 FTE	-1.0	No	No
8	9.5 FTE : 8.5 FTE	-0.5	No	No
	<i>Even Ratio</i>	<i>Negative</i>		
9	1.5 FTE : 1.5 FTE	-0.5	No	No
	<i>Uneven Ratio</i>	<i>Positive</i>		
10	3.5 FTE : 4.0 FTE	1.5	No	No
11	2.0 FTE : 0.5 FTE	2.0	Yes	Yes
	<i>Even Ratio</i>	<i>Positive</i>		
12	2.0 FTE : 2.0 FTE	2.0	No	No

Note: When allocating additional resources to a circuit in need based on workload, any disparity in the 1:1 ratio will be addressed before the need for resources.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014**

**Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers
Background Statistics**

A	B	C	D	E	F
	FY 2013/14 Allotment ¹		Total Need		
Circuit	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer FTE Allotment	Administrative Support FTE Allotment	Maximum Total Need ²	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer Maximum Total Need (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Administrative Support Maximum Total Need ³ (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)
1	2.25	2.25	2.8	3	3
2	1.5	1	0.9	1	1
3	1	0.5	0.9	1	1
4	3	2.5	3.9	4	4
5	2.5	2	3.8	4	4
6	3	3	2.5	3	3
7	1.5	0.5	2.4	2	2
8	2.5	2	1.9	2	2
9	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	4
10	2	1	2.9	3	3
11	3.5	3	4.8	5	5
12	2.5	2.5	3.2	3	3
13	2	2	3.5	4	4
14	1.5	1	1.6	2	2
15	2	2	1.7	2	2
16	0	0	0.1	0	0
17	2	2	2.6	3	3
18	2	2	2.3	2	2
19	2	1	1.4	1	1
20	1.25	1	2.0	2	2
Reserve	0	0.75			
Total	41.5	35.5	48.7	51	51

¹ FY 2013/14 FTE allotment is based on April 2014 circuit payroll projections.

² Maximum total need reflects the maximum Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer (CSEHO) FTE projected total need over a three-year period. The total need was calculated in two steps. The first step estimates the CSEHO workload by multiplying the case weight of 83.4 minutes to 92.8% of projected child support and UIFSA filings and 5.6% of projected other domestic relations filings. In the second step, the CSEHO total need was calculated by dividing the estimated CSEHO workload by the total time available for case-related work.

³ Administrative Support maximum total need assumes a 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to CSEHO.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014**

**Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers
FY 2014/15 Proposed FTE Allotment**

A	B	C	D	E
	Net Need ¹		FMC RECOMMENDATION FY 2014/15 Proposed FTE Allotment Using Current Methodology ²	
Circuit	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer Net Need	Administrative Support Net Need	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer FTE	Administrative Support FTE
1	0.75	0.75	2.25	2.25
2	-0.5	0	1.5	1
3	0	0.5	1	0.5
4	1	1.5	3	2.5
5	1.5	2	2.5	2
6	0	0	3	3
7	0.5	1.5	1.5	0.5
8	-0.5	0	2.5	2
9	0.5	0.5	3.5	3.5
10	1	2	2	1.75
11	1.5	2	3.5	3
12	0.5	0.5	2.5	2.5
13	2	2	2	2
14	0.5	1	1.5	1
15	0	0	2	2
16	0	0	0	0
17	1	1	2	2
18	0	0	2	2
19	-1	0	2	1
20	0.75	1	1.25	1
Reserve	0	0	0	0
Total	9.5	16.25	41.5	35.5

¹ Net need is the difference between maximum total need and FY 2013/14 FTE allotment.

² FY 2014/15 proposed FTE allotment using current methodology is based on FY 2013/14 FTE allotment.

Circuit 13 has the highest positive CSEHO net FTE need. Circuits 5, 10, 11, 1, and 13 have the highest positive Administrative Support net FTE need. Circuits 2, 8, and 19 have the highest negative CSEHO net FTE need.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
General Magistrates
Background Statistics

A	B	C	D	E	F
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Allotment ¹		Maximum Total Need ²	Total Need	
	General Magistrate FTE Allotment	Administrative Support FTE Allotment		General Magistrate Maximum Total Need (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Administrative Support Maximum Total Need ³ (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)
1	3.5	3	4.7	5	5
2	2	2	2.3	2	2
3	1	0	1.2	1	1
4	7	6	6.8	7	7
5	5	5	6.4	6	6
6	7.25	7	6.6	7	7
7 ⁴	3.5	4	4.8	5	5
8	2	1	2.3	2	2
9	6	4	7.2	7	7
10	4	3	4.9	5	5
11	11	11	12.2	12	12
12	4	3	4.0	4	4
13	7	7	7.8	8	8
14	2	1	2.2	2	2
15	7	6	5.8	6	6
16	0	0	0.6	1	1
17	9	8.5	8.0	8	8
18	4	3	4.6	5	5
19	3	3	3.2	3	3
20	5	5	5.1	5	5
Total	93.25	82.5	100.7	101	101

¹ FY 2013/14 FTE allotment is based on April 2014 circuit payroll projections.

² Maximum total need reflects the maximum General Magistrate FTE total need over a three-year period. The total need is based on projected filings for simplified dissolution, dissolution, child support, UIFSA, other domestic relations, domestic violence, repeat violence, delinquency, dependency, professional malpractice, products liability, auto negligence, other negligence, condominium, contract and indebtedness, real property/mortgage foreclosure, eminent domain, other circuit civil, probate, guardianship, trust, Baker Act, substance abuse, other social, small claims, and county civil (\$5,001 to \$15,000). The total need for each of the three years was calculated in two steps. The first step estimated General Magistrate workload by multiplying the projected filings by the appropriate case weight. In the second step, General Magistrate total need was calculated by dividing the estimated General Magistrate workload by the total time available for case-related work.

³ Administrative Support maximum total need assumes a 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to General Magistrate.

⁴ Circuit 7 FY 2013/14 allotment has 0.5 FTE more Administrative Support FTE than General Magistrate FTE but is not considered in excess of the 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to General Magistrates due to their total need.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014**

**General Magistrates
FY 2014/15 Proposed FTE Allotment**

A	B	C	D	E
	Net Need ¹		FMC RECOMMENDATION FY 2014/15 Proposed FTE Allotment Using Current Methodology ²	
Circuit	General Magistrate Net Need	Administrative Support Net Need	General Magistrate FTE	Administrative Support FTE
1	1.5	2	3.5	3
2	0	0	2	2
3	0	1	1	0
4	0	1	7	6
5	1	1	5	5
6	-0.25	0	7.25	7
7	1.5	1	3.5	4
8	0	1	2	1
9	1	3	6	4
10	1	2	4	3
11	1	1	11	11
12	0	1	4	3
13	1	1	7	7
14	0	1	2	1
15	-1	0	7	6
16 ³	0	0	0	0
17	-1	-0.5	9	8.5
18	1	2	4	3
19	0	0	3	3
20	0	0	5	5
Total	6.75	17.5	93.25	82.5

¹ Net Need is the difference between maximum total need and FY 2013/14 FTE allotment.

² FY 2014/15 proposed FTE allotment using current methodology is based on FY 2013/14 FTE allotment.

³ Circuit 16 uses contracted services for general magistrates.

IV.B. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments: Maintain Existing Allotments: Court Administration, Case Management, Law Clerks, and Operating Budgets

**Agenda Item IV.B.: FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments –
Maintain Existing Allotments**

FTE Allotments

Each year, the FMC and TCBC review elements to determine allocations. Unless new FTE resources are appropriated or budget reductions are required, positions are typically not adjusted. For FY 2014/15, the Legislature did not appropriate any new FTE's to the trial courts. The TCBC may wish to recommend maintaining FY 2013/14 FTE allotments for the elements listed below. Proposed allocations are reflected in the following attachments.

- Case Management including Drug Court Case Managers
- Trial Court Administration
- Trial Court Law Clerks including Post-Conviction Law Clerks

Operating Budgets

The proposed FY 2014/15 operating budget allotments are based on the FY 2013/14 beginning allotments and adjusted for: permanent budget amendments, actions approved by the TCBC, non-recurring items, and approved personnel actions. The FY 2014/15 proposed operating category allotments for each element are detailed in the following attachments.

Decision Needed

Option 1: Approve proposed FY 2014/15 FTE and operating category allotments based on maintaining FY 2013/14 beginning allotments and adjusted for: permanent budget amendments, actions approved by the TCBC, non-recurring items, and approved personnel actions.

Option 2: Do not approve and consider an alternative.

FMC Recommendation

Approve *Option 1*.

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations

FY 2014-2015

Child Support Enforcement - Federal Grants Trust Fund

Cost Center - 024

		FY 2013-14			Proposed FY 2014-15				
Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Total All Categories
0	0.75	125,748		125,748	0	0.75	25,748		25,748
1	4.50		6,276	6,276	1	4.50		6,276	6,276
2	3.00		4,184	4,184	2	2.50		4,184	4,184
3	1.50		2,426	2,426	3	1.50		2,426	2,426
4	5.00		8,784	8,784	4	5.50		8,784	8,784
5	4.00		2,789	2,789	5	4.50		2,789	2,789
6	6.00		9,563	9,563	6	6.00		9,563	9,563
7	2.00		2,956	2,956	7	2.00		2,956	2,956
8	5.25		11,384	11,384	8	4.50		11,384	11,384
9	7.00		7,593	7,593	9	7.00		7,593	7,593
10	2.75		4,417	4,417	10	3.00		4,417	4,417
11	5.50		8,337	8,337	11	6.50		8,337	8,337
12	5.00		7,472	7,472	12	5.00		7,472	7,472
13	4.00		5,578	5,578	13	4.00		5,578	5,578
14	2.50		3,985	3,985	14	2.50		3,985	3,985
15	4.00		5,578	5,578	15	4.00		5,578	5,578
16	-			0	16	-			0
17	4.00		5,911	5,911	17	4.00		5,911	5,911
18	4.00		6,276	6,276	18	4.00		6,276	6,276
19	2.50		3,819	3,819	19	3.00		3,819	3,819
20	2.25		3,288	3,288	20	2.25		3,288	3,288
Total	75.50	125,748	110,616	236,364	Total	77.00	25,748	110,616	136,364

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

**Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015**

**Circuit Judges and Judicial Assistants - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 110/111**

FY 2013-14							Proposed FY 2014-15						
Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0						0	0						0
1	48.00		56,279	9,169	5,342	70,790	1	48.00		56,279	9,169	5,342	70,790
2	32.00		54,572	10,766	4,349	69,687	2	32.00		54,572	10,325	4,790	69,687
3	14.00		10,970			10,970	3	14.00		10,970			10,970
4	70.00		105,074	20,280	803	126,157	4	70.00		105,074	20,280	803	126,157
5	62.00		139,537	16,696	2,523	158,756	5	62.00		139,537	0	2,523	142,060
6	90.00		174,069	16,718	9,851	200,638	6	90.00	10,000	143,469	16,718	9,851	180,038
7	54.00		130,385		1,713	132,098	7	54.00		130,385		1,713	132,098
8	26.00		14,912		1,601	16,513	8	26.00		14,912		1,601	16,513
9	86.00		49,794			49,794	9	86.00		49,794			49,794
10	56.00		117,007		6,796	123,803	10	56.00		117,007		6,796	123,803
11	160.00		247,376			247,376	11	160.00		247,376			247,376
12	42.00		94,503			94,503	12	42.00		94,503			94,503
13	90.00		163,672	19,008		182,680	13	90.00		163,672	19,008		182,680
14	22.00		28,472			28,472	14	22.00		28,472			28,472
15	70.00		230,830			230,830	15	70.00		197,830			197,830
16	8.00		9,785			9,785	16	8.00		9,785			9,785
17	116.00		235,897	63,950	8,309	308,156	17	116.00		235,897	63,950	8,309	308,156
18	52.00		61,822	21,973		83,795	18	52.00		58,397	21,973	3,425	83,795
19	38.00		90,841	4,861	6,152	101,854	19	38.00		90,841	4,861	6,152	101,854
20	62.00		65,565	60,638	8,252	134,455	20	62.00		65,565	60,638	8,252	134,455
Total	1,198.00	0	2,081,362	244,059	55,691	2,381,112	Total	1,198.00	10,000	2,014,337	226,922	59,557	2,310,816

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations

FY 2014-2015

County Judges and Judicial Assistants - General Revenue Fund

Cost Center - 110/111

FY 2013-14						Proposed FY 2014-15					
Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0					0	0					0
1	22.00	142,484		63	142,547	1	22.00	142,484		63	142,547
2	20.00	106,883			106,883	2	20.00	106,883			106,883
3	14.00	60,298	480	13,100	73,878	3	14.00	73,398	480		73,878
4	40.00	122,972		6,753	129,725	4	40.00	122,972		6,753	129,725
5	22.00	96,811	5,760	5,673	108,244	5	22.00	96,811	5,760	5,673	108,244
6	48.00	183,694		2,425	186,119	6	48.00	183,694		2,425	186,119
7	30.00	125,567			125,567	7	30.00	125,567			125,567
8	20.00	64,361	21,120	2,036	87,517	8	20.00	64,361	21,120	2,036	87,517
9	44.00	156,472			156,472	9	44.00	156,472			156,472
10	24.00	102,558		5,997	108,555	10	24.00	102,558		5,997	108,555
11	86.00	397,421	156,480	1,025	554,926	11	86.00	397,421	156,480	1,025	554,926
12	20.00	44,264	14,400		58,664	12	20.00	44,264	14,400		58,664
13	34.00	64,258	5,760		70,018	13	34.00	64,258	5,760		70,018
14	18.00	84,112			84,112	14	18.00	84,112			84,112
15	38.00	194,993		2,223	197,216	15	38.00	194,993		2,223	197,216
16	8.00	41,803		2,352	44,155	16	8.00	41,803		2,352	44,155
17	64.00	179,389			179,389	17	64.00	179,389			179,389
18	34.00	184,680		8,034	192,714	18	34.00	184,680		8,034	192,714
19	20.00	72,597			72,597	19	20.00	72,597			72,597
20	38.00	166,784			166,784	20	38.00	166,784			166,784
Total	644.00	2,592,401	204,000	49,681	2,846,082	Total	644.00	2,605,501	204,000	36,581	2,846,082

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015

Case Management - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 122

FY 2013-14							Proposed FY 2014-15						
Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0						0	0						0
1	10.00		12,480			12,480	1	10.00		12,480			12,480
2	4.00		6,089			6,089	2	4.00		6,089			6,089
3	4.00		12,662		2,350	15,012	3	4.00		15,012			15,012
4	19.00		30,916	924	1,606	33,446	4	19.00		30,916	924	1,606	33,446
5	9.00		20,830			20,830	5	9.00	21,313	1,830			23,143
6	21.50		24,987			24,987	6	21.50	14,600	24,987			39,587
7	13.50		30,450			30,450	7	14.50		30,450			30,450
8	5.00		9,600	1,920		11,520	8	5.00		9,600	1,920		11,520
9	16.00		38,031			38,031	9	16.00		38,031			38,031
10	10.50		16,093			16,093	10	10.50		16,093			16,093
11	46.00		4,139	20,846		24,985	11	46.00		4,139	20,846		24,985
12	8.00		11,589			11,589	12	9.00		11,589			11,589
13	19.00		19,237	86,400		105,637	13	20.00		19,237	86,400		105,637
14	6.00		13,265			13,265	14	6.00		13,265			13,265
15	17.00		34,853			34,853	15	17.00		34,853			34,853
16	5.00		5,655			5,655	16	5.00		5,655			5,655
17	30.00		35,952	27,648	13,049	76,649	17	30.00		35,952	27,648	13,049	76,649
18	10.50		19,212			19,212	18	10.50		19,212			19,212
19	5.00		8,317			8,317	19	5.00		8,317			8,317
20	16.00		11,917		11,037	22,954	20	16.00		11,917		11,037	22,954
Total	275.00	0	366,274	137,738	28,042	532,054	Total	278.00	35,913	349,624	137,738	25,692	548,967

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015

Magistrates - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 123

FY 2013-14						Proposed FY 2014-15					
Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0					0	0					0
1	6.00	6,828			6,828	1	6.50	6,828			6,828
2	4.00	6,365		941	7,306	2	4.00	6,365		941	7,306
3	1.00	6,514		498	7,012	3	1.00	7,012			7,012
4	13.00	17,818			17,818	4	13.00	17,818			17,818
5	10.00	25,920			25,920	5	10.00	25,920			25,920
6	14.25	15,496	38,400		53,896	6	14.25	15,496	38,400		53,896
7	7.50	21,334			21,334	7	7.50	21,334			21,334
8	3.00		19,200		19,200	8	3.00		19,200		19,200
9	10.00	39,591			39,591	9	10.00	39,591			39,591
10	7.00	11,799		1,372	13,171	10	7.00	11,799		1,372	13,171
11	22.00	7,989	10,286		18,275	11	22.00	7,989	10,286		18,275
12	7.00	6,835			6,835	12	7.00	6,835			6,835
13	14.00	35,962			35,962	13	14.00	8,962	27,000		35,962
14	3.00	6,298			6,298	14	3.00	6,298			6,298
15	13.00	38,219			38,219	15	13.00	38,219			38,219
16	-		58,944		58,944	16	-		58,944		58,944
17	18.00	57,279	6,912	6,254	70,445	17	17.50	57,279	6,912	6,254	70,445
18	7.00	8,298			8,298	18	7.00	8,298			8,298
19	6.00	12,467		2,520	14,987	19	6.00	12,467		2,520	14,987
20	10.00	9,460	16,320	7,340	33,120	20	10.00	9,460	16,320	7,340	33,120
Total	175.75	334,472	150,062	18,925	503,459	Total	175.75	307,970	177,062	18,427	503,459

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations

FY 2014-2015

Expert Witness - General Revenue Fund

Cost Center - 127

		FY 2013-14		Proposed FY 2014-15	
Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000
0			0		
1			1		
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6	1.00	1,095	6	1.00	1,095
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		
11			11		
12			12		
13			13		
14			14		
15			15		
16			16		
17			17		
18			18		
19			19		
20			20		
Total	1.00	1,095	Total	1.00	1,095

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations

FY 2014-2015

Court Reporting - General Revenue Fund

Cost Center - 129

FY 2013-14							Proposed FY 2014-15						
Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0						0	0						0
1	18.00		72,102			72,102	1	18.00		72,102			72,102
2	10.00		36,309			36,309	2	10.00		36,309			36,309
3	5.00		16,016		1,664	17,680	3	5.00		17,680			17,680
4	1.00		1,286			1,286	4	1.00		1,286			1,286
5	16.00		19,200			19,200	5	16.00		19,200			19,200
6	36.00		71,701			71,701	6	36.00	4,000	67,701			71,701
7	13.00		47,357			47,357	7	13.00		47,357			47,357
8	14.00		46,558			46,558	8	14.00		46,558			46,558
9	36.00		118,276			118,276	9	36.00		118,276			118,276
10	12.00		13,281			13,281	10	12.00		13,281			13,281
11	4.00		0			0	11	4.00		0			0
12	15.00		60,979			60,979	12	15.00		60,979			60,979
13	3.00		46,522			46,522	13	3.00		46,522			46,522
14	5.00		19,065			19,065	14	5.00		19,065			19,065
15	20.75		44,412			44,412	15	21.75		44,412			44,412
16	5.00		10,216			10,216	16	5.00		10,216			10,216
17	29.00		59,000	6,048	3,400	68,448	17	29.00		59,000	6,048	3,400	68,448
18	12.00		37,426			37,426	18	12.00		37,426			37,426
19	13.00		48,250		2,940	51,190	19	13.00		48,250		2,940	51,190
20	15.00		14,976		2,112	17,088	20	15.00		14,976		2,112	17,088
Total	282.75	0	782,932	6,048	10,116	799,096	Total	283.75	4,000	780,596	6,048	8,452	799,096

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015

Court Interpreting - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 131

Circuit	FY 2013-14					Proposed FY 2014-15					
	FTE	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0					0	0					0
1					0	1					0
2					0	2					0
3					0	3					0
4					0	4					0
5	3.00				0	5	3.00				0
6					0	6					0
7	3.00	4,454			4,454	7	3.00	4,454			4,454
8	1.00				0	8	1.00				0
9	10.00	37,679			37,679	9	10.00	37,679			37,679
10	6.00	8,928			8,928	10	6.00	8,928			8,928
11	41.00	28,800			28,800	11	41.00	28,800			28,800
12					0	12					0
13	10.00	6,372			6,372	13	10.00	6,372			6,372
14					0	14					0
15	13.00	23,144			23,144	15	13.00	23,144			23,144
16	2.00				0	16	2.00				0
17	15.50	37,117	4,320		41,437	17	15.50	37,117	4,320		41,437
18	1.00	411			411	18	1.00	411			411
19	2.00	6,488			6,488	19	2.00	6,488			6,488
20	7.00	297		951	1,248	20	7.00	297		951	1,248
Total	114.50	153,690	4,320	951	158,961	Total	114.50	153,690	4,320	951	158,961

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

**Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015**

**Trial Court Administration - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 210**

FY 2013-14								Proposed FY 2014-15							
Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	OCO 060000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	OCO 060000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0							0	0							0
1	12.00		34,267	6,762	14,016	1,944	56,989	1	12.00		34,267	6,762	14,016	1,944	56,989
2	9.00		22,076	4,428	11,589		38,093	2	9.50		22,076	4,428	11,589		38,093
3	8.00		14,675	1,000	4,679	4,731	25,085	3	8.00		17,325	1,000	4,679	2,081	25,085
4	19.00		62,082	30,739	49,795	3,282	145,898	4	19.00		62,082	30,739	49,795	3,282	145,898
5	14.00		44,220	6,916	5,835		56,971	5	14.00		41,907	6,916	427		49,250
6	23.75		70,829	12,296	45,693		128,818	6	23.75	18,000	61,829	12,296	36,693		128,818
7	12.00		40,699	10,126	22,604		73,429	7	11.00		40,699	10,126	22,604		73,429
8	8.00		31,687	9,221	5,732		46,640	8	8.00		31,687	9,221	5,732		46,640
9	20.00	162,182	105,178	14,450	44,133		325,943	9	20.00	162,182	105,178	14,450	44,133		325,943
10	13.00		42,469	10,759	11,863		65,091	10	13.00		42,469	10,759	11,863		65,091
11	38.00		49,159	68,000	120,808		237,967	11	38.00		49,159	68,000	120,808		237,967
12	12.00		52,572	10,759	0	190	63,521	12	12.00		52,572	10,759	0	190	63,521
13	22.00		76,685	22,284	24,000		122,969	13	21.00		76,685	22,284	24,000		122,969
14	6.00		17,530	7,349	4,320		29,199	14	6.00		17,530	7,349	4,320		29,199
15	26.00		54,781	9,221	37,812		101,814	15	26.00	33,000	54,781	9,221	37,812		134,814
16	5.00		16,048	3,074	2,400		21,522	16	5.00		16,048	3,074	2,400		21,522
17	22.00		51,204	34,907	53,581	10,236	149,928	17	22.00		51,204	34,907	53,581	10,236	149,928
18	12.25		34,574	15,370	17,837		67,781	18	12.25		34,574	15,370	17,837		67,781
19	8.00		18,726	3,074	28,906	3,001	53,707	19	8.00		18,726	3,074	28,906	3,001	53,707
20	11.00		20,643	6,148	63,639	14,721	105,151	20	12.00		20,643	6,148	63,639	14,721	105,151
Total	301.00	162,182	860,104	286,883	569,242	38,105	1,916,516	Total	300.50	213,182	851,441	286,883	554,834	35,455	1,941,795

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations

FY 2014-2015

Drug Court Case Management - General Revenue Fund

Cost Center - 217

		FY 2013-14			Proposed FY 2014-15		
Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000
0				0	0		
1	1.00	4,936		4,936	1	1.00	4,936
2		2,455		2,455	2		2,455
3	1.00	2,916	102	3,018	3	1.00	3,018
4	1.00	8,429		8,429	4	1.00	8,429
5	1.00	5,397		5,397	5	1.00	5,397
6		3,763		3,763	6		3,763
7	2.00	8,909		8,909	7	2.00	8,909
8		3,920		3,920	8		3,920
9	2.00	8,909		8,909	9	2.00	8,909
10		2,414		2,414	10		2,414
11	2.00	1,229		1,229	11	2.00	1,229
12	2.00	3,447		3,447	12	2.00	3,447
13	1.00	5,875		5,875	13	1.00	5,875
14	1.00	1,958		1,958	14	1.00	1,958
15	1.00	3,637		3,637	15	1.00	3,637
16	2.00	2,612		2,612	16	2.00	2,612
17	1.00	3,840		3,840	17	1.00	3,840
18	2.00	8,075		8,075	18	2.00	8,075
19	2.00	7,876		7,876	19	2.00	7,876
20		3,014		3,014	20		3,014
Total	22.00	93,611	102	93,713	Total	22.00	93,713

Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015

Post Conviction Trial Court Law Clerks - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 257

FY 2013-14			Proposed FY 2014-15		
Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000
0			0		
1	2.00	6,613	1	2.00	6,613
2	3.00		2	3.00	
3	1.00	1,117	3	1.00	1,117
4	2.00		4	2.00	
5	2.00	1,457	5	2.00	1,457
6	2.00	457	6	2.00	457
7	1.50	1,457	7	1.50	1,457
8	2.00	1,077	8	2.00	1,077
9	1.00	1,457	9	1.00	1,457
10	2.00		10	2.00	
11	3.00		11	3.00	
12	2.00	1,093	12	2.00	1,093
13	2.00	1,457	13	2.00	1,457
14	2.00		14	2.00	
15	2.00	1,457	15	2.00	1,457
16			16		
17	2.00	1,728	17	2.00	1,728
18	1.00	661	18	1.00	661
19	1.00	729	19	1.00	729
20	1.00		20	1.00	
Total	34.50	20,760	Total	34.50	20,760

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

**Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015**

**Trial Court Law Clerks - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 258**

FY 2013-14							Proposed FY 2014-15						
Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0						0	0						0
1	7.00		5,949			5,949	1	7.00		5,949			5,949
2	5.00		7,858			7,858	2	5.00		7,858			7,858
3	2.00		5,308		987	6,295	3	2.00		6,295			6,295
4	11.50		7,639	11,151		18,790	4	11.50		7,639	11,151		18,790
5	8.00		15,688	23,000		38,688	5	8.00	45,960	13,152	1,680		60,792
6	13.00		20,348	17,280		37,628	6	13.00	21,000	10,348	12,280		43,628
7	7.00		18,922			18,922	7	7.00		18,922			18,922
8	4.00		14,120			14,120	8	4.00		14,120			14,120
9	13.00		9,833			9,833	9	13.00		9,833			9,833
10	8.00		16,920		3,230	20,150	10	8.00		16,920		3,230	20,150
11	22.00		6,783	13,071		19,854	11	22.00		6,783	13,071		19,854
12	5.00		12,691			12,691	12	5.00		12,691			12,691
13	14.00		39,367	1,920		41,287	13	14.00		39,367	1,920		41,287
14	4.00		7,008			7,008	14	4.00		7,008			7,008
15	9.50		14,858			14,858	15	9.50		14,858			14,858
16	1.00		679			679	16	1.00		679			679
17	15.00		30,448	6,912	3,467	40,827	17	15.00		30,448	6,912	3,467	40,827
18	8.00		7,669			7,669	18	8.00		7,669			7,669
19	4.00		13,942			13,942	19	4.00		13,942			13,942
20	9.00		17,168		3,952	21,120	20	9.00		17,168		3,952	21,120
Total	170.00	0	273,198	73,334	11,636	358,168	Total	170.00	66,960	261,649	47,014	10,649	386,272

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015

Cost Recovery - Administrative Trust Fund
 Cost Center - 267

		FY 2013-14		Proposed FY 2014-15	
Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000	Circuit	FTE	Expense 040000
0			0		
1			1		
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9	1.00	3,928	9	1.00	3,928
10			10		
11			11		
12			12		
13			13		
14			14		
15			15		
16			16		
17			17		
18			18		
19			19		
20			20		
Total	1.00	3,928	Total	1.00	3,928

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015

Mediation Arbitration Services - General Revenue Fund
 Cost Center - 430

Circuit	FY 2013-14					Proposed FY 2014-15					
	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories	Circuit	FTE	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	Lease Purchase 105281	Total All Categories
0					0	0					0
1	3.00		3,521		3,521	1	3.00		3,521		3,521
2	3.50		8,475		8,475	2	3.50		8,475		8,475
3	3.00		2,433		2,433	3	3.00		2,433		2,433
4	9.00		12,033	1,205	13,238	4	9.00		12,033	1,205	13,238
5	4.00		16,800		16,800	5	5.00		16,800		16,800
6	7.50		19,800		19,800	6	7.50	6,400	13,400		19,800
7	3.00		6,721		6,721	7	3.00		6,721		6,721
8	4.00		7,693		7,693	8	4.00		7,693		7,693
9	9.50		39,080		39,080	9	9.50		39,080		39,080
10	6.00		12,484		12,484	10	6.00		12,484		12,484
11	11.00		5,700		5,700	11	11.00		5,700		5,700
12	6.00		24,318		24,318	12	5.00		24,318		24,318
13	11.00		29,321		29,321	13	11.00		29,321		29,321
14	4.00		10,038		10,038	14	4.00		10,038		10,038
15	10.50		14,901	2,163	17,064	15	9.50		14,901	2,163	17,064
16	3.00		7,560		7,560	16	3.00		7,560		7,560
17	12.00		31,533	3,467	35,000	17	12.00		31,533	3,467	35,000
18	6.50		22,336		22,336	18	6.50		22,336		22,336
19	5.00		17,916		17,916	19	5.00		17,916		17,916
20	6.00		12,689	3,431	16,120	20	6.00		12,689	3,431	16,120
Total	127.50	0	305,352	10,266	315,618	Total	126.50	6,400	298,952	10,266	315,618

Item IV.B.: Operating Budget Allotments

Trial Court Budget Allocations
 FY 2014-2015

Due Process Cost Sharing - General Revenue Fund

FY 2013-14				Proposed FY 2014-15			
Court Reporting Cost Center 729		Court Interpreting Cost Center 730		Court Reporting Cost Center 729		Court Interpreting Cost Center 730	
Circuit	FY 2012-13 FTE	Circuit	FY 2012-13 FTE	Circuit	FY 2013-14 FTE	Circuit	FY 2013-14 FTE
0		0		0		0	
1	4.0	1		1	4.0	1	
2	5.0	2		2	5.0	2	
3	1.0	3		3	1.0	3	
4		4		4		4	
5		5		5		5	
6	2.0	6		6	2.0	6	
7	1.0	7		7	1.0	7	
8	2.0	8		8	2.0	8	
9	8.0	9		9	8.0	9	
10	2.0	10		10	2.0	10	
11		11	11.0	11		11	11.0
12	3.0	12		12	3.0	12	
13	11.0	13		13	11.0	13	
14	2.0	14		14	2.0	14	
15	2.0	15		15	2.0	15	
16	1.0	16		16		16	
17	2.0	17		17	2.0	17	
18		18		18		18	
19		19		19		19	
20		20		20		20	
Total	46.0	Total	11.0	Total	45.0	Total	11.0

**IV.C. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments: Revise
Non-Due Process Allotments: Senior Judge
Days, Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers,
Additional Compensation to County Judges, and
Mediation**

**Agenda Item IV.C.: FY 2014/15 Circuit Allotments –
Revise Non-Due Process Allotments**

Each year, the FMC and the TCBC review contractual allotments for possible reallocation due to changes in expenditure trends and variability caused by other factors. Enhancements have been incorporated as appropriate. These enhancements include the use of a three year average of expenditures, contacting circuits with proposed allotments for review and comment, and maintaining a 10% target for reserve. Each circuit was provided the proposed FY 2014/15 allotments for Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officer, Additional Compensation to County Judges, and Mediation for review and opportunity to provide input.

Circuit level FY 2014/15 contractual authority allotments need to be determined. A vote is required by the Commission for all issues listed below:

1. Senior Judge Days

The proposed FY 2014/15 allocation is based on a rate of \$355.08 per day, holding 50 days in reserve, and using a proportional distribution based on circuit judicial need as calculated during the most recent certification process and actual county judges (**See Attachment A**).

Option 1: Approve proposed FY 2014/15 circuit allotments.

Option 2: Do not approve and consider an alternative.

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 1*.

2. Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers (CTIHO)

Option 1: Approve proposed circuit allotments based on maintaining FY 2013/14 circuit allotments. (**See Column H in Attachment B.**)

Option 2: Approve proposed circuit allotments based on applying the percent of total average contractual expenditures to the total allotment (\$2,123,854) using the three year average expenditures for each circuit. (**See Column I in Attachment B.**)

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 2*. Consider revising the methodology used for determining CTIHO allotments for FY 2015/16.

3. Additional Compensation to County Court Judges

Option 1: Approve revised proposed FY 2014/15 circuit allotments using the current methodology which distributes the \$75,000 appropriation (less \$100 in reserve) based on each circuit's percent of the

total statewide expenditures using three years of historical expenditure data (**See Attachment C – Revised**). *Note: Since the June 13, 2014, FMC meeting, the proposed allocations have been updated to reflect revised FY 2013/14 Estimated Expenditures for the 3rd Circuit.*

Option 2: Do not approve and consider an alternative.

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 1*.

4. Mediation

The methodology for this element utilizes a funding ceiling applied to each circuit. (**See Attachment D.**) The ceiling is calculated using a standard cost per mediation session held (\$20 for small claims sessions, \$37.50 for other civil sessions, and \$300 for family and dependency sessions) with modifiers applied for coordination, multiple facilities, and the use of volunteers. The proposed contractual allocation is based on three-year average expenditures as long as the circuit's total budget does not exceed the funding ceiling. The three-year maximum number of actual sessions held was used in calculating the funding ceiling. A funding floor based on the total cost of salaries, benefits, and expenses for an Alternative Dispute Resolution Director, a Mediation Services Coordinator, and an Administrative Assistant I position is also utilized in developing the proposed allotments.

Option 1: Approve contractual allocation based on the above funding methodology. Place remaining funds in the statewide reserve. This option does not hold circuits exceeding their funding ceiling harmless and reduces their proposed contractual allotment. FTE's were held harmless for all circuits. (**See Column I in Attachment D.**)

Option 2: Approve contractual allocation based on the above funding methodology; however, hold those circuits above their funding ceiling partially harmless by

- 1) Reducing the 6th Circuit's contractual authority by one half the amount in which it exceeds its funding ceiling.

A 5% cushion was applied to each circuit as long as it did not cause the circuit to exceed its funding ceiling. Place remaining funds in the statewide reserve. (**See Column K in Attachment D.**)

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 2*.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014**

**Senior Judge Days
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment**

A	B	C	D	E	F
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Number of Days Allocated	FY 2014/15 Percent of Total Judicial Need ¹	FMC RECOMMENDATION FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment ²	Net Difference (Option 1 and FY 2013/14 Number of Days Allocated)	Estimated FY 2013/14 Days Used ³
1	243	4.0%	237	-6	190
2	162	2.7%	164	2	74
3	89	1.5%	91	2	22
4	362	6.0%	359	-3	384
5	542	4.9%	504	-38	300
6	441	7.4%	442	1	422
7	285	4.7%	280	-5	202
8	146	2.4%	142	-4	125
9	430	7.2%	429	-1	365
10	258	4.3%	255	-3	253
11	778	13.4%	802	24	602
12	195	3.2%	194	-1	122
13	397	6.8%	407	10	388
14	134	2.2%	132	-2	35
15	346	5.7%	338	-8	244
16	46	0.8%	51	5	35
17	550	9.7%	583	33	325
18	276	4.6%	274	-2	241
19	190	3.0%	182	-8	133
20	329	5.6%	333	4	233
Reserve	50		50	0	50
Total	6,249	100.0%	6,249	0	4,745

¹ FY 2014/15 percent of total judicial need is based on judicial need weighted caseload for circuit court plus the actual number of county court judges. Total may not be exact due to rounding.

² FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment set circuit 5 at 504 and redistributed the remaining days based on an adjusted FY 2014/15 percent of total judicial need.

³ Estimated FY 2013/14 days used were annualized using regular senior judge days used from July 2012 to April 2014. Also included are volunteer senior judge days used for circuits 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, and 18.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Options

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
							FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment		
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment ¹	FY 2011/12 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2012/13 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ²	3 Year Average Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	Percent of Total Average Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	Option 1 Maintain FY 2013/14 Allotment ³	FMC RECOMMENDATION Option 2 Based on Percent of Average Expenditures ³	Percent Difference (FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment and Option 2)
1	\$11,683	\$8,645	\$10,190	\$9,165	\$9,333	0.5%	\$11,683	\$10,575	-9.5%
2	\$30,244	\$27,563	\$23,831	\$21,255	\$24,216	1.3%	\$30,244	\$27,439	-9.3%
3	\$4,974	\$2,287	\$5,974	\$5,425	\$4,562	0.2%	\$4,974	\$5,169	3.9%
4	\$55,913	\$44,400	\$48,200	\$50,960	\$47,853	2.6%	\$55,913	\$54,221	-3.0%
5	\$51,719	\$43,515	\$60,098	\$64,657	\$56,090	3.0%	\$51,719	\$63,554	22.9%
6	\$68,961	\$58,975	\$59,028	\$59,846	\$59,283	3.2%	\$68,961	\$67,172	-2.6%
7	\$79,449	\$69,000	\$69,000	\$69,000	\$69,000	3.7%	\$79,449	\$78,182	-1.6%
8	\$56,328	\$46,750	\$60,423	\$61,149	\$56,107	3.0%	\$56,328	\$63,574	12.9%
9	\$229,488	\$195,533	\$198,798	\$188,060	\$194,130	10.4%	\$229,488	\$219,964	-4.2%
10	\$26,921	\$22,988	\$23,538	\$22,474	\$23,000	1.2%	\$26,921	\$26,061	-3.2%
11	\$761,857	\$663,700	\$683,000	\$644,280	\$663,660	35.4%	\$761,857	\$751,973	-1.3%
12	\$55,491	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$47,775	\$48,592	2.6%	\$55,491	\$55,058	-0.8%
13	\$144,728	\$138,600	\$122,880	\$123,708	\$128,396	6.8%	\$144,728	\$145,482	0.5%
14	\$19,983	\$16,915	\$16,235	\$14,697	\$15,949	0.9%	\$19,983	\$18,071	-9.6%
15	\$146,878	\$146,675	\$122,743	\$109,028	\$126,149	6.7%	\$146,878	\$142,935	-2.7%
16	\$26,170	\$20,970	\$23,646	\$24,796	\$23,137	1.2%	\$26,170	\$26,216	0.2%
17	\$247,350	\$208,538	\$239,944	\$246,555	\$231,679	12.4%	\$247,350	\$262,509	6.1%
18	\$14,535	\$12,525	\$11,475	\$12,106	\$12,035	0.6%	\$14,535	\$13,637	-6.2%
19	\$25,296	\$21,513	\$21,500	\$27,171	\$23,395	1.2%	\$25,296	\$26,508	4.8%
20	\$65,886	\$65,159	\$60,213	\$48,190	\$57,854	3.1%	\$65,886	\$65,553	-0.5%
Total	\$2,123,854	\$1,863,251	\$1,909,716	\$1,850,297	\$1,874,421	100.0%	\$2,123,854	\$2,123,853	0.0%

¹ FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment as of August 2013.

² FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures are based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 through April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards.

³ The FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment for option 1 is based on FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment. Option 2 applies the percent of total average contractual expenditures to the total FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Additional Compensation for County Judges
FY 2014/15 Revised Proposed Contractual Allotment

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment ¹	FY 2011/12 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2012/13 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ²	Total Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	Percent of Total Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	FMC RECOMMENDATION FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Using Current Methodology ³	Percent Difference (FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment and FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Using Current Methodology)
1	\$1,438	\$1,103	\$2,313	\$2,301	\$5,717	3.1%	\$2,322	61.5%
2	\$1,537	\$1,172	\$1,384	\$1,539	\$4,095	2.2%	\$1,663	8.2%
3	\$5,684	\$4,374	\$5,437	\$8,436	\$18,247	9.9%	\$7,410	30.4%
4	\$975	\$453	\$663	\$2,731	\$3,847	2.1%	\$1,562	60.2%
5	\$99	\$180	\$133	\$946	\$1,259	0.7%	\$511	416.2%
6	\$3,880	\$1,786	\$2,848	\$6,169	\$10,803	5.9%	\$4,387	13.1%
7	\$3,204	\$2,671	\$2,742	\$3,885	\$9,298	5.0%	\$3,776	17.9%
8	\$3,672	\$1,736	\$3,847	\$4,148	\$9,731	5.3%	\$3,952	7.6%
9	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	NA
10	\$3,216	\$2,104	\$2,480	\$1,612	\$6,196	3.4%	\$2,516	-21.8%
11	\$17,722	\$8,362	\$16,359	\$6,543	\$31,264	17.0%	\$12,697	-28.4%
12	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	NA
13	\$18,306	\$16,403	\$11,328	\$14,064	\$41,795	22.7%	\$16,972	-7.3%
14	\$697	\$438	\$756	\$969	\$2,163	1.2%	\$878	26.0%
15	\$929	\$442	\$1,100	\$480	\$2,022	1.1%	\$821	-11.6%
16	\$1,680	\$1,423	\$1,548	\$1,689	\$4,660	2.5%	\$1,892	12.6%
17	\$1,257	\$864	\$2,034	\$2,246	\$5,144	2.8%	\$2,089	66.2%
18	\$121	\$135	\$0	\$137	\$272	0.1%	\$110	-9.1%
19	\$1,079	\$750	\$1,009	\$1,037	\$2,796	1.5%	\$1,135	5.2%
20	\$9,404	\$7,984	\$6,882	\$10,269	\$25,135	13.6%	\$10,207	8.5%
Reserve	\$100	\$1,702	\$0	\$0			\$100	
Total	\$75,000	\$54,082	\$62,863	\$69,201	\$184,444	100.0%	\$75,000	0.0%

¹ FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment as of August 2013.

² FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures is based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 to April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards. The FY 2013/14 estimate also includes uncompensated expenditures for circuits 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 19.

³ FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment using current methodology distributes \$75,000 based on the percent of total contractual expenditures.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Mediation Arbitration Services
FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling Table

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Circuit	Maximum Sessions Held ¹					Funding Methodology			
	Small Claims	Other County Civil	Family	Dependency	Total Projected Sessions Held	Direct Mediation Services ²	Number of Facilities	Coordination/Volunteer/Pro Bono/Multi-Facility Adjustments ³	FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling ⁴
1	582	28	471	108	1,189	\$186,390	6	\$83,876	\$270,266
2	925	24	579	162	1,690	\$241,700	7	\$108,765	\$350,465
3	353	0	377	144	874	\$163,360	7	\$73,512	\$236,872
4	808	136	1,257	57	2,258	\$415,460	3	\$166,184	\$581,644
5	1,495	127	1,264	1,025	3,911	\$721,363	6	\$324,613	\$1,045,976
6	1,991	41	1,380	374	3,786	\$567,558	6	\$255,401	\$822,959
7	753	131	788	2	1,674	\$256,973	6	\$115,638	\$372,611
8	553	65	857	107	1,582	\$302,698	6	\$136,214	\$438,912
9	3,109	663	3,234	102	7,108	\$1,087,843	3	\$435,137	\$1,522,980
10	333	316	1,020	183	1,852	\$379,410	5	\$170,735	\$550,145
11	2,551	2,237	3,454	272	8,514	\$1,252,708	8	\$563,719	\$1,816,427
12	1,146	81	740	42	2,009	\$260,558	6	\$117,251	\$377,809
13	1,537	305	2,394	95	4,331	\$788,878	2	\$315,551	\$1,104,429
14	659	173	391	282	1,505	\$221,568	7	\$99,706	\$321,274
15	3,049	970	1,914	795	6,728	\$910,055	4	\$409,525	\$1,319,580
16	116	6	90	9	221	\$32,245	3	\$14,510	\$46,755
17	3,435	1,562	1,625	643	7,265	\$807,675	4	\$363,454	\$1,171,129
18	1,673	235	1,580	103	3,591	\$547,173	4	\$246,228	\$793,401
19	476	211	789	83	1,559	\$279,033	5	\$125,565	\$404,598
20	2,157	89	1,815	250	4,311	\$665,978	7	\$299,690	\$965,668
Total	27,701	7,400	26,019	4,838	65,958	\$10,088,626	105	\$4,425,274	\$14,513,900

¹ Maximum sessions held reflects the maximum number of actual sessions held over a three-year period.

² Direct mediation services is the sum of median cost of a session multiplied by the average number of hours per session multiplied by the maximum sessions held for small claims, other county civil, family, and dependency. For example, the dollars required to provide direct mediation services for the First Circuit is: \$20*1 hour*582*maximum small claims sessions held. plus \$25*1.5 hours*28 maximum other county civil sessions held plus \$100*3 hours*471 maximum family sessions held. plus \$100*3 hours*108 maximum dependency sessions held. totaling \$186,390.

³ Coordination/volunteer/pro bono/multi-facility apply adjustments to direct mediation services. All circuits receive a 50% increase for coordination and a 20% reduction for volunteer and pro bono. The multi-facility adjustment includes a 10% increase for circuits with 2 to 3 facilities and a 15% increase for the 16th Circuit and circuits with 4 or more facilities. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

⁴ FY 2014/15 funding ceiling is the sum of direct mediation services and the coordination/volunteer/pro bono/multi-facility adjustments.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Mediation Arbitration Services
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Options**

								FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment			
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment	FY 2013/14 FTE Allotment ¹	FY 2013/14 Salaries, Benefits, & Expenses ¹	3 Year Average Contractual Expenditures ² (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	FY 2014/15 Estimated Budget ³	FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling ⁴	Amount Under/Over (-) FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling (Ceiling minus Estimated Budget)	Option 1 Current Methodology ⁵	Percent Difference (Current Methodology and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	FMC RECOMMENDATION Option 2 Partially Held Harmless ⁵	Percent Difference (Partially Held Harmless and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)
1	\$104,100	3	\$150,795	\$85,339	\$236,134	\$270,266	\$34,132	\$85,339	-18.0%	\$89,606	-13.9%
2	\$107,920	3.5	\$229,209	\$109,463	\$338,672	\$350,465	\$11,793	\$109,463	1.4%	\$114,936	6.5%
3	\$29,739	3	\$171,597	\$20,855	\$192,452	\$236,872	\$44,420	\$20,855	-29.9%	\$21,898	-26.4%
4	\$0	9	\$532,699	\$0	\$532,699	\$581,644	\$48,945	\$0	NA	\$0	NA
5	\$169,436	5	\$358,642	\$116,966	\$475,608	\$1,045,976	\$570,368	\$116,966	-31.0%	\$122,814	-27.5%
6	\$442,903	7.5	\$431,865	\$451,404	\$883,269	\$822,959	-\$60,310	\$391,094	-11.7%	\$421,249	-4.9%
7	\$95,534	3	\$173,110	\$89,667	\$262,777	\$372,611	\$109,834	\$89,667	-6.1%	\$94,150	-1.4%
8	\$48,091	4	\$262,444	\$44,714	\$307,158	\$438,912	\$131,754	\$44,714	-7.0%	\$46,950	-2.4%
9	\$604,506	9.5	\$551,214	\$558,286	\$1,109,500	\$1,522,980	\$413,480	\$558,286	-7.6%	\$586,200	-3.0%
10	\$26,888	6	\$318,734	\$31,663	\$350,397	\$550,145	\$199,748	\$31,663	17.8%	\$33,246	23.6%
11	\$78,336	11	\$751,951	\$61,301	\$813,252	\$1,816,427	\$1,003,175	\$61,301	-21.7%	\$64,366	-17.8%
12	\$2,096	5	\$345,541	\$3,955	\$349,496	\$377,809	\$28,313	\$3,955	88.7%	\$4,153	98.1%
13	\$473,281	11	\$620,671	\$436,401	\$1,057,072	\$1,104,429	\$47,357	\$436,401	-7.8%	\$458,221	-3.2%
14	\$26,993	4	\$253,601	\$24,531	\$278,132	\$321,274	\$43,142	\$24,531	-9.1%	\$25,758	-4.6%
15	\$101,614	9.5	\$608,692	\$96,756	\$705,448	\$1,319,580	\$614,132	\$96,756	-4.8%	\$101,594	0.0%
16	\$0	3	\$171,674	\$0	\$171,674	\$46,755	\$0	\$0	NA	\$0	NA
17	\$86,405	12	\$779,565	\$82,118	\$861,683	\$1,171,129	\$309,446	\$82,118	-5.0%	\$86,224	-0.2%
18	\$143,723	6.5	\$401,701	\$120,846	\$522,547	\$793,401	\$270,854	\$120,846	-15.9%	\$126,888	-11.7%
19	\$4,962	5	\$310,272	\$4,513	\$314,785	\$404,598	\$89,813	\$4,513	-9.0%	\$4,739	-4.5%
20	\$463,947	6	\$326,069	\$458,530	\$784,599	\$965,668	\$181,069	\$458,530	0.0%	\$481,457	3.8%
Reserve	\$296,858							\$570,334		\$422,883	42.5%
Total	\$3,307,332	126.5	\$7,750,046	\$2,797,308	\$10,547,354	\$14,513,900	\$4,091,465	\$3,307,332		\$3,307,332	

¹ FY 2013/14 FTE allotment, salaries and benefits are based on April 2014 circuit payroll projections. In addition, expenses include lease purchase in circuits 4, 15, 17, and 20.

² Circuit 5 is set at FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures.

³ FY 2014/15 estimated budget is the sum of FY 2013/14 salaries, benefits, and expenses and three-year average contractual expenditures.

⁴ FY 2014/15 funding ceiling is the sum of direct mediation services and the coordination/volunteer/pro bono/multi-facility adjustments.

⁵ FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment option 1 is based on the three year average contractual expenditures as long as the proposed contractual allotment does not cause a circuit to exceed the ceiling calculation. Option 2 is the same as option 1, but provides a 5-percent cushion as long as the cushion does not cause a circuit to exceed the ceiling calculation. For circuit 6, option 2 reduces the amount over the ceiling by one half.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Mediation Arbitration Services
Contractual Expenditures
FY 2011/12 through Estimated FY 2013/14

A	B	C	D
Circuit	FY 2011/12 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2012/13 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ¹
1	\$92,844	\$88,838	\$74,336
2	\$107,600	\$104,880	\$115,908
3	\$26,297	\$23,268	\$12,999
4	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	\$161,594	\$156,498	\$116,966
6	\$411,544	\$456,362	\$486,307
7	\$93,800	\$87,600	\$87,600
8	\$43,922	\$44,346	\$45,875
9	\$615,049	\$579,421	\$480,388
10	\$22,176	\$36,991	\$35,823
11	\$66,188	\$66,846	\$50,869
12	\$5,940	\$3,780	\$2,145
13	\$432,585	\$441,968	\$434,649
14	\$26,612	\$7,420	\$39,561
15	\$93,825	\$89,550	\$106,893
16	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	\$77,385	\$79,163	\$89,807
18	\$131,948	\$121,290	\$109,301
19	\$4,050	\$5,200	\$4,290
20	\$441,050	\$463,550	\$470,990
Total	\$2,854,409	\$2,856,971	\$2,764,707

¹ FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures is based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 to April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014**

**Senior Judge Days
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment**

A	B	C	D	E	F
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Number of Days Allocated	FY 2014/15 Percent of Total Judicial Need ¹	FMC RECOMMENDATION FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment ²	Net Difference (Option 1 and FY 2013/14 Number of Days Allocated)	Estimated FY 2013/14 Days Used ³
1	243	4.0%	237	-6	190
2	162	2.7%	164	2	74
3	89	1.5%	91	2	22
4	362	6.0%	359	-3	384
5	542	4.9%	504	-38	300
6	441	7.4%	442	1	422
7	285	4.7%	280	-5	202
8	146	2.4%	142	-4	125
9	430	7.2%	429	-1	365
10	258	4.3%	255	-3	253
11	778	13.4%	802	24	602
12	195	3.2%	194	-1	122
13	397	6.8%	407	10	388
14	134	2.2%	132	-2	35
15	346	5.7%	338	-8	244
16	46	0.8%	51	5	35
17	550	9.7%	583	33	325
18	276	4.6%	274	-2	241
19	190	3.0%	182	-8	133
20	329	5.6%	333	4	233
Reserve	50		50	0	50
Total	6,249	100.0%	6,249	0	4,745

¹ FY 2014/15 percent of total judicial need is based on judicial need weighted caseload for circuit court plus the actual number of county court judges. Total may not be exact due to rounding.

² FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment set circuit 5 at 504 and redistributed the remaining days based on an adjusted FY 2014/15 percent of total judicial need.

³ Estimated FY 2013/14 days used were annualized using regular senior judge days used from July 2012 to April 2014. Also included are volunteer senior judge days used for circuits 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, and 18.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Options

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
							FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment		
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment ¹	FY 2011/12 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2012/13 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ²	3 Year Average Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	Percent of Total Average Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	Option 1 Maintain FY 2013/14 Allotment ³	FMC RECOMMENDATION Option 2 Based on Percent of Average Expenditures ³	Percent Difference (FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment and Option 2)
1	\$11,683	\$8,645	\$10,190	\$9,165	\$9,333	0.5%	\$11,683	\$10,575	-9.5%
2	\$30,244	\$27,563	\$23,831	\$21,255	\$24,216	1.3%	\$30,244	\$27,439	-9.3%
3	\$4,974	\$2,287	\$5,974	\$5,425	\$4,562	0.2%	\$4,974	\$5,169	3.9%
4	\$55,913	\$44,400	\$48,200	\$50,960	\$47,853	2.6%	\$55,913	\$54,221	-3.0%
5	\$51,719	\$43,515	\$60,098	\$64,657	\$56,090	3.0%	\$51,719	\$63,554	22.9%
6	\$68,961	\$58,975	\$59,028	\$59,846	\$59,283	3.2%	\$68,961	\$67,172	-2.6%
7	\$79,449	\$69,000	\$69,000	\$69,000	\$69,000	3.7%	\$79,449	\$78,182	-1.6%
8	\$56,328	\$46,750	\$60,423	\$61,149	\$56,107	3.0%	\$56,328	\$63,574	12.9%
9	\$229,488	\$195,533	\$198,798	\$188,060	\$194,130	10.4%	\$229,488	\$219,964	-4.2%
10	\$26,921	\$22,988	\$23,538	\$22,474	\$23,000	1.2%	\$26,921	\$26,061	-3.2%
11	\$761,857	\$663,700	\$683,000	\$644,280	\$663,660	35.4%	\$761,857	\$751,973	-1.3%
12	\$55,491	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$47,775	\$48,592	2.6%	\$55,491	\$55,058	-0.8%
13	\$144,728	\$138,600	\$122,880	\$123,708	\$128,396	6.8%	\$144,728	\$145,482	0.5%
14	\$19,983	\$16,915	\$16,235	\$14,697	\$15,949	0.9%	\$19,983	\$18,071	-9.6%
15	\$146,878	\$146,675	\$122,743	\$109,028	\$126,149	6.7%	\$146,878	\$142,935	-2.7%
16	\$26,170	\$20,970	\$23,646	\$24,796	\$23,137	1.2%	\$26,170	\$26,216	0.2%
17	\$247,350	\$208,538	\$239,944	\$246,555	\$231,679	12.4%	\$247,350	\$262,509	6.1%
18	\$14,535	\$12,525	\$11,475	\$12,106	\$12,035	0.6%	\$14,535	\$13,637	-6.2%
19	\$25,296	\$21,513	\$21,500	\$27,171	\$23,395	1.2%	\$25,296	\$26,508	4.8%
20	\$65,886	\$65,159	\$60,213	\$48,190	\$57,854	3.1%	\$65,886	\$65,553	-0.5%
Total	\$2,123,854	\$1,863,251	\$1,909,716	\$1,850,297	\$1,874,421	100.0%	\$2,123,854	\$2,123,853	0.0%

¹ FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment as of August 2013.

² FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures are based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 through April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards.

³ The FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment for option 1 is based on FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment. Option 2 applies the percent of total average contractual expenditures to the total FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Additional Compensation for County Judges
FY 2014/15 Revised Proposed Contractual Allotment

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment ¹	FY 2011/12 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2012/13 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ²	Total Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	Percent of Total Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	FMC RECOMMENDATION FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Using Current Methodology ³	Percent Difference (FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment and FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Using Current Methodology)
1	\$1,438	\$1,103	\$2,313	\$2,301	\$5,717	3.1%	\$2,322	61.5%
2	\$1,537	\$1,172	\$1,384	\$1,539	\$4,095	2.2%	\$1,663	8.2%
3	\$5,684	\$4,374	\$5,437	\$8,436	\$18,247	9.9%	\$7,410	30.4%
4	\$975	\$453	\$663	\$2,731	\$3,847	2.1%	\$1,562	60.2%
5	\$99	\$180	\$133	\$946	\$1,259	0.7%	\$511	416.2%
6	\$3,880	\$1,786	\$2,848	\$6,169	\$10,803	5.9%	\$4,387	13.1%
7	\$3,204	\$2,671	\$2,742	\$3,885	\$9,298	5.0%	\$3,776	17.9%
8	\$3,672	\$1,736	\$3,847	\$4,148	\$9,731	5.3%	\$3,952	7.6%
9	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	NA
10	\$3,216	\$2,104	\$2,480	\$1,612	\$6,196	3.4%	\$2,516	-21.8%
11	\$17,722	\$8,362	\$16,359	\$6,543	\$31,264	17.0%	\$12,697	-28.4%
12	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	NA
13	\$18,306	\$16,403	\$11,328	\$14,064	\$41,795	22.7%	\$16,972	-7.3%
14	\$697	\$438	\$756	\$969	\$2,163	1.2%	\$878	26.0%
15	\$929	\$442	\$1,100	\$480	\$2,022	1.1%	\$821	-11.6%
16	\$1,680	\$1,423	\$1,548	\$1,689	\$4,660	2.5%	\$1,892	12.6%
17	\$1,257	\$864	\$2,034	\$2,246	\$5,144	2.8%	\$2,089	66.2%
18	\$121	\$135	\$0	\$137	\$272	0.1%	\$110	-9.1%
19	\$1,079	\$750	\$1,009	\$1,037	\$2,796	1.5%	\$1,135	5.2%
20	\$9,404	\$7,984	\$6,882	\$10,269	\$25,135	13.6%	\$10,207	8.5%
Reserve	\$100	\$1,702	\$0	\$0			\$100	
Total	\$75,000	\$54,082	\$62,863	\$69,201	\$184,444	100.0%	\$75,000	0.0%

¹ FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment as of August 2013.

² FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures is based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 to April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards. The FY 2013/14 estimate also includes uncompensated expenditures for circuits 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 19.

³ FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment using current methodology distributes \$75,000 based on the percent of total contractual expenditures.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Mediation Arbitration Services
FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling Table

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	Maximum Sessions Held ¹					Funding Methodology			
Circuit	Small Claims	Other County Civil	Family	Dependency	Total Projected Sessions Held	Direct Mediation Services ²	Number of Facilities	Coordination/Volunteer/Pro Bono/Multi-Facility Adjustments ³	FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling ⁴
1	582	28	471	108	1,189	\$186,390	6	\$83,876	\$270,266
2	925	24	579	162	1,690	\$241,700	7	\$108,765	\$350,465
3	353	0	377	144	874	\$163,360	7	\$73,512	\$236,872
4	808	136	1,257	57	2,258	\$415,460	3	\$166,184	\$581,644
5	1,495	127	1,264	1,025	3,911	\$721,363	6	\$324,613	\$1,045,976
6	1,991	41	1,380	374	3,786	\$567,558	6	\$255,401	\$822,959
7	753	131	788	2	1,674	\$256,973	6	\$115,638	\$372,611
8	553	65	857	107	1,582	\$302,698	6	\$136,214	\$438,912
9	3,109	663	3,234	102	7,108	\$1,087,843	3	\$435,137	\$1,522,980
10	333	316	1,020	183	1,852	\$379,410	5	\$170,735	\$550,145
11	2,551	2,237	3,454	272	8,514	\$1,252,708	8	\$563,719	\$1,816,427
12	1,146	81	740	42	2,009	\$260,558	6	\$117,251	\$377,809
13	1,537	305	2,394	95	4,331	\$788,878	2	\$315,551	\$1,104,429
14	659	173	391	282	1,505	\$221,568	7	\$99,706	\$321,274
15	3,049	970	1,914	795	6,728	\$910,055	4	\$409,525	\$1,319,580
16	116	6	90	9	221	\$32,245	3	\$14,510	\$46,755
17	3,435	1,562	1,625	643	7,265	\$807,675	4	\$363,454	\$1,171,129
18	1,673	235	1,580	103	3,591	\$547,173	4	\$246,228	\$793,401
19	476	211	789	83	1,559	\$279,033	5	\$125,565	\$404,598
20	2,157	89	1,815	250	4,311	\$665,978	7	\$299,690	\$965,668
Total	27,701	7,400	26,019	4,838	65,958	\$10,088,626	105	\$4,425,274	\$14,513,900

¹ Maximum sessions held reflects the maximum number of actual sessions held over a three year period.

² Direct mediation services is the sum of median cost of a session multiplied by the average number of hours per session multiplied by the maximum sessions held for small claims, other county civil, family, and dependency. For example, the dollars required to provide direct mediation services for the First Circuit is: \$20*1 hour*582*maximum small claims sessions held plus \$25*1.5 hours*28 maximum other county civil sessions held plus \$100*3 hours*471 maximum family sessions held plus \$100*3 hours*108 maximum dependency sessions held totaling \$186,390.

³ Coordination/volunteer/pro bono/multi-facility apply adjustments to direct mediation services. All circuits receive a 50% increase for coordination and a 20% reduction for volunteer and pro bono. The multi-facility adjustment includes a 10% increase for circuits with 2 to 3 facilities and a 15% increase for the 16th circuit and circuits with 4 or more facilities. Totals may not be exact due to rounding.

⁴ FY 2014/15 funding ceiling is the sum of direct mediation services and the coordination/volunteer/pro bono/multi-facility adjustments.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Mediation Arbitration Services
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Options

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	
								FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment				
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment	FY 2013/14 FTE Allotment ¹	FY 2013/14 Salaries, Benefits, & Expenses ¹	3 Year Average Contractual Expenditures ² (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	FY 2014/15 Estimated Budget ³	FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling ⁴	Amount Under/Over (-) FY 2014/15 Funding Ceiling (Ceiling minus Estimated Budget)	Option 1 Current Methodology ⁵	Percent Difference (Current Methodology and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	FMC RECOMMENDATION Option 2 Partially Held Harmless ⁵	Percent Difference (Partially Held Harmless and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	
1	\$104,100	3	\$150,795	\$85,339	\$236,134	\$270,266	\$34,132	\$85,339	-18.0%	\$89,606	-13.9%	
2	\$107,920	3.5	\$229,209	\$109,463	\$338,672	\$350,465	\$11,793	\$109,463	1.4%	\$114,936	6.5%	
3	\$29,739	3	\$171,597	\$20,855	\$192,452	\$236,872	\$44,420	\$20,855	-29.9%	\$21,898	-26.4%	
4	\$0	9	\$532,699	\$0	\$532,699	\$581,644	\$48,945	\$0	NA	\$0	NA	
5	\$169,436	5	\$358,642	\$116,966	\$475,608	\$1,045,976	\$570,368	\$116,966	-31.0%	\$122,814	-27.5%	
6	\$442,903	7.5	\$431,865	\$451,404	\$883,269	\$822,959	-\$60,310	\$391,094	-11.7%	\$421,249	-4.9%	
7	\$95,534	3	\$173,110	\$89,667	\$262,777	\$372,611	\$109,834	\$89,667	-6.1%	\$94,150	-1.4%	
8	\$48,091	4	\$262,444	\$44,714	\$307,158	\$438,912	\$131,754	\$44,714	-7.0%	\$46,950	-2.4%	
9	\$604,506	9.5	\$551,214	\$558,286	\$1,109,500	\$1,522,980	\$413,480	\$558,286	-7.6%	\$586,200	-3.0%	
10	\$26,888	6	\$318,734	\$31,663	\$350,397	\$550,145	\$199,748	\$31,663	17.8%	\$33,246	23.6%	
11	\$78,336	11	\$751,951	\$61,301	\$813,252	\$1,816,427	\$1,003,175	\$61,301	-21.7%	\$64,366	-17.8%	
12	\$2,096	5	\$345,541	\$3,955	\$349,496	\$377,809	\$28,313	\$3,955	88.7%	\$4,153	98.1%	
13	\$473,281	11	\$620,671	\$436,401	\$1,057,072	\$1,104,429	\$47,357	\$436,401	-7.8%	\$458,221	-3.2%	
14	\$26,993	4	\$253,601	\$24,531	\$278,132	\$321,274	\$43,142	\$24,531	-9.1%	\$25,758	-4.6%	
15	\$101,614	9.5	\$608,692	\$96,756	\$705,448	\$1,319,580	\$614,132	\$96,756	-4.8%	\$101,594	0.0%	
16	\$0	3	\$171,674	\$0	\$171,674	\$46,755	\$0	\$0	NA	\$0	NA	
17	\$86,405	12	\$779,565	\$82,118	\$861,683	\$1,171,129	\$309,446	\$82,118	-5.0%	\$86,224	-0.2%	
18	\$143,723	6.5	\$401,701	\$120,846	\$522,547	\$793,401	\$270,854	\$120,846	-15.9%	\$126,888	-11.7%	
19	\$4,962	5	\$310,272	\$4,513	\$314,785	\$404,598	\$89,813	\$4,513	-9.0%	\$4,739	-4.5%	
20	\$463,947	6	\$326,069	\$458,530	\$784,599	\$965,668	\$181,069	\$458,530	0.0%	\$481,457	3.8%	
Reserve	\$296,858							\$570,334		\$422,883	42.5%	
Total	\$3,307,332	126.5	\$7,750,046	\$2,797,308	\$10,547,354	\$14,513,900	\$4,091,465	\$3,307,332		\$3,307,332		

¹ FY 2013/14 FTE allotment, salaries and benefits are based on April 2014 circuit payroll projections. In addition, expenses include lease purchase in circuits 4, 15, 17, and 20.

² Circuit 5 is set at FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures.

³ FY 2014/15 estimated budget is the sum of FY 2013/14 salaries, benefits, & expenses and three year average contractual expenditures.

⁴ FY 2014/15 funding ceiling is the sum of direct mediation services and the coordination/volunteer/pro bono/multi-facility adjustments.

⁵ FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment option 1 is based on the three year average contractual expenditures as long as the proposed contractual allotment does not cause a circuit to exceed the ceiling calculation. Option 2 is the same as option 1, but provides a 5 percent cushion as long as the cushion does not cause a circuit to exceed the ceiling calculation. For circuit 6, option 2 reduces the amount over the ceiling by one half.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Mediation Arbitration Services
Contractual Expenditures
FY 2011/12 through Estimated FY 2013/14

A	B	C	D
Circuit	FY 2011/12 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2012/13 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ¹
1	\$92,844	\$88,838	\$74,336
2	\$107,600	\$104,880	\$115,908
3	\$26,297	\$23,268	\$12,999
4	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	\$161,594	\$156,498	\$116,966
6	\$411,544	\$456,362	\$486,307
7	\$93,800	\$87,600	\$87,600
8	\$43,922	\$44,346	\$45,875
9	\$615,049	\$579,421	\$480,388
10	\$22,176	\$36,991	\$35,823
11	\$66,188	\$66,846	\$50,869
12	\$5,940	\$3,780	\$2,145
13	\$432,585	\$441,968	\$434,649
14	\$26,612	\$7,420	\$39,561
15	\$93,825	\$89,550	\$106,893
16	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	\$77,385	\$79,163	\$89,807
18	\$131,948	\$121,290	\$109,301
19	\$4,050	\$5,200	\$4,290
20	\$441,050	\$463,550	\$470,990
Total	\$2,854,409	\$2,856,971	\$2,764,707

¹ FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures is based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 to April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards.

IV.D. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments: Revise
Due Process Contractual Allotments: Court
Interpreting, Expert Witnesses, Court Reporting,
and Cost Recovery

**Agenda Item IV.D.: FY 2014/15 Circuit Allotments –
Revise Due Process Contractual Allotments**

For the FY 2013/14 allocation process, the TCBC approved the following recommendations regarding enhancements to the allocation methodologies used to determine contractual funds.

- a. Base allocations on a 3 year average of expenditures. Data should be provided to the Funding Methodology Committee (FMC) for all 3 years with staff recommendations for removing outliers in the calculation if needed.
- b. Contact circuits prior to the Committee meeting.
- c. Set a target of maintaining 10% of contractual funds in reserve for each element.
- d. Due process deficit procedures were revised for accessing the reserve which does not preclude a circuit from using their operating budget to fill a due process shortage but does not require it before making a request to the Budget Management Committee.

The TCBC also directed the FMC to further examine all funding methodologies for potential revisions. Due to time constraints and circuit input, OSCA staff recommended focusing on revising the funding methodology for payments over the flat fee for the FY 2014/15 while addressing the remaining funding methodologies during later fiscal years. During the 2014 Session, the Legislature removed the proviso and statutory language requiring amounts ordered above the flat fee to be paid from the courts' due process funds once the JAC appropriation has been exhausted.

For FY 2014/15, OSCA staff propose allocating contractual funds for court interpreting, expert witness, and court reporting using methodologies incorporating the three year average expenditures for each circuit with modifications applied where appropriate. Each circuit was provided the proposed FY 2014/15 allotments for review and opportunity to provide input. Each circuit's response is included in the materials. Remaining funds in the due process category will be held in a statewide reserve.

A vote is required by the Commission for all issues listed below:

1. Court Interpreting (See Attachment A)

Option 1: Approve proposed FY 2014/15 allocations using the current methodology in which contractual funds are allocated based on each circuit's three year average expenditures with a one year growth rate applied based on projected growth in non-English speaking population. Place remaining funds in the statewide due process reserve.

Option 2: Same methodology as *Option 1* but including a 5% cushion.

Option 3: Same methodology as *Option 2* but include adjustments for 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 13th, 14th, and 19th circuits.

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 3*.

Remote Interpreting

(See Attachment B of the materials for background information.)

Decision Needed

Option 1: Approve allocating \$81,428 from FY 2014/15 due process reserves to support continuation of the regional pilot into FY 2014/15.

Option 2: Defer allocating funds from due process reserves until mid-year when more information is available as to current year expenditures.

Option 3: Do not approve.

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 1*.

2. Expert Witness (See Attachment C)

Option 1: Approve proposed FY 2014/15 circuit allotments based on the average expenditures over three years. Place remaining funds in the statewide due process reserve.

Option 2: Same methodology as *Option 1* but including a 5% cushion.

Option 3: Same methodology as *Option 2* but include adjustments to the 4th circuit (\$182,257) and 14th circuit (\$159,783).

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 3* with the exception of the 14th Circuit's allocation. Allocate \$59,783 to the 14th Circuit with the understanding that the 14th circuit can request additional expert witness funds from the due process reserve during the year once they determine that they will exhaust their allocation.

3. Court Reporting (See Attachment D)

Option 1: Approve proposed FY 2013/14 circuit allotments based on the average expenditures over three years. Place remaining funds in the statewide due process reserve.

Option 2: Same methodology as *Option 1* but including a 5% cushion.

Option 3: Same methodology as *Option 2* but include adjustments to the 4th circuit.

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 2*. Allocate \$1,341,622 to the 4th Circuit with the understanding that the 4th circuit can request additional court reporting funds from the due process reserve during the year once they determine that they will exhaust their allocation.

Open Court

(See Attachment E of the materials for background information and recommendations of the Due Process Technology Workgroup.)

Decision Needed

Option 1: Approve the recommendations of the Due Process Technology Workgroup.

Option 2: Do not approve recommendations.

FMC Recommendation: Approve *Option 1*.

4. Due Process Reserve

As previously mentioned, remaining funds from the court interpreting, expert witness, and court reporting categories are held in a statewide reserve. Attached (**Attachment F**) are charts demonstrating the remaining funds to be held in reserve based on the methodologies incorporating the three year average expenditures for each circuit with modifications applied where appropriate under *Option 1*, *Option 2*, and *Option 3*. The proposed amount to be held in reserve will be contingent on further adjustments recommended by the FMC and final approval by the TCBC.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Court Interpreting
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment Options

Note: If unanticipated expenditures arise during the year that cannot be covered by the approved allotment, additional due process funds may be requested from the due process reserve in accordance with the due process deficit procedures.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
								FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment				
Circuit	FY 2013/14 FTE Allotment ¹	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment ²	FY 2011/12 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2012/13 Contractual Expenditures	FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures ³	Three Year Average Contractual Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Contractual Expenditures)	Estimated Annual Growth Rate ⁴	Option 1 Using Current Methodology ⁵	Percent Difference (Option 1 and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	Option 2 5 Percent Cushion ⁵	Percent Difference (Option 2 and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	FMC RECOMMENDATION Option 3 Circuit Request ⁵
1	0	\$49,188	\$44,651	\$42,464	\$35,335	\$40,817	5.6%	\$43,089	-12.4%	\$45,243	-8.0%	\$45,243
2	0	\$21,988	\$16,690	\$17,205	\$34,465	\$22,787	3.9%	\$23,670	7.6%	\$24,854	13.0%	\$37,854
3	0	\$44,840	\$46,157	\$43,075	\$45,006	\$44,746	1.8%	\$45,535	1.5%	\$47,812	6.6%	\$47,812
4	0	\$242,987	\$213,475	\$221,881	\$254,322	\$229,893	6.5%	\$244,778	0.7%	\$257,017	5.8%	\$279,754
5 ⁶	3	\$84,349	\$163,641	\$79,627	\$109,116	\$117,461	6.0%	\$100,007	18.6%	\$105,007	24.5%	\$154,007
6	0	\$252,843	\$243,399	\$204,870	\$187,977	\$212,082	3.3%	\$219,027	-13.4%	\$229,978	-9.0%	\$304,027
7 ⁶	3	\$87,785	\$118,466	\$83,810	\$69,877	\$90,718	4.6%	\$80,398	-8.4%	\$84,418	-3.8%	\$84,418
8	1	\$39,347	\$26,472	\$26,817	\$33,635	\$28,975	3.5%	\$29,975	-23.8%	\$31,474	-20.0%	\$31,474
9	10	\$172,657	\$157,100	\$135,696	\$104,712	\$132,503	6.2%	\$140,686	-18.5%	\$147,720	-14.4%	\$147,720
10	6	\$96,577	\$73,801	\$83,847	\$66,674	\$74,774	7.5%	\$80,390	-16.8%	\$84,410	-12.6%	\$84,410
11	52	\$328,837	\$300,807	\$362,800	\$237,014	\$300,207	1.1%	\$303,612	-7.7%	\$318,793	-3.1%	\$318,793
12	0	\$301,923	\$268,741	\$284,450	\$307,685	\$286,959	5.0%	\$301,361	-0.2%	\$316,429	4.8%	\$316,429
13	10	\$153,366	\$145,896	\$132,162	\$133,808	\$137,289	4.0%	\$142,830	-6.9%	\$149,972	-2.2%	\$247,830
14	0	\$33,770	\$33,127	\$27,324	\$31,367	\$30,606	4.5%	\$31,989	-5.3%	\$33,588	-0.5%	\$38,588
15	13	\$128,938	\$118,029	\$133,904	\$77,380	\$109,771	5.4%	\$115,648	-10.3%	\$121,430	-5.8%	\$121,430
16	2	\$21,244	\$17,488	\$25,052	\$16,152	\$19,564	0.5%	\$19,656	-7.5%	\$20,639	-2.8%	\$20,639
17	15.5	\$104,661	\$90,784	\$107,069	\$120,117	\$105,990	3.9%	\$110,151	5.2%	\$115,659	10.5%	\$115,659
18	1	\$33,041	\$35,831	\$30,215	\$21,905	\$29,317	3.3%	\$30,270	-8.4%	\$31,784	-3.8%	\$31,784
19	2	\$418,507	\$362,250	\$365,739	\$390,975	\$372,988	8.4%	\$404,210	-3.4%	\$424,421	1.4%	\$404,210
20	7	\$375,023	\$357,951	\$296,386	\$328,895	\$327,744	8.0%	\$354,048	-5.6%	\$371,750	-0.9%	\$371,750
Total	125.5	\$2,991,871	\$2,834,756	\$2,704,393	\$2,606,417	\$2,715,189	3.3%	\$2,821,330	-5.7%	\$2,962,398	-1.0%	\$3,203,831

¹ FY 2013/14 FTE allotment for CC 131 and CC 730 as of August 2013.

² FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment includes \$951 lease purchase in circuit 20.

³ FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures is based on cost center 131 actual expenditure data from July 2013 to April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards.

⁴ Estimated annual growth rate is based on the 2000 and 2010 Census. The rate is based on the difference between the number of "People who speak English at home less than very well" in Florida from 2000 to 2010.

⁵ FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment option 1 applies the estimated annual growth rate to the three year average contractual expenditures. Option 2 includes a 5 percent cushion. Option 3 is based on circuit requests.

⁶ Due to previous requests by circuits 5 and 7 to transfer funds from their due process contractual allotment to the salary and benefits category in order to utilize FTE from the Due Process Contingency Fund, FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment option 1 applies the estimated annual growth rate to the two year average contractual expenditures (FY 2012-13 and FY 2013/14 estimated contractual expenditures). These previous requests to transfer funds were approved by the TCBC.

Agenda Item IV.D.: FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments – Revise Due Process Contractual Allotments – Remote Interpreting

In December 2013, the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) approved a supplemental LBR issue for remote court interpreting, in the total amount of \$81,428, based on expanding the remote interpreting regional pilot in FY 2014-15. The funding proposal was developed by the Due Process Technology Workgroup (DPTW) based on an outreach to all trial court administrators on November 21, 2013. The total amount includes providing:

- 1) \$39,162 for redundancy backup for the statewide call manager (\$11,322 non-recurring), additional bandwidth for the statewide network (\$15,526 recurring), and ongoing maintenance support for the pilot once the initial 1 year warranty expires (\$12,314 recurring).
- 2) \$42,266 to support additional equipment installations in the 3rd Circuit (2 courtrooms at \$24,984 non-recurring) and the 7th Circuit (1 courtroom and 1 interpreter office at \$17,282 non-recurring).

The Legislature did not fund this request. Therefore, the issue is being brought to the Funding Methodology Committee and TCBC for consideration in providing a FY 2014-15 allocation using existing due process reserve funds.

Status Update on the Remote Interpreting Pilot Initiative

The pilot went live on March 2014, between the 7th, 9th, 14th, 15th, and 16th Judicial Circuits. As part of the pilot, the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) is participating by housing a state-level call manager. To assist in evaluating the pilot's success, a Joint Workgroup on Shared Remote Interpreting Services (Workgroup) was created. The joint workgroup, with cross-over membership from the TCBC's Due Process Technology Workgroup, the Court Interpreter Certification Board, and the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability, was charged with evaluating the pilot and also, determining the best business practices on a future shared model.

Currently, the regional pilot is going well. Based on the continued progress, the Workgroup has recently approved initiating a six-month data collection effort that is planned to involve each circuit. The hope is to collect comprehensive data on the workload of each court interpreter to determine whether/how shared remote interpreting could benefit the circuits. An official reporting template and instructions will be sent to the circuits in the next few weeks.

Options

Option One: Approve allocating funds from FY 2014-15 due process reserves to support continuation of the regional pilot into FY 2014-15.

Option Two: Defer allocating funds from due process reserves until mid-year when more information is available as to current year expenditures.

Option Three: Do not approve.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation

Approve Option One.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Expert Witness
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment

Note: If unanticipated expenditures arise during the year that cannot be covered by the approved allotment, additional due process funds may be requested from the due process reserve in accordance with the due process deficit procedures.

							FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment				
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Circuit	FY 2013/14 FTE Allotment ¹	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment	FY 2011/12 Expenditures ²	FY 2012/13 Expenditures ²	FY 2013/14 Estimated Expenditures ²	3 Year Average Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Expenditures)	Option 1 Based on 3 Year Average Expenditures ³	Percent Difference (Option 1 and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	Option 2 5 Percent Cushion ³	Percent Difference (Option 2 and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	FMC RECOMMENDATION Option 3 Circuit Request ⁵
1	0	\$108,726	\$106,205	\$110,388	\$116,701	\$111,098	\$111,098	2.2%	\$116,653	7.3%	\$116,653
2	0	\$324,748	\$309,890	\$329,234	\$319,027	\$319,384	\$319,384	-1.7%	\$335,353	3.3%	\$335,353
3	0	\$20,189	\$21,730	\$18,316	\$11,339	\$17,128	\$17,128	-15.2%	\$17,984	-10.9%	\$17,984
4 ⁴	0	\$115,436	\$109,294	\$117,413	\$182,257	\$136,321	\$136,321	18.1%	\$143,137	24.0%	\$182,257
5	0	\$89,642	\$85,750	\$108,051	\$116,941	\$103,581	\$103,581	15.5%	\$108,760	21.3%	\$108,760
6	1	\$199,288	\$189,771	\$302,707	\$209,135	\$233,871	\$233,871	17.4%	\$245,565	23.2%	\$245,565
7	0	\$149,057	\$139,980	\$157,000	\$139,732	\$145,571	\$145,571	-2.3%	\$152,850	2.5%	\$152,850
8 ⁴	0	\$56,693	\$56,607	\$55,263	\$118,872	\$76,914	\$126,914	123.9%	\$133,260	135.1%	\$133,260
9	0	\$342,676	\$351,027	\$296,158	\$435,931	\$361,039	\$361,039	5.4%	\$379,091	10.6%	\$379,091
10	0	\$591,629	\$589,133	\$556,140	\$585,032	\$576,768	\$576,768	-2.5%	\$605,606	2.4%	\$605,606
11	0	\$1,395,133	\$1,386,781	\$1,376,513	\$1,355,809	\$1,373,034	\$1,373,034	-1.6%	\$1,441,686	3.3%	\$1,441,686
12	0	\$262,605	\$295,613	\$272,285	\$302,875	\$290,258	\$290,258	10.5%	\$304,771	16.1%	\$304,771
13	0	\$662,597	\$676,893	\$714,925	\$629,070	\$673,629	\$673,629	1.7%	\$707,310	6.7%	\$707,310
14 ⁴	0	\$60,511	\$54,144	\$75,861	\$40,804	\$56,936	\$56,936	-5.9%	\$59,783	-1.2%	\$59,783
15	0	\$478,207	\$472,288	\$535,542	\$453,960	\$487,263	\$487,263	1.9%	\$511,626	7.0%	\$511,626
16	0	\$17,489	\$24,204	\$25,885	\$20,930	\$23,673	\$23,673	35.4%	\$24,857	42.1%	\$24,857
17 ⁴	0	\$964,198	\$845,601	\$1,011,616	\$943,410	\$933,542	\$977,513	1.4%	\$980,219	1.7%	\$980,219
18	0	\$136,423	\$147,728	\$129,793	\$114,141	\$130,554	\$130,554	-4.3%	\$137,082	0.5%	\$137,082
19	0	\$145,821	\$153,070	\$208,214	\$177,759	\$179,681	\$179,681	23.2%	\$188,665	29.4%	\$188,665
20	0	\$350,868	\$374,463	\$352,909	\$357,082	\$361,485	\$361,485	3.0%	\$379,559	8.2%	\$379,559
Total	1	\$6,471,936	\$6,390,172	\$6,754,213	\$6,630,807	\$6,591,730	\$6,685,701	3.3%	\$6,973,817	7.8%	\$7,012,937

¹ FY 2013/14 FTE allotment as of August 2013.

² Expenditures include contractual and cost recovery. FY 2013/14 estimated expenditures is based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 to April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards.

³ FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment option 1 is based on the 3 year average contractual expenditures. Option 2 includes a 5 percent cushion.

⁴ Circuit 4 option 3 set at FY 2013/14 estimated expenditures due to an increase in juvenile competency evaluations. Circuit 8 option 1 and option 2 includes a special allocation of \$50,000. Circuit 14 requested \$159,783 due to the court's requirement to pay for competency evaluations previously paid by the Public Defender's office. The FMC is recommending in option 3 that \$59,783 be allocated to the 14th Circuit with the understanding the 14th Circuit can request additional funds from the due process reserve during the year. Circuit 17 option 1 is set at \$977,513 (average of FY 2012/13 and estimated FY 2013/14 expenditures).

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014
Court Reporting
FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment

Note: If unanticipated expenditures arise during the year that cannot be covered by the approved allotment, additional due process funds may be requested from the due process reserve in accordance with the due process deficit procedures.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
							FY 2014/15 Proposed Contractual Allotment				
Circuit	FY 2013/14 FTE Allotment ¹	FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment ² (CC 129)	FY 2011/12 Expenditures ³	FY 2012/13 Expenditures ³	FY 2013/14 Estimated Expenditures ³	3 Year Average Expenditures (FY 2011/12 to FY 2013/14 Estimated Expenditures)	Option 1 Based on 3 Year Average Expenditures ⁴	Percent Difference (Option 1 and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	FMC RECOMMENDATION Option 2 5 Percent Cushion ⁴	Percent Difference (Option 2 and FY 2013/14 Beginning Contractual Allotment)	Option 3 Circuit Request
1	22	\$47,768	\$42,116	\$46,096	\$55,746	\$47,986	\$47,986	0.5%	\$50,385	5.5%	\$50,385
2	15	\$28,607	\$35,603	\$24,250	\$28,037	\$29,297	\$29,297	2.4%	\$30,762	7.5%	\$30,762
3 ⁵	6	\$6,399	\$47,722	\$5,445	\$8,501	\$20,556	\$6,973	9.0%	\$7,322	14.4%	\$7,322
4 ⁵	1	\$1,368,453	\$1,244,584	\$1,302,760	\$1,285,861	\$1,277,735	\$1,277,735	-6.6%	\$1,341,622	-2.0%	\$1,446,593
5	16	\$127,840	\$131,049	\$96,877	\$139,014	\$122,313	\$122,313	-4.3%	\$128,429	0.5%	\$128,429
6	38	\$374,485	\$330,912	\$350,397	\$520,083	\$400,464	\$400,464	6.9%	\$420,487	12.3%	\$420,487
7	14	\$212,248	\$213,288	\$206,076	\$169,048	\$196,137	\$196,137	-7.6%	\$205,944	-3.0%	\$205,944
8	16	\$37,811	\$45,943	\$58,871	\$63,287	\$56,034	\$56,034	48.2%	\$58,836	55.6%	\$58,836
9	45	\$105,000	\$156,357	\$119,658	\$106,106	\$127,374	\$127,374	21.3%	\$133,743	27.4%	\$133,743
10	14	\$336,110	\$307,466	\$372,016	\$401,616	\$360,366	\$360,366	7.2%	\$378,384	12.6%	\$378,384
11	4	\$2,238,591	\$2,194,053	\$2,173,051	\$2,184,578	\$2,183,894	\$2,183,894	-2.4%	\$2,293,089	2.4%	\$2,293,089
12	18	\$55,398	\$47,479	\$46,104	\$26,746	\$40,110	\$40,110	-27.6%	\$42,116	-24.0%	\$42,116
13	14	\$1,732,873	\$1,676,426	\$1,677,623	\$1,303,897	\$1,552,649	\$1,552,649	-10.4%	\$1,630,281	-5.9%	\$1,630,281
14 ⁵	7	\$73,777	\$73,292	\$71,142	\$39,762	\$61,399	\$39,762	-46.1%	\$41,750	-43.4%	\$41,750
15	22.75	\$135,302	\$151,349	\$125,491	\$86,152	\$120,997	\$120,997	-10.6%	\$127,047	-6.1%	\$127,047
16 ⁵	6	\$85,476	\$17,805	\$24,590	\$34,008	\$25,468	\$85,476	0.0%	\$89,750	5.0%	\$89,750
17	31	\$817,546	\$773,489	\$801,717	\$752,120	\$775,775	\$775,775	-5.1%	\$814,564	-0.4%	\$814,564
18	12	\$193,673	\$226,462	\$133,680	\$159,992	\$173,378	\$173,378	-10.5%	\$182,047	-6.0%	\$182,047
19	13	\$139,950	\$155,756	\$91,240	\$65,804	\$104,267	\$104,267	-25.5%	\$109,480	-21.8%	\$109,480
20	15	\$556,818	\$494,359	\$482,645	\$591,577	\$522,860	\$522,860	-6.1%	\$549,003	-1.4%	\$549,003
Total	329.75	\$8,674,125	\$8,365,510	\$8,209,729	\$8,021,935	\$8,199,059	\$8,223,847	-5.2%	\$8,635,041	-0.5%	\$8,740,012

¹ FY 2013/14 FTE allotment for cost centers 129, 267, and 729 as of August 2013.

² FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment includes contracted services and maintenance for cost center 129.

³ Expenditures include contractual and cost recovery. Circuit 8 excludes non-recurring allotment for OpenCourt. FY 2013/14 estimated expenditures is based on actual expenditure data from July 2013 to April 2014 and includes an estimate for certified forwards.

⁴ FY 2014/15 proposed contractual allotment option 1 is based on the three year average contractual expenditures. Option 2 includes a 5 percent cushion.

⁵ Circuit 3 option 1 is set at \$6,973 (average of FY 2012/13 and estimated FY 2013/14 expenditures) due to the transition to OpenCourt. Circuit 4 option 3 is set at \$1,446,593 due to increased contractual rates. Circuit 14 option 1 is set at \$39,762 (FY 2013/14 estimated expenditures) due to the transition to OpenCourt. Circuit 16 option 1 is set at \$85,476 (FY 2013/14 beginning contractual allotment).

Agenda Item IV.D: FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments – Revise Due Process Contractual Allotments: Court Reporting OpenCourt**Background**

Since 2012, funds have been approved by the TCBC to support the implementation of OpenCourt in several circuits. In FY 2013-14, \$75,000 in contractual funds were allocated to the 8th Circuit for the hiring of an user support analyst to provide technical support assistance in troubleshooting, analyzing and correcting hardware and software problems related to OpenCourt. Also, \$100,000 in contractual funds were allocated to the 8th Circuit in support of hiring a contract developer to provide continued software enhancements as proposed by an OpenCourt User Group.¹

Status Update

As of June 2014, OpenCourt has been installed in 200 venues, in 33 counties and in 9 circuits.

On April 14, 2014, the Due Process Technology Workgroup (DPTW) met to discuss on-going funding needs of OpenCourt. The DPTW reviewed current implementation progress, estimated annual savings and annual allocation expenditures. Further, it was discussed the OpenCourt development team and User Group continue to identify additional features that may be added in the future. As such, additional update releases of the software are anticipated by circuits using or planning to use OpenCourt in FY 2014-15.

Recommendations of the Due Process Technology Workgroup

The DPTW recommends maintaining existing OpenCourt allocations in FY 14-15 in the 8th Circuit (\$100,000 contractual for the software developer and \$75,000 contractual for the user support analyst).

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation

Approve as recommended.

¹ The DPTW established a user group to develop recommendations on software enhancements related to OpenCourt. The user group meets on a quarterly basis to identify needed features and monitor software enhancements.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting June 20, 2014

Due Process Reserve Funds based on Proposed FY 2014/15 Circuit Allocations

Option 1	Court Interpreting	Expert Witness	Court Reporting	Remote Interpreting	OpenCourt	Total
FY 2014/15 Due Process Appropriation	\$19,765,532					\$19,765,532
FY 2014/15 Proposed Circuit Allotments	\$2,821,330	\$6,685,701	\$8,223,847	\$81,428	\$175,000	\$17,987,306
Remaining Funds to be held in Reserve						\$1,778,226
Percent of Due Process Appropriation held in Reserve						9.0%

Option 2	Court Interpreting	Expert Witness	Court Reporting	Remote Interpreting	OpenCourt	Total
FY 2014/15 Due Process Appropriation	\$19,765,532					\$19,765,532
FY 2014/15 Proposed Circuit Allotments	\$2,962,398	\$6,973,817	\$8,635,041	\$81,428	\$175,000	\$18,827,684
Remaining Funds to be held in Reserve						\$937,848
Percent of Due Process Appropriation held in Reserve						4.7%

Option 3	Court Interpreting	Expert Witness	Court Reporting	Remote Interpreting	OpenCourt	Total
FY 2014/15 Due Process Appropriation	\$19,765,532					\$19,765,532
FY 2014/15 Proposed Circuit Allotments	\$3,203,831	\$7,112,937	\$8,740,012	\$81,428	\$175,000	\$19,313,208
Remaining Funds to be held in Reserve						\$452,324
Percent of Due Process Appropriation held in Reserve						2.3%

FMC Recommendations	Court Interpreting	Expert Witness	Court Reporting	Remote Interpreting	OpenCourt	Total
FY 2014/15 Due Process Appropriation	\$19,765,532					\$19,765,532
FY 2014/15 Proposed Circuit Allotments	\$3,203,831	\$7,012,937	\$8,635,041	\$81,428	\$175,000	\$19,108,237
Remaining Funds to be held in Reserve						\$657,295
Percent of Due Process Appropriation held in Reserve						3.3%

1st Circuit's Responses:

Mediation Arbitration:

The First Circuit has been able to reduce the mediation contractual expenditures in prior years by implementing a model where the Mediation Director conducts more mediation sessions. However, to support the growth of the Circuit's mediation program, the Director will be required to conduct less mediations and more community outreach in order to solicit more mediators to meet the Judge's caseloads. Therefore, it is anticipated the First Circuit will expend more contractual funds than it has in prior years.

Court Interpreting:

It's evident the current methodology doesn't take into account the Supreme Court AO SC13-304 and the fact that each Circuit, which doesn't currently use certified interpreters exclusively, will certainly have increased contractual expenditures due to the new requirement. The First Circuit is no exception to this as we currently utilize very few certified interpreters. Therefore, even if those interpreters don't request a rate increase, which we are confident they will, contractual expenditures are certain to increase simply due to being required to use certified versus duly qualified interpreters.

Expert Witnesses:

For the past three fiscal years, the First Circuit has experienced an increase in expert witness expenditures due to more Court ordered evaluations and less evaluations being paid for by the attorneys. We expect that increase to continue in FY 14/15; therefore, even the higher methodology option is not sufficient to support the projected increase that is evident by the actual expenditures in the previous and current fiscal years.

2nd Circuit's Responses:

Court Interpreting:

We will very likely need an additional \$14,000 in court interpreting contractual allocation for option 1 and \$13,000 in court interpreting contractual allocation for option 2. We had a significant funding shortfall this year and had to transfer approximately \$22,000 in funds to cover our estimated year-end deficit.

Expert Witnesses:

Although we estimate that we will be close to recommended allotments for expert witness contracts, we are imposing more rigorous cost controls and therefore think we will be okay.

Mediation Arbitration:

There is some concern in mediation arbitration contractual services where we ultimately borrow about \$10,000 every year at year end to satisfy the demand. While allotments in both expert witnesses and mediation arbitration are not ideal, we can live with them in times of austere budget, especially if we can get our aforementioned court interpreting contractual monies increased.

3rd Circuit's Responses:

The third circuit is okay with the proposed allocations.

4th Circuit's Responses:

Court Interpreting:

The number of cases requiring court interpreters has increased significantly due to the changing demographics of the Fourth Circuit. This is reflected on the UDR Reports filed each month and we anticipate this trend to continue into the next fiscal year. Furthermore, with the implementation of AOSC 13-304 (Amendments to the Rules for Certification of Interpreters), we anticipate at least a 10% increase in spending from FY 13-14. We are requesting a total allotment of \$279,754.20 for FY 14-15 which is 10% over the Estimated expenditures for FY 13-14.

Expert Witnesses:

The number of Juvenile Competency and Misdemeanor Competency Evaluations has doubled over the past fiscal year, causing a dramatic increase in costs in the expert witness category. This is reflected in the UDR reports filed each month and we anticipate this trend to continue into the next fiscal year. We are requesting a total allotment of \$182,257 for FY 14-15 which is equal to the estimated expenditures for FY 13-14.

Court Reporting:

The 4th Circuit utilizes a sole Contractor for our entire Circuit's court reporting needs. We are currently in contract negotiations with our vendor, Official Court Reporters, and they are requesting an approximate 12.5% increase in contractual rates for the next 3 years, due to rising costs in providing services. Official Court Reporters is the only company to respond to the bid proposal to provide the court reporting services for the 4th Circuit. Therefore, the 12.5% increase in contractual rates will be necessary. We are requesting a total allotment of \$1,446,593 which is 12.5% over the estimated expenditures for FY 13-14.

5th Circuit's Responses:

Court Interpreting:

We anticipate needing an additional **\$54,000** (over option one) in court interpreting due process costs for next fiscal year based on the proposed budget. The \$54,000 includes \$18,000 to address the increasing workload demands with Sign Language events within our circuit for next fiscal year. Also, in order to comply with the implementation of AOSC 13-304 amendments with Rules for Certification of Court Interpreters, an additional funding need of \$36,000 is necessary to provide a full year service model for our circuit.

The \$36,000 includes mileage and the higher premium of costs associated with having Supreme Court Certified contractual interpreter available for compliance with Haitian-Creole, Spanish, Portuguese, and Vietnamese language events, rather than using Language Line. Spanish, Portuguese and Vietnamese interpreting events also continue to increase significantly as well from last fiscal year. *One pattern to justify an increase in funding is the 300% upsurge increase from last year to provide Haitian-Creole court interpreting events in our circuit.* The \$36,000 request is only associated with felony matters court interpreting events for the five-county circuit. In the Fifth Judicial Circuit, according to the current six Florida Supreme Court Certified Interpreting Language Registries, our circuit has only two Spanish language Supreme Court Certified interpreters and one Creole language Supreme Court Certified interpreter who reside within the five-county circuit. Having this limited pool of certified court interpreters results in our circuit relying on traveling Certified Court Interpreters from Gainesville, Orlando, or Tampa

for felony matters. Scheduling availability with court interpreters is extremely challenging having the Federal Middle District Court House (in Ocala) directly across the street from the Marion County Judicial Center (the Federal Court pays their interpreting contractors a higher hourly rate).

Expert Witnesses:

This fiscal year there was a significant change with requests for expert witnesses for competency to proceed evaluations, since the prior fiscal year, which resulted in an increase. We anticipate needing an additional **\$14,000** (over option one) due to the increasing workload demands with competency to proceed evaluations, based on current year data trends.

Also, there is an unknown financial impact for the judiciary associated with new financial funding of the \$3 million dollars for the Florida's Public Guardianship program. As additional services increase with Guardianship services on a state-wide basis, we anticipate more expenses to incur with our guardianship committee costs this fiscal year.

Court Reporting:

Our circuit does not have cost sharing costs related to services provided under our circuit's statement of services for State Attorney, Public Defender, GAL, and Conflict Counsel.

Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers

There is an increased workload demand to provide these services since we have not received additional funding for county judges since 2006, and services to address increasing civil traffic filings continue to grow.

Based on our Fiscal Year 2013-2014 annual expenditures for Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officer Services, the annual amended budget is \$66,719, which provides adequate coverage in Citrus, Lake, and Marion Counties for the year.

If option one is approved, an additional **\$15,000** is needed in order to provide services for next fiscal year based on the proposed budget for next fiscal year.

If option two is approved, an additional **\$3,108** is needed in order to provide services for next fiscal year based on the proposed budget for next fiscal year.

Additional Compensation to County Court Judges

There is an increased workload demand to provide these services since we have not received additional funding for circuit judges since 2006 and circuit filings continue to increase. We exhausted our circuit's local annual allotment associated with this element during the first month of the fiscal year. Currently, we have an outstanding amount of fifty-eight additional compensation hours pending approval, using the state-wide pooled reserved funding. We anticipate needing our annual expenditures of **\$320.00** (84 hours of additional compensation hours) per year to provide a full service model for our circuit, based on the current data trends.

Mediation Arbitration:

There has been an increased demand in coverage for family and dependency mediations. The funding ceiling clearly reflects a net funding need of \$570,368 for our circuit to provide court mediation services.

One example to substantiate an increase in funding is the 34% upsurge increase from last year to provide Dependency Mediation events in our circuit. If option one is approved, an additional **\$16,648** is needed in order to provide services for next fiscal year based on the proposed budget for next fiscal year. If option two is approved, an additional **\$10,800** is needed in order to provide services for next fiscal year based on the proposed budget for next fiscal year. Also, there is an unknown financial impact for the judiciary associated with new financial funding for these entities:

- \$6.1 million dollars for the Guardian Ad Litem program (105.5 FTE)
- \$18.6 million for the Department of Child and Families (270 child protective investigators FTE)
- \$8.1 million for Sheriffs who conduct child protective investigations

As these entities receive additional funding to cover dependency matters on a state-wide basis, we anticipate an increase of scheduling events to occur with our dependency mediation program this fiscal year, and a possible potential short fall to exist with funding.

6th Circuit's Responses:

Court Interpreting:

The Interpreter Allocation for the Sixth Judicial Circuit will not be sufficient to meet the anticipated expenditures for FY 2014-2015. The **Contractual** authority allocation was based on each circuit's three year average expenditures with a one year growth rate applied based on projected growth in non-English speaking population plus a 5% cushion. However, the methodology did not take into consideration the impact of Supreme Court Administrative Order SC13-304. Because of the new requirements regarding the use of Certified Interpreters and eliminating Duly Qualified Interpreters, expenditures in the Sixth Circuit will increase Four (4) times for Spanish Interpreters alone. Because of the limited availability of Certified Interpreters, we were forced to increase the rates we pay from \$38 per hour for a Dully Qualified interpreter to \$60 per hour with a two-hour minimum. The negative impact to our interpreter budget will be substantial. For example: Prior to SC 13-304 implementation, a 10-minute advisory hearing would cost the Court \$38 after implementation the cost is \$120 plus travel.

If you assume one Spanish Interpreter is required in both counties 50 percent of the total number of days (365 days), the impact would be an **85k** increase. The example does not take into account the **In Court** schedule events in both counties.

The funding methodology should include a multiplier to address the increased costs statewide. Funding based on a 3 year average of expenditures, is troubling since Circuits who find ways to reduce expenditures and limit contract expenditures are penalized with reduced allocations.

Mediation Arbitration:

The allocation will not be sufficient. Our estimated mediation expenditures for FY 14 are \$460,160 and our allocation for FY 15 is \$421,249 (option 2).

Additional Compensation to County Judges:

The allocation will not be sufficient. County Judges in our circuit have not been paid for their Circuit Court coverage in about 4 months since we depleted our \$3,880.00 allocation. As of May 2014, we have a negative balance of -1,744.

7th Circuit's Responses:

Mediation:

7th Circuit has a flat-rate contract in place and will require \$87,600.

Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers:

7th Circuit has a flat-rate contract in place and will require \$69,000.

Court Interpreting:

Expenses will be greater than the "estimate", but we'll work within the allocations as proposed.

Expert Witnesses:

Expenses will be greater than the "estimate", but we'll work within the allocations as proposed.

8th Circuit's Response:

The 8th Circuit is okay with their allotments.

9th Circuit's Response:

The proposed numbers are ok and we can work with the allocations. My only issue is the proposed allocations are developed from past expenditures. As a result, Circuits are rewarded for spending more and the efficient circuits are punished. There should be some built in motive to reward the circuits that reduce expenditures.

10th Circuit's Responses:

Additional Compensation to County Judges:

The circuit prefers Option # 1 as their allocation.

All Other Elements:

Option 2 is preferred since this allows a "cushion" and our circuit won't have to worry as much about year- end spending.

11th Circuit's Response:

Mediation and Arbitration:

I am concerned this element in particular.

Court Interpreting:

We have put in place many cost saving measures, but even so, we never know what we will face in the coming year with regards to interpreters.

Additional Compensation to County Judges:

This year we have a circuit judge who is sitting part time in adult drug court and part time in juvenile drug court so I am not too worried. However, that may change and if it does it could be problematic.

General Concern:

The 11th Circuit expressed concerns that due process expenditures are unpredictable and any one case can cause them to exceed their budget.

12th Circuit's Response:

Civil Traffic Hearing Officers

Option 1, \$55,491. The estimated contractual expenditures for FY13/14 is not accurate. We will spend every dollar of our allocation this year and request the same funding for next FY.

Additional compensation to county judges

\$0 requested. No change.

Mediation/Arbitration Services

Either option is acceptable. The estimated contractual expenditures for FY13/14 is not accurate. We currently have over \$1200 in unpaid contractual invoices because we do not have the funds available to pay them. They will be paid from the FY 14/15 allocation.

Court Interpreting

Option 2, \$316,429. We estimate that we will spend all of our contractual allotment this year. The 12th Circuit is the 19th lowest circuit in cost per interpreting event because we pay less for interpreting services than most circuits in order to stay within our allocation – see attached spreadsheet. In order to comply with the new FL Supreme Court AO and interpreting rule changes to use Certified Interpreters, it is going to cost us more money. Our interpreting costs will increase as a result of trying to comply with the new interpreting rules, but we don't know how much. Right now only one interpreter out of the 6 that are regularly used in our circuit is certified. We are preparing an ITN to solicit proposals for other certified interpreters.

Using the spreadsheet we provided, if we moved up to the number 11 spot (i.e., the top of the lower half of all circuits) it would be \$40.32 per event and using 11/12 events that would bring our costs to \$706,527 or 2.74 times what we received. I don't know any other way to calculate it unless we request 2 or 3 times the allocation

Expert Witness

Option 2, \$304,771. We ran out of money in this cost center by early May; and even by OSCA's projections we will exceed our allotment by \$40,000. We have transferred funds from other cost centers to pay the expert witness invoices, but will not have enough funds to pay all invoices this fiscal year, so some invoices will be paid from the FY 14/15 allocation. In the past we have relied on the 267 cost recovery account to pay expert witness invoices in excess of our allocation, however, because we had to refresh court reporting equipment this year, and plan to use the 267 account to refresh equipment again next fiscal year, those funds are not available to be used. *Ideally, we would receive an additional \$30,000 in expert witness funds (above the Option 2 amount) in order to fully fund that cost we incur.*

Court Reporting

Option 2, \$42,115. The estimated contractual expenditures for FY 13/14 is not accurate. By our calculations our entire allotment for this fiscal year will be spent, which is why Option 1 is not an accurate figure. *Ideally our allocation would remain the same as this year - \$55,398.*

13th Circuit's Response:

Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers

Allotment is acceptable

Additional Compensation to County Judges

Allotment is acceptable

Mediation and Arbitration

Allotment is acceptable

Expert Witness

Allotment is acceptable

Court Reporting

Allotment is acceptable

Court Interpreting

The proposed contractual allocations for Court Interpreting (Due Process) will not be sufficient. Due to the recent amendments to the Florida Rules for Certification and Regulation of Court Interpreters, I anticipate that in order for our circuit to pay a competitive rate for Spanish interpreting services, the circuit will need an increase in the allocation in the court interpreting element of \$105,000.00. We also expect to increase our contractual rates for our exotic (non-Spanish) interpreters for the same reasons which will further exacerbate the forecasted deficit.

14th Circuit's Response:

Additional Compensation for County Judges:

The proposed allotment for the 14th Circuit is \$913. The 14th Circuit could really use about \$1,200.

Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officer Allotment:

The 14th Circuit is OK with either Option 1 or Option 2.

Mediation Arbitration:

Option 2 is most preferable. It takes that much money to get us through the year paying contractual mediators. The 14th Circuit has already spent over \$35,000 this year in that category. (We had to borrow money from another circuit to help cover these expenses.)

Court Interpreting:

Per Supreme Court order, our interpreters should get their certification. If the interpreters do, that will increase the hourly rate at which we pay them. I have estimated that increase will be approximately \$600 a month. There is no way our interpreters can get certified before the end of

September, so I estimate the 14th Circuit needs an additional \$5,000 on top of the Option 2 allocation.

Court Reporting:

Since we are moving to Open Court, the 14th Circuit should be fine with either Option 1 or Option 2.

Expert Witness:

The Public Defender in the 14th Circuit has had discussions with our Chief Judge and our Trial Court Administrator recently indicating for the past several years they have paid for many competency evaluations that the Courts should have paid. They will no longer continue to do that. Based on what the Public Defender's Office has paid in the past for these competency evaluations, it has been determined that this will add an additional \$100,000 to our existing Expert Witness Contractual Allocation. We are just now finding this out and need to let OSCA and the TCBC know these circumstances. As a result, the 14th Circuit will need an additional \$100,000 to the allocation in Option 2 on Page 8 to help cover this increase of requests expected from the Public Defender's office.

15th Circuit's Response:

Additional Compensation for County Judges:

Not problematic

Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers:

Not problematic – Option one is the same as the current year budget and we *aspire* for Option one

Mediation Arbitration:

Not problematic

Court Interpreting:

Not problematic

Court Reporting:

Both options are problematic, option #1 being the most detrimental. Option1 represents a \$14,000 decrease. We will need more or at least the same amount of contractual dollars due to staffing issues and our reliance on contractual transcriptionists and DCRs in this next fiscal year.

Expert Witness:

Not problematic

16th Circuit's Response:

Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers:

Our actual expenses for 2013/2014 will be \$24,796.20. Based on our current contractual arrangement with our CTIHO, the expenditure will be exactly the same for next year. If Option 2 is approved, we will not have any “wobble room” if another event needs to be added or

additional travel through-out the county becomes necessary due to an emergency or other unforeseen circumstances.

Court Interpreting:

The expenditures do not appear to include charges made against the cost recovery budget, which is taken into consideration in the Expert Witness Category. I respectfully request that these expenditures be factored in to the average. In 2011-2012, we used \$1,020 cost recovery dollars toward interpreting and in 2012-2013 we used \$8,778. This makes approximately a \$3,000 difference in our 3 year average. While that may not seem like a lot, for a small circuit such as ours, it is.

Court Reporting:

The 16th Circuit converted FTE into contractual dollars last year. Because this allocation was based on the salary appropriation of our former FTE, we had no control over how much authority we would have in this category. Therefore, there was really nothing that slowed down the expenditures, because we never had this much authority in the past. If anything, our expenditures in this category increased because we did not have to use cost recovery dollars, or transfer funds from other due process areas. I would respectfully request that since this allocation of \$85,476 was based on a reallocation of an 16th Judicial Circuit FTE, that we be able to maintain the same level of funding for FY 14-15, as 13-14 and that we reassess next year.

17th Circuit's Response:

Mediation and Arbitration:

Mediation contract expenditures will be approximately \$98,000 this year, but option one funding is only \$82,118, while option 2 funding is \$86,224

Court Interpreting:

Estimated expense of \$120,117 this year is close to accurate, but option one funding is only \$110,151, and option 2 funding is only \$115,659.

Court Reporting:

Estimated expense of \$708,179 is wildly inaccurate since we have already processed \$738,965 as of today, with one month remaining. Total Court Reporting expense will be approximately \$798,000, not \$708,179. Last year we expended \$801,717. Option one funding of \$761,128 is inadequate, while option two funding of \$799,185, is slightly inadequate.

Expert Witness:

Option one funding of \$933,542 is too low since last year we expended \$1,011,616 and this year we will expend over \$943,410. Note that option two funding of \$980,219, might suffice.

General Concerns:

Funding based on an average of the last three years expenditures, troubling since the state does not always pay all of the bills in the year incurred. Many expenditures incurred or ordered prior to July 1, will be paid with next year's allotments because we won't have ample funds to 'certify forward' this year's invoices.

18th Circuit's Response:

The 18th Circuit believes allocations may be adequate based on FY 13-14 YTD spending. It's going to be close. As in previous years, I'm concerned that some allocations are based on actual expenses. If I spend more, I get more each year. If I'm productive and frugal, I get less each year. I'm also concerned that the TCBC asked for various methodologies to be looked at a year ago, and to my knowledge this was not done.

19th Circuit's Response:

Additional Compensation for County Judges:

I must apologize, as there was some confusion at the local level about reporting the work, and then separately requesting reimbursement. Today, we submitted for reimbursement for all of our allocation. Please see the attached table which shows the amount of work done, and that we exhausted our allocation in December 2013, with a total of 197 uncompensated hours through April 2014.

Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers:

Our original allocation was \$25,296, in December 2013, we added Indian River County into the CTIHO mix, and contracted with 4 new hearing officers. We requested additional funds from the circuits as the rate of the billings indicated we would exhaust our resources well in advance of June 30th. Currently we expect our 13-14 expenditures in this area to be closer to \$28,800 based upon, current billings pending for May in the amount of \$2,625, and an estimated billing of \$3,400 for June.

Mediation and Arbitration:

We are good with this amount.

Court Interpreting:

We think these numbers look good under our current contracts. However, with the 14 series rules change and requirement to use certified interpreters, the cost has increased for 14-15. Three certified Spanish interpreters negotiated a \$5 increase in their hourly rate (still comparatively a bargain). While there will be increases for the certified interpreters just in rate, there will probably also be an increase in hours billed, as we will be using certified interpreters for more proceedings. I would estimate an increase in the amount of contractual expenditure of \$15,000 to \$20,000 for 14-15, above the estimated 13-14 expenditure.

Court Reporting:

We are good with this amount.

Expert Witness:

We estimate our 13-14 expenditure to be \$189,000, as at present we have \$17,500 in billings that have not been sent to the OSCA. At the end of May, we estimate the expenditure to be \$173,000 including the \$17,500 mentioned above. We estimate June expenditure at \$15,727 (1/11th of the \$173,000 through May).

20th Circuit's Response:

The 20th Circuit is okay with their allocations.

Item IV.D.: FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments – Due Process Cost Recovery

Background:

Each year the Funding Methodology Committee and the Trial Court Budget Commission reviews the due process cost recovery contractual allotment for reallocation due to changes in revenue collections or expenditure trends and the variability caused by other factors involved within each methodology.

The due process cost recovery allotments represent budget authority only. Spending is allowed based on the availability of cash carried forward from the prior fiscal year and revenue collected in the current fiscal year (cumulative revenue), up to the amount of the budget authority allotted. Additionally, as outlined in the Budget and Pay Administration Memorandum, expenditures may be of any type of allowable state expenditures but only in support of due process elements.

For FY 2013-14, the due process cost recovery allotment of \$1,104,930 was based on each circuit's prorated share of the FY 2013-14 projected revenue. The allotments for the 2nd, 7th, and 13th Circuits were capped at the amount of FY 2013-14 cumulative projected revenue.

FY 2014-15 Allotments:

The primary goal in the analysis for developing the due process cost recovery allotments was to determine a methodology to provide each circuit with sufficient budget authority to spend up to their cumulative revenue. The projected revenues and the projected expenditures were both considered in developing the allotments.

The attached chart reflects two options for FY 2014-15 allotments.

Option 1: Allot the due process cost recovery based on each circuit's prorated share of FY 2014-15 projected revenue. The allotments for the 2nd, 13th, 16th and 17th Circuits were capped at the amount of FY 14-15 cumulative projected revenue and the excess redistributed. Additionally, the 9th Circuit was adjusted to reflect the cash needed to cover the Salaries and Benefits for 1.0 FTE for FY 14-15.

Option 2: Allot the due process cost recovery based on each circuit's prorated share of FY 2014-15 cumulative projected revenue. The 9th Circuit was adjusted to reflect the cash needed to cover the Salaries and Benefits for 1.0 FTE for FY 14-15.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation: Option 1

TRIAL COURTS DUE PROCESS COST RECOVERY (Cost Center 267)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
CIRCUIT	FY 13-14 Beginning Allotment	TOTAL FY 13-14 Projected Expenditures (annualized)	FY 13-14 Projected Year-End Revenue	FY 14-15 Projected Revenue ¹ (three year average)	FY 14-15 Cumulative Projected Revenue (Column D + Column E)	FY 14-15 Projected Expenditures (three year average)	Option 1 (based on FY 14-15 Projected Revenue) ²	Option 2 (based on FY 14-15 Cumulative Projected Revenue) ³
1	65,529	(22,385)	42,088	39,227	81,315	(36,454)	61,719	44,175
2	22,632	(15,996)	5,328	24,225	29,553	(19,270)	29,533	16,055
3	6,035	(1,276)	41,047	7,226	48,273	(425)	11,369	26,224
4	1,513	0	4,392	1,158	5,550	0	1,823	3,015
5	32,715	(13,902)	38,358	32,738	71,096	(47,420)	51,509	38,623
6	346,739	(45,055)	525,203	239,934	765,137	(93,591)	377,507	415,665
7	22,823	(1,693)	11,053	17,701	28,754	(17,539)	27,851	15,621
8	35,653	(13,177)	18,527	26,770	45,297	(28,622)	42,120	24,608
9	87,785	0	40,982	57,876	98,858	(27,346)	11,258	11,258
10	29,089	0	88,532	23,327	111,859	(4,874)	36,703	60,768
11	14,140	(11,253)	15,915	21,712	37,626	(17,615)	34,161	20,441
12	47,141	(62,341)	49,776	30,981	80,757	(43,396)	48,744	43,872
13	106,029	(19,466)	10,275	68,459	78,734	(46,685)	78,734	42,773
14	16,672	0	88,563	11,794	100,357	(3,208)	18,556	54,519
15	60,380	(29,396)	101,177	45,562	146,739	(35,474)	71,687	79,717
16	43,684	(27,045)	9,647	20,122	29,769	(24,872)	29,769	16,172
17	73,000	(49,353)	21,252	45,329	66,582	(44,970)	66,582	36,171
18	17,962	(16,703)	70,273	15,121	85,394	(18,810)	23,791	46,391
19	46,644	(1,762)	89,052	31,719	120,770	(16,236)	49,905	65,609
20	28,765	(11,423)	59,528	20,090	79,618	(8,031)	31,609	43,253
TOTALS	1,104,930	(342,226)	1,330,968	781,071	2,112,039	(534,838)	1,104,930	1,104,930

¹ Includes projected revenue for FY 13-14.

² For Circuits 2, 13, 16 and 17 (highlighted), the allotment is capped at the amount of the cumulative projected revenue for FY 14-15. Additionally, the 9th Circuit (highlighted) was adjusted to reflect the cash needed to cover the Salaries and Benefits for 1.0 FTE for FY 14-15.

³ 9th Circuit (highlighted) was adjusted to reflect the cash needed to cover the Salaries and Benefits for 1.0 FTE for FY 14-15.

**IV.E.1. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments:
Statewide Allotments: Continuing Allotments**

Trial Court Budget Allotments
FY 2014-2015

Statewide Allotments

Cost Center	Allotment Description	FY 13-14 Allotments										FY 14-15 Proposed Allotments										
		OPS 030000	Expense 040000	OCO 060000	Add Comp to County Judges ¹ 100035	Comp to Retired Judges ¹ 100630	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase of Equipment 105281	Mediation Services 105415 ¹	Due Process Contractual ¹ 105420	Other Data Processing Services 210014	Total All Categories	OPS 030000	Expense 040000	OCO 060000	Add Comp to County Judges ¹ 100035	Comp to Retired Judges ¹ 100630	Contracted Services 100777	Lease Purchase of Equipment 105281	Mediation Services 105415 ¹	Due Process Contractual ¹ 105420	Other Data Processing Services 210014
136	Circuit Operating Reserve	38,000	856,717				38,331				933,048	38,000	851,891			38,772	14,385					943,048
136	County Operating Reserve		531,511		100			43,571			575,182		518,411		100		42,211					560,722
136	Due Process Reserves								449,741		449,741								657,295			657,295
720	Conflict Cases Over the Flat Fee ²								2,003,810		2,003,810								0			0
136	Mediation Services Reserve							296,858			296,858						422,883					422,883
630	Compensation to Retired Judges (50 Days)					17,754					17,754			17,754								17,754
Total Statewide Reserve		38,000	1,388,228	0	100	17,754	38,331	43,571	296,858	2,453,551	4,276,393	38,000	1,370,302	0	100	17,754	38,772	56,596	422,883	657,295		2,601,702
134	Florida Bar Dues		100,000								100,000		100,000									100,000
135	Unemployment Comp		200,000								200,000		200,000									200,000
137	National Center for State Court Dues		249,415								249,415		249,415									249,415
129	OpenCourt ¹								175,000		175,000								175,000			175,000
176	Remote Interpreting Pilot		10,000	90,000							100,000		0	0					81,428			81,428
239	Trial Court Process Improvement		103,200				8,000				111,200		103,200			8,000						111,200
252	Trial Court Budget Commission		90,000				800				90,800		90,000			800						90,800
262	State Court Network Lines		271,300							97,902	369,202		271,300								97,902	369,202
373	Legal Services		50,000				50,000				100,000		50,000			50,000						100,000
TBD	Problem Solving Courts Education and Training										0		100,000									100,000
TBD	Drug Treatments for Drug Court Participants										0					3,000,000						3,000,000
Total Other Statewide Allotments		0	1,073,915	90,000	0	0	58,800	0	0	175,000	1,495,617	0	1,163,915	0	0	3,058,800	0	0	256,428	97,902		4,577,045
Grand Total Statewide Allotments		38,000	2,462,143	90,000	100	17,754	97,131	43,571	296,858	2,628,551	5,772,010	38,000	2,534,217	0	100	17,754	3,097,572	56,596	422,883	913,723	97,902	7,178,747

Note: Shaded cells indicate change from prior year.

¹ Based on FMC recommendation

² Includes \$1M funded by the Legislature (\$500K in GR and \$500K in SCRTF) and due process reserves of \$1,003,810 as recommended by the FMC.

Note: Shaded cells indicate change from prior year.

¹ Based on FMC recommendation

**IV.E.2. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments:
Statewide Allotments: National Center for State
Courts Projects**

Agenda Item IV.E.2.: National Center for State Courts Projects

Background:

From time to time, the OSCA enlists the help of the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) as a consultant on a range of issues. Not only is the NCSC an organization with staff experts in a number of areas, including the fields of technology and workload, but it also represents an impartial party that can evaluate proposals developed by the State Courts System and provide input and recommendations to the Florida Legislature for possible funding issues.

Issue 1:

At the request of the Florida Legislature in 1998, the OSCA contracted with the NCSC to develop and validate a judicial workload model for Florida's trial courts. The model created by the NCSC and OSCA provided case weight values necessary for workload estimates used annually by the Supreme Court in the Certification of Judicial Need. At the conclusion of the study, the NCSC recommended a regular review of the model annually and a thorough review at least every five years. The first review of the judicial workload model and case weights occurred in 2007 with the Judicial Resource Study. Since 2007 there have been many changes in legislation, court rules, legal practices, and technology. In order to maintain the accuracy of the judicial workload model and case weights, a study to review the entire system is necessary. With the assistance of the NCSC, the proposed study would be conducted from September 2014 through December 2015. The projected cost is approximately \$370,000 (\$186,000 for FY 2014-15 and \$184,000 for FY 2015-16).

Issue 2:

As part of the work of the TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup, it has been determined that an information technology strategic plan is needed to determine the scope of what needs to be funded and sustained. The NCSC has been contacted to provide guidance and facilitate a two-day workshop with Trial Court Administrators and Chief Technology Officers. The NCSC proposes developing an "enterprise" view of the technology needs of the Florida courts. They believe that strategic plans should be business driven and actionable. Consequently, the most important discussion is what business needs or new business capabilities the Florida courts require or want. Once those needs are identified, then they should be prioritized. Finally, for a technology strategic plan, the specific technology capabilities and projects should be identified that support the business needs.

The resulting deliverable is a plan with prioritized business needs, proposed technology projects, and recommended performance measures (which must be objective and practical) for evaluating if the desired business capabilities have been created. The deliverable is a draft strategic plan for

enterprise technology needs. The draft strategic plan would be vetted through the Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup, the Trial Court Budget Commission, and the Florida Courts Technology Commission.

Decisions Needed:

Issue 1:

Approve the OSCA request for \$370,000 (\$186,000 for FY 2014-15 and \$184,000 for FY 2015-16) to contract with the NCSC to conduct a time study, hold focus group meetings, conduct analyses, and create a final report, to be funded out of the trial court expense reserve.

Issue 2:

Approve the OSCA request for \$40,262 to contract with the NCSC to develop a draft strategic plan and pay for a two-day workshop for court administration staff, to be funded out of the trial court expense reserve.

IV.E.3. FY 2014-15 Circuit Allotments:
Statewide Allotments: Integrated Case
Management System Funding Request (Eighth,
Tenth, Fourteenth, and Eighteenth Judicial
Circuits)

Agenda Item IV.E.3.: Integrated Case Management System Funding Request (Eighth, Tenth, Fourteenth, and Eighteenth Judicial Circuits)

Background:

The State Courts System received a total of \$9.0 million from the National Mortgage Foreclosure Settlement Funds since FY 2012-13 to help provide technology solutions to move foreclosure cases through the judicial process. These solutions enable the judges and staff to effectively use electronic documents when disposing foreclosure cases, produce orders electronically, provide for electronic calendaring, serve orders electronically, and generate cases management reports.

Of the \$9.0 million received by the trial courts for this technology, the Eighth Judicial Circuit requested and was allocated \$258,096 for FY 2012-13 and \$399,998 for FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 to purchase hardware, software, and for contractual development and programming (with an additional transfer of \$40,000 in April 2014 from the 10th Circuit to help pay for programmer overtime hours in FY 2013-14). The contractual funding was used to continue to advance the Integrated Case Management System (ICMS) to meet Court Application Processing System (CAPS) compliance, as well as meet the requirements outlined for differentiated case management and reporting for civil case types. These funds are being utilized to not only benefit the Eighth Judicial Circuit but have also been used to support the ICMS systems in the 10th, 14th, 15th circuits, and Brevard County.

As the attached email indicates, on June 3, 2014, Chief Judge Robert Roundtree of the Eighth Judicial Circuit requested that the Trial Court Budget Commission allocate an additional \$275,000 contractual services funds for ongoing programming and support to keep ICMS3 compliant with the CAPS standards and to be fully functional and operational. This figure is based on the \$500 per user annual maintenance fee proposed by the OSCA for ongoing maintenance and support of in-house systems.

The request for \$275,000 included an anticipated \$54,000 in carry forward funds being available from the 18th Circuit and 14th Circuit transfers, but the 18th Circuit was able to provide an additional \$16,000. Because of this amount received, the 8th Circuit has reduced its request to **\$259,000** for FY 2014/15.

Justification from the Eighth Judicial Circuit:

CAPS approved applications, like ICMS3, provide courts with a suite of tools that facilitate electronic viewing and case management of electronic case files. These solutions permit electronic generation of court orders, secure e-filing, e-service, e-calendaring, and reporting of performance metrics needed to ensure the efficient and effective disposition of cases. These e-processes are critical components of electronic case management, and modernization of court business processes.

Without continued funding for ICMS3 in FY14/15, support, maintenance, bug fixes, improvements and the additions necessary to meet new CAPS requirements will be slowed

down significantly. Carry forward funding for contractual developers will be exhausted in early September. Even if funding is restored at some point, it is unlikely that the current programmers familiar with ICMS3 would be available to return to the project. Recruitment and selection of highly skilled and qualified replacements would take an estimated 2-3 months.

Currently, all ICMS3 Circuits rely on the system to provide the Court with viewing capabilities of electronic case files in court and in chambers in many divisions. Without funding, divisions still employing paper case files will be slower going paperless. Changes to ICMS3 required for local Circuit user needs will take a back seat to general development and programming system needs. Modifying ICMS3 to support new CAPS standards and changes in the various clerks' case maintenance systems will also be delayed.

State funded solutions for the court's business needs and problems can be realized. Continued dollars for ICMS3 would be of great benefit statewide, providing a cost-effective solution to the Circuits for their electronic case management needs and a less expensive alternative to third party vendor solutions. The successful model of OpenCourt where a locally developed digital court reporting system was enhanced with state funding for ongoing maintenance and support is such an example. With OpenCourt now employed in ten of the twenty Circuits, we would support and encourage a similar funding model be embraced for ICMS3 for long term success.

We encourage the OSCA to explore all possible funding avenues, not only for the future of ICMS3, but for the long-term electronic case management needs of the trial courts. If allowed, we are prepared to look within our own budgets to help defray some of the costs, and we hope that all Circuits are given this opportunity to keep their judicial viewer and CAPS systems online, and maintained.

Decisions Needed:

Option 1: Approve the Eighth Judicial Circuit's request for \$259,000 to continue to support the development of the ICMS program through FY 2014-15, using trial court expense reserves. This would require a budget amendment to convert the funds to contracted services, which would need approval from the Chief Justice and Florida Legislature (although it would not have to go to the Legislative Budget Commission).

Option 2: Table the Eighth Judicial Circuit's request for \$259,000 to continue to support the development of the ICMS program through FY 2014-15, with the understanding that funding will be pursued as part of the strategic plan developed by the Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup in the FY 2015-16 Legislative Budget Request.

Option 3: Defer the issue for consideration of any unused National Mortgage Foreclosure Settlement Funds, if they come available from other circuits during FY 2014-15.

Judge Margaret O. Steinbeck, Chair
Trial Court Budget Commission
Lee County Justice Center
1700 Monroe Street
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Via E-mail

RE: Integrated Case Management System (ICMS3) ó Continued Funding Request:
Eighth, Tenth, Fourteenth, and Eighteenth Judicial Circuits

Dear Judge Steinbeck:

The funding allocated to our circuits through the Foreclosure Initiative in FY 12/13 and FY 13/14 provided us with the case management resources necessary to efficiently process these cases and technology funds necessary to begin court modernization. The development and implementation of CAPS approved systems provide courts with real-time access to electronic case files, a critical step in working towards a paperless and more efficient court system.

We used this funding to develop ICMS3, which is based on the Eighth Judicial Circuit's existing case management system, ICMS 2.5. ICMS3 complies with the CAPS requirements and provides a statewide, "in house" case file management system used by multiple Circuits which interfaces with multiple Clerks' databases. ICMS3 provides the court with a browser based system, enables judges and court personnel to view and work with electronic case files in real-time. It also provides the necessary case management tools to automate many of the court's functions, including order generation and ultimately, one-step, secure e-filing and service of judicial orders, across all case types.

Currently, ICMS3 is used in our four Circuits, encompassing 15 counties. It interfaces with the following individual Clerks' case maintenance systems: CourtView, CLERICUS, FACTS, and Pioneer Benchmark, as well as the JACS calendaring system. In the coming months, ICMS3 will also support New Vision, the Polk County Clerk's case maintenance system.

Without continued technology funding for FY14/15, our contractual allotments for programming and maintenance will be exhausted shortly after the beginning of the new fiscal year. If that happens, programming, maintenance, and support would fall back on Fred Buhl, the Eighth Circuit's Court Technology Officer. This additional workload and programming costs would be in addition to his existing responsibilities and duties. It would also create an unreasonable financial burden on the Eighth Judicial Circuit.

As the CAPS committee makes additional changes to the system requirements, functionality modifications must be made to the base code to comply with the new requirements. Updating ICMS3 or any other case management solution to compliance

with the latest standards (CAPS 3.0, was approved by the FCTC on 5/14/2014), will require significant programming time.

Changes to TIMS CAPS standards, bug fixes and improvements to the base code, as well as customization to meet individual needs of our circuits all require programming time and modifications to the system. System tweaks so that ICMS3 properly interfaces with the separate Clerk databases and web browsers will also be required whenever those systems are updated, modified, or changed.

Lifecycle costs for an in-house, internally developed application, of this scale are significant. However, ICMS3 and other in-house systems provide cost effective alternatives to the more expensive third party proprietary solutions, which require annual licensing and maintenance fees plus programming costs for system modifications. Moving forward, we hope to explore making ongoing support and programming of ICMS3 a shared cost those Circuits who choose the application.

Our Circuits have pooled our resources to provide some contractual dollars for ongoing programming through the use of carry forward funding from FY13/14 past July. However, we will still require additional funding to fully program, develop, and support ICMS3.

We are requesting funding as a stop gap measure until a sustainable source has been identified and secured for ongoing programming, maintenance, and support of the CAPS systems used statewide.

For FY14/15, we request \$275,000.00 (\$68,750.00 per participating Circuit) for ongoing programming and support. This figure is based on the \$500 per user annual maintenance fee proposed by the OSCA for ongoing maintenance and support of in-house systems. This amount, combined with FY 13/14 foreclosure carry forward funds contributed by our circuits, will allow our Circuits to keep ICMS3 compliant with TIMS CAPS and fully functional and operational. Thank you, and the members of the Trial Court Budget Commission, in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

The Eighth, Tenth, Fourteenth, and Eighteenth Judicial Circuits

cc: Lisa Goodner, State Courts Administrator
Honorable Lisa T. Munyon, Chair of Florida Courts Technology Commission
Chief Judges, Trial Court Administrators, Court Technology Officers of ICMS3 Circuits
Christina Blakeslee, Information Systems Services Manager
Kristine Slayden, Resource Planning and Support Services Manager
Patty Harris, Senior Court Operations Consultant

IV.F. FY 2014-15 Allotments for Special Appropriations

Agenda Item IV.F.: Allotments for Special Appropriations

1. Post Adjudicatory Expansion Drug Courts

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated recurring funding totaling \$5,543,957 (\$540,835 in the Other Personal Personnel (OPS), \$5,000,000 in the Contracted Services category, and \$3,122 in HR Services) for post adjudicatory drug courts. Specifically, proviso states: *“From the funds in Specific Appropriation 3193, \$5,000,000 in recurring general revenue funds is provided for treatment services for offenders in post-adjudicatory drug court programs in Broward, Escambia, Hillsborough, Marion, Orange, Pinellas, Polk, and Volusia counties. Each program shall serve prison-bound offenders (at least 50 percent of participants shall have Criminal Punishment Code scores of greater than 44 points but no more than 60 points) and shall make residential treatment beds available for clients needing residential treatment.”*

The funding for these counties is summarized below.

Cost Center 753		
Circuit/County	OPS 030000 (recurring)	Contracted Services 100777 (recurring)
0 – Statewide	\$24,473	\$33,000
1 - Escambia	\$34,942	\$317,000
5 – Marion	\$46,033	\$65,325
6 – Pinellas	\$74,876	\$945,347
7 – Volusia	\$34,942	\$221,085
9 - Orange	\$69,884	\$905,030
10 – Polk	\$69,884	\$492,713
13 – Hillsborough	\$115,917	\$795,500
17 – Broward	\$69,884	\$1,225,000
Total	\$540,835	\$5,000,000

In 2009, the Legislature appropriated \$18.6 million in federal stimulus funding through the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program to the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) to divert offenders in need of substance abuse treatment from prison into post-adjudicatory drug courts. Funding was provided for treatment services, drug testing, case management, probation supervision, statewide data system development and maintenance, and OSCA program monitoring and administration. Federal funding expired June 30, 2013, and the Legislature authorized \$5.5 million in non-recurring funding for fiscal year 2013-14 to the trial courts to continue drug court operations in eight participating counties, including Broward, Escambia, Hillsborough, Marion, Orange, Pinellas, Polk, and Volusia. The Legislature also authorized \$297,000 in recurring general revenue to OSCA to continue maintenance and support of the Florida Drug Court Case Management System (FDCCMS), training and technical assistance, and ongoing program monitoring and administration.

As of June 9, 2014, there have been 2,655 offenders admitted into the programs since inception. An evaluation report was released in January 2014 on the eight expansion drug courts by the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA), which showed the average rate of drug court completion statewide is 53%. Drug court completers had fewer felony convictions compared to similar offenders who did not participate in drug court (9% for drug court completers versus 19% for the comparison group), and drug court completers had fewer prison sentences (2% for drug court completers versus 9% for the comparison group). The estimated cost savings for diverting offenders from prison into drug court during the federal grant period studied is \$7.6 million – if 100% of the offenders were prison-bound. OPPAGA also noted in its report that additional cost savings are realized through reductions in recidivism by helping participants overcome addiction and avoid criminal behavior.

2. Veterans' Courts

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated recurring funding totaling \$1,000,000 in the Contracted Services category for veterans' courts. Specifically, proviso states: *"From the funds in Specific Appropriation 3193, \$600,000 in recurring general revenue funds shall be distributed to Okaloosa, Pasco, Pinellas, and Clay counties and \$200,000 each in recurring general revenue funds shall be distributed to Duval and Orange counties to create or continue, pursuant to sections 948.08(7)(a), 948.16(2)(a), and 948.21, Florida Statutes, felony and/or misdemeanor pretrial or post-adjudicatory veterans' treatment intervention programs to address the substance abuse and/or mental health treatment needs of veterans and service members charged with, or on probation or community control for, criminal offenses."*

The funding for these counties is summarized below.

Cost Center 377

Circuit/County	Contracted Services 100777 (recurring)
1 - Okaloosa	\$150,000
4 – Clay	\$150,000
4 – Duval	\$200,000
6 – Pasco	\$150,000
6 – Pinellas	\$150,000
8 – Alachua	\$150,000
9 – Orange	\$200,000
Total	\$1,000,000

In the fiscal year 2013-14 GAA, the Legislature appropriated \$600,000 in nonrecurring general revenue funds for Okaloosa, Pasco, Pinellas, and Clay counties and \$150,000 in recurring general revenue funds for Alachua County for this initiative. The Office of the State Courts Administrator currently is gathering end-of-year implementation information from the participating circuits.

3. Problem-Solving Courts Education and Training

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated nonrecurring funding totaling \$100,000 in the Expenses category for training and education of judges and staff on how to address co-occurring disorders in the criminal justice system. Specifically, proviso states: *“From the funds in Specific Appropriation 3188, \$100,000 in nonrecurring general revenue funds is provided to train judges and staff on how to address co-occurring disorders in the criminal justice system.”*

The Office of the State Courts Administrator will utilize the funds for travel and registration costs to send 150 problem-solving court judges and staff, with representatives from nearly every judicial circuit, to the 2014 Florida Partners in Crisis Annual Conference and Justice Institute scheduled for July 1-2, 2014, in Orlando. The conference will provide plenary sessions and workshops with educational content to assist judges and staff with effectively addressing the needs of individuals entering the criminal justice system with substance use and mental health disorders.

Cost Center TBD

Circuit	Expenses 040000 (nonrecurring)
Statewide	\$100,000

4. Criminal Mental Health Treatment Services

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated nonrecurring funding totaling \$250,000 in the Contracted Services category for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit’s Criminal Mental Health Project (CMHP). Specifically, the proviso requires the circuit to contract with the South Florida Behavioral Health Network (SFBHN), a non-profit 501(c)(3) managing entity, to provide treatment services for individuals served by the program. It is anticipated that a contract will be executed between the circuit and SFBHN on or around July 1, 2014. The SFBHN will provide evidence-based behavioral health treatment services targeted to the unique needs and risk factors of individuals with serious mental illnesses who are frequent and costly recidivists to the justice system and acute care treatment system. The target population includes individuals with histories of severe psychiatric illness, chronic homelessness, hospitalizations, and arrests. Services will focus on reducing costs to the criminal justice and public health systems, as well as improving public safety. It is estimated that 50 people will be served at a cost of \$5,000 per person, rather than spending \$27,000 annually for services in the criminal justice system, state hospitals, crisis stabilization units, and emergency room visits with little to no return on investment.

The CMHP has been in operation since 2000 and has demonstrated a 75% reduction in recidivism among people with mental illnesses who were arrested. In 2012, police officers from the Miami-Dade Police Department and the City of Miami Police Department, trained by the CMHP, responded to 10,000 mental health calls, resulting in 2,100 people diverted from the criminal justice system and only 27 arrests. The CMHP reports that as a result, the jail census dropped from 7,800 to 5,000 inmates, allowing closure of one jail facility at a cost-savings to taxpayers of \$12 million per year. This funding will be used to achieve similar outcomes among more frequent and costly recidivists by providing more targeted interventions. Outcomes will continue to be measured in fiscal year 2014-15 and will include rates of arrest and incarceration, utilization rates and costs for behavioral health services, rates of

access to federal entitlement benefits, and housing and employment status. Results of these outcomes will be made available to policy makers so that cost-savings may be replicated statewide.

Cost Center TBD

Circuit	Contracted Services 100777 (nonrecurring)
11	\$100,000

5. Vivitrol/Naltrexone to Treat Alcohol- or Opioid-Addicted Offenders

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated \$3,000,000 (\$2,000,000 nonrecurring) in the Contracted Services category for the purpose of providing naltrexone extended-release injectable medication (Vivitrol) to treat alcohol- or opioid-addicted offenders in court-ordered, community-based drug treatment programs. Specifically, the proviso directs the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) contract with a non-profit entity for the purpose of distributing the medication.

The Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) anticipates issuing a Request for Information/Qualifications to determine how many vendors could provide the service and then either contract with one of them or decide whether to go into more formal negotiations. OSCA’s General Services unit is working with the OSCA Office of Court Improvement to develop the selection process, including the identification of measurable contract deliverables. An implementation timeline is contingent on the selection process and contract negotiations.

Cost Center TBD

Circuit	Contracted Services 100777 (recurring)	Contracted Services 100777 (nonrecurring)	Total Funds
Statewide	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000

6. 24x7 Sobriety Monitory Program

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated nonrecurring funding totaling \$75,000 in the Grants and Aids – Contracted Services category to implement an around the clock sobriety monitoring program pilot in the Fourth Judicial Circuit. Specifically, the proviso states: *“The funds in Specific Appropriation 3193A are provided to implement a 24x7 Sobriety Monitoring Program pilot in the 4th Judicial Circuit. The pilot program shall use evidence-based practices that are anticipated to result in a reduction in recidivism for substance abuse related crimes and an increase in public safety for the community. Funds shall be used to produce a statewide template demonstration video for the training of patrol and correctional officers; pay for the program’s set-up costs incurred by law enforcement; pay for a law enforcement coordinator; and defray other implementation costs.”*

The General Services unit of the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) is working with the Office of Court Improvement and the Fourth Judicial Circuit to determine how the contracting process will be implemented. It is anticipated that the funding will flow to a local law enforcement entity via contract. Competitive procurement may not be necessary. OSCA anticipates a September 1, 2014, start date.

Cost Center TBD

Circuit	Grants and Aids – Contracted Services 100778 (nonrecurring)
4	\$75,000

7. Domestic Violence Active Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) Technology

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated recurring funding totaling \$316,000 in the Domestic Violence Offender Monitoring category for the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit to continue its program to protect victims of domestic violence with Active Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) technology.

The GPS projects were first funded in the fiscal year 2012-13 General Appropriations Act (GAA). That year the Legislature appropriated \$1,264,720 from the General Revenue Fund with the following provision stating: *“From the funds in Specific Appropriation 3222A, \$948,720 in nonrecurring general revenue funds is distributed to the First Judicial Circuit (\$316,000), the Ninth Judicial Circuit (\$316,720), the Tenth Judicial Circuit (\$316,000), and \$316,000 in recurring general revenue funds is distributed to the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit to implement 4 pilot projects using Active Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) technology to protect victims of domestic violence. The courts shall issue a report on the benefits and limitations of the pilot projects to the chair of the Senate Budget Committee and the chair of the House Appropriation Committee by June 30, 2013.”*

In the fiscal year 2013-14 GAA, the Legislature provided \$316,000 in continuation funding for the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit’s project, but it converted the funding to non-recurring general revenue. The Legislature did not provide continuation funding in fiscal year 2013-14 for the projects in the three circuits that received non-recurring general revenue in fiscal year 2012-13.

The fiscal year 2014-15 funding will allow the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit to continue GPS project operations on a recurring basis. Under the program, a judge may require a defendant or an offender in a criminal case involving domestic violence to wear a GPS device as a condition of being released into the community.

Cost Center TBD

Circuit	Domestic Violence Offender Monitoring 101078 (recurring)
18	\$316,000

8. Courthouse Furnishings

In the fiscal year 2014-15 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature appropriated nonrecurring funding totaling \$65,000 in the Expenses category for courthouse furnishings. There was no associated proviso with this funding; however, it was communicated by the legislature that the intent of this funding was for the Fourth Judicial Circuit's newly built Duval County Courthouse.

Cost Center 288

Circuit	Expenses 040000 (nonrecurring)
4	\$65,000

V. FY 2014-15 Budget and Pay Policies: Payroll Projection Timeline

**State Courts System
FY 2014-15 Payroll Projections Audit Timeline
Trial Courts**

Monday, June 16 - Friday, June 20	Prepare and format FY 2014-15 payroll projection files
Tuesday, June 24	Production of June Payroll Registry
Tuesday, June 24 - Tuesday, July 1	Audit period
Wednesday, July 2	Review and reconciliation of audit findings
Thursday, July 3 - Monday, July 7	Review and reconciliation of remaining audit with Personnel
Thursday, July 3 - Monday, July 7	Prepare start up payroll projection reports and salary budget reports
Tuesday, July 8 - Wednesday, July 9	Payroll projection reports and salary budget reports provided to Senior Analysts for review and analysis
Thursday, July 10	Payroll projection reports and salary budget reports provided to Budget Administrator for review and analysis
Friday, July 11	Payroll projection reports and salary budget reports presented to Chief of Budget Services for final review and approval
Tuesday, August 26	Distribution of FY 2014-15 payroll projections to the Trial Court Budget Commission

VI. Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup Status Report

Agenda Item VI.: Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup Status Report

Background:

Recently, the Supreme Court charged the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) with exploring revenue sources for supporting lifecycle funding for judicial viewers and future technology needs of the trial courts, and directed the TCBC to consider access fees for remote access to court documents, including a proposed fee structure, if any, in its recommendations to the Court.

To respond to the Supreme Court's charges, the TCBC formed the Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup (Workgroup). Attached is the draft June 2014 Status Report that details the progress made to date by the Workgroup, challenges faced, and a plan for future work.

Decisions Needed:

Option 1: Approve TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup June 2014 Status Report.

Option 2: Deny or revise TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup June 2014 Status Report.

TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup June 2014 Status Report

Charge:

In a June 25, 2013, letter, the Supreme Court charged the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) with exploring revenue sources for supporting lifecycle funding for judicial viewers and future technology needs of the trial courts, based on recommendations from the National Center for State Courts' (NCSC) report entitled "*Florida Statewide Case Management System Implementation and Funding Strategies.*" The Supreme Court, in a March 20, 2014, letter, further directed the TCBC to consider access fees for remote access to court documents, including a proposed fee structure, if any, in its recommendations to the Court.

Formation of the Workgroup:

To respond to the Supreme Court's charge, Judge Margaret Steinbeck, Chair of the TCBC, formed the Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup (Workgroup). The Workgroup, chaired by Chief Judge Robert Roundtree of the Eighth Judicial Circuit, consists of judges, Trial Court Administrators (TCA), and Chief Technology Officers (CTO), with equal representation from the TCBC and the Florida Courts Technology Commission (FCTC). The Workgroup will develop recommendations to the TCBC that address the resources needed to adequately fund the acquisition, support, maintenance, and refresh of technologies required to support the business needs of the trial courts so that all circuits around the state have the necessary technology infrastructure in place to provide equal justice to all Floridians.

Workgroup's Progress:

Since its establishment, the Workgroup has held six meetings (four meetings via conference call and two in-person meetings). At these meetings, the Workgroup discussed the scope of the project, learned the background of the current funding mechanisms for trial court technology, researched the current constitutional and statutory framework for technology funding in the trial courts, and recognized the role of the Florida Courts Technology Commission (FCTC) and the interrelationship of the courts and clerks of court on technology-related issues.

As a part of its work, the Workgroup has identified a number of challenges associated with developing a funding structure for future technology needs of the trial courts. These challenges include:

- Much of technology funding for the trial courts is currently a county responsibility, as outlined in Florida Statutes and the Constitution, and this has created funding inequities and disparate technology resources available across the state, as some counties have more funds available from the existing \$2 recording fee and other sources to dedicate to trial court technology than other counties.
- There is currently no comprehensive strategic plan for the future trial court technology needs (although there have been many studies in the past that have not been adopted or funded), no estimates of what those technologies may cost, and no defined mechanism for funding those technologies. Currently, technology has been requested and funded in a piecemeal approach, with due process technology

TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup June 2014 Status Report

needs going through the TCBC and other technology going through the FCTC or developed by the Information Systems Services (ISS) staff of the OSCA.

- Because much of the technology needed by judges and staff in the trial courts relies on data that is maintained by the clerks of court, collaboration and communication with the clerks of court will be key in developing final recommendations, including proposed distributions of revenue sources.
- Due process technology in the trial courts has remained unrefreshed for many years, causing critical hardware failures. The Workgroup will need to consider how to balance current and future technology needs of the trial courts.
- In researching user access fees for electronic court records in Florida, in other states, and in the federal system, it has become clear that there are many different methods for accessing electronic court records and varying fee structures. The Workgroup also reviewed relevant Florida statutes, case law, and committee reports related to the issue of electronic access to court records.

Despite the challenges, the Workgroup has accomplished a number of milestones in its work, which include the following:

- Development and submission of a FY 2014-15 supplemental legislative budget request for judicial viewer funding in the criminal division of court, as well as funding for secure transmission of court documents from judges to the clerks of court (Not funded by the Florida Legislature during the 2014 Legislative Session).
 - Development of a draft list of trial court technology needs and the estimated costs associated with those needs, for which a stable source of funding would be required.
 - Development of a proposal for an increase to the recording fee to generate a recurring revenue stream that would be managed at the state level to help sustain the current and future technology needs of the trial courts.
 - Development of a draft recommendation to direct revenues generated for the purpose of supporting trial court technology needs to the State Courts Administrative Trust Fund.
 - Development of draft statutory language to codify county versus state technology funding responsibilities.
-

TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup June 2014 Status Report

- Referral of the issue of defining the types of electronic access for which a fee structure could be established, as well as the technical specifications associated with such a structure, to the FCTC.
- Establishment of a joint subgroup of clerks of court and judges to explore a funding structure for electronic access to court records.
- Establishment of a workgroup of CTO's and OSCA staff to determine technology staffing needs.
- Recommendation that a strategic plan is needed for determining the scope of information technology issues that need to be funded and sustained.

Future Work:

In order to develop final recommendations for the TCBC, the Workgroup has outlined a plan for its future work:

- 1) Collaborate with clerks of court on exploring a fee structure for electronic access to court records.
- 2) Work with the TCA's and CTO's on developing an "enterprise" view of the technology needs of the trial courts to determine what business needs or new business capabilities the trial courts require or want. Once those requirements are identified, they will be prioritized, and a strategic plan specifying technologies required to support those needs will be developed.
- 3) Identify the costs for acquiring and sustaining technologies required to support the business needs of the trial courts for development of the proposed FY 2015-16 Legislative Budget Request.
- 4) Recommend additional revenue sources needed to more adequately fund the acquisition, support, maintenance, and refresh of technologies required to support the business needs of the trial courts. Propose statutory revisions to earmark the revenue for trial court technologies that allows the courts to be more self-sustaining. Propose more clearly defined statutory language that clarifies the responsibility of the state versus the county for funding trial court technology.

VII. A. FY 2015-16 Legislative Budget Request (LBR): LBR Timeline

2015-2016 Legislative Budget Request (LBR) Timeline Trial Courts

Friday, June 13	Preliminary LBR strategy discussion; TCBC Funding Methodology Committee meeting <i>1 p.m. to 4 p.m. - Telephone Conference</i>
Friday, June 20	Approval of LBR strategy for new issues; TCBC – Tampa, Florida
Tuesday, June 24	Notice of LBR strategy and LBR request instructions distributed to Chief Judges and TCAs
Wednesday, July 9	Circuit specific LBRs due to OSCA Office of Budget Services
Wednesday, July 9 thru Friday, August 8	OSCA Office of Budget Services technical review
Wednesday, August 20	Approval of preliminary LBR recommendations; TCBC Funding Methodology Committee meeting, <i>2 p.m. to 4 p.m. - Telephone Conference</i>
Tuesday, August 26	Approval of final LBR recommendations; TCBC – Orlando, Florida
Friday, August 29	Notice of TCBC Final LBR recommendations distributed to Circuits
Monday, September 8 <i>(10 days following Notice of TCBC Final LBR decisions)</i>	Budget issue appeals, if any, due to TCBC
Tuesday, September 16	Joint Leadership meeting materials sent out via email
Friday, September 19 <i>(Tentative)</i>	Joint meeting of Leadership with the Chief Justice, OSCA, District Court of Appeal Budget Commission, Trial Court Budget Commission, JQC and Judicial Conference Chairs to review the LBR recommendations, <i>1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. – Telephone Conference (Executive Conference Center has been reserved for Tallahassee participants)</i>
Wednesday, September 24	Final LBR recommendations distributed to the Supreme Court for Court Conference
Wednesday, October 1	Approval of LBR recommendations by the Chief Justice and the Court
Tuesday, October 14	Public Hearing
Wednesday, October 15	Submission of the Legislative Budget Request to the Legislature

VII. B. FY 2015-16 Legislative Budget Request (LBR): Priorities/Strategies

Agenda Item VII.B.: FY 2015-16 Legislative Budget Request (LBR)

FY 2014/15 LBR Requests		Amount Requested	Funded by Legislature	FMC Recommended Priorities FY 2015/16 LBR
Enhancing Existing Resources: Employee Pay Issues (Branch Wide)		\$15,633,244	Partially	1
Technology	Remote Court Interpreting	\$81,428	No	2
	Existing Due Process Equipment: Refresh/Maintenance	\$4,806,925	No	
	Expansion of Due Process Equipment and Maintenance	\$1,446,114	No	
	Electronic Transmission of Judicial Order to Clerk of Court	\$4,705,116	No	
	Other Technology	N/A	N/A	
Moving Cost Sharing to Court's Budget		\$3,695,347	No	
Conflict Counsel Cases Over the Flat Fee		\$2,081,103	Removed from Court's Budget	
Law Clerks to Support Death Penalty Legislation		\$1,918,731	No	
Foreclosure Backlog Reduction Initiative		\$3,837,624	No	
Post Adjudicatory Drug Courts		\$544,013	Yes	
Courthouse Furnishings		\$953,999	Partially	
Problem Solving Courts Education and Training		\$100,000	Yes	
Trial Courts General Counsel Support		\$1,181,043	No	
Additional Issues for Consideration				FMC Recommended Priorities FY 2015/16 LBR
Additional Court Interpreting Resource Issues				3A
Additional Case Management Resources				3B
Other Issues				

Note: FMC recommended considering other issues listed above but not included in the top priority issues.

Trial Court Budget Commission

Meeting June 20, 2014

Technology Funding and Sustainability Needs

	Fiscal Year	GR / Trust	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17	FY 2017/18
Current System Needs					
1	CAPS Criminal Viewers (including hardware, programming/licensing, secure transmission and disaster recovery)	GR (Non-Recurring)	\$3,929,275	\$0	\$0
2	Court Reporting Equipment Expansion		\$1,446,114	TBD	TBD
3	Due Process Equipment (Court Reporting) - Refresh /Maintenance		\$2,223,562	\$0	\$0
4	Due Process Equipment (Remote Interpreting)		\$5,428,418	\$0	\$0
5	Judicial Data Management Services (OSCA)		\$126,553	\$0	\$0
6	Other (assessments / collections, viewer reporting, etc)		TBD	TBD	TBD
7	TOTAL			\$13,153,922	\$0
System Sustainability and Life Cycle Needs (Maintenance / Refresh)					
8	CAPS Viewers (civil and criminal) annual maintenance	Trust (Recurring)	\$1,697,880	\$1,697,880	\$1,697,880
9	Server Refresh 4 year life cycle		\$658,614	\$658,614	\$658,614
10	Bandwidth		\$235,960	\$235,960	\$235,960
11	Secure Transmission annual maintenance		\$33,200	\$33,200	\$33,200
12	Due Process Equipment (Court Reporting) - Refresh /Maintenance		\$2,583,363	\$2,583,363	\$2,583,363
13	Due Process Equipment (Remote Interpreting)		\$0	\$583,027	\$583,027
14	Open Court (Expansion)		\$175,000	\$175,000	\$175,000
15	Estimated Cost for FTE / Contractual Support		\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000
16	Judicial Data Management Services (OSCA)		\$394,199	\$324,919	\$324,919
17	Other (assessments / collections, viewer reporting, etc)		TBD	TBD	TBD
18	TOTAL		\$7,578,216	\$8,091,963	\$8,091,963
19	TOTAL Recurring and Non-Recurring		\$20,732,138	\$8,091,963	\$8,091,963

Note: Lines 1 and 8 do not include costs associated with 11th circuit's system.

Estimate as of 6/17/2014

VIII. Report from Chief Justice Designee to Clerks of Court Operations Corporation

**Agenda Item VIII.: Report from Chief Justice Designee to Clerks of Court
Operations Corporation**

There are no materials for this agenda item.

IX. Other Business

Agenda Item IX.: Other Business

There are no materials for this agenda item.