



**Please Note: By the morning of January 6, 2014, materials will be available at:**  
[http://www.flcourts.org/gen\\_public/funding/tcbc.shtml](http://www.flcourts.org/gen_public/funding/tcbc.shtml)

**MEETING AGENDA  
12:00 PM to 1:00 PM (EST)  
JANUARY 6, 2014  
CONFERENCE CALL**

Call-in number: 1-888-670-3525 Code: 2923925849#

---

- I. Roll Call and Opening Remarks from Judge Margaret O. Steinbeck, Chair
- II. Allocation of Child Support Hearing Officer Resources
- III. FY 2014/15 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request – Criminal Judicial Viewers
- IV. Update/Discussion on Post-Adjudicatory Drug Court Study by Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability

## **Agenda Item II: Allocation of Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer (CSEHO) Resources**

### *Background*

At the August 3, 2013, meeting, the TCBC approved allocating a 0.5 FTE CSEHO position to the 13<sup>th</sup> Circuit and a 1.0 FTE Administrative Secretary I position to the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit. These positions were funded using \$100,000 that was held in reserve for this category. Allocation of the positions was based on the following: 1) maximum sustained net need in the charts approved in the FY 2013/14 allotments (see Attachment A), 2) the one to one ratio of hearing officer to administrative support, 3) Department of Revenue (DOR) information, and 4) circuit information.

On December 4, 2013, the chief judge of the 13<sup>th</sup> Circuit submitted a letter to Judge Steinbeck, Chair of the TCBC, indicating the 0.5 FTE hearing officer position cannot be adequately staffed for various reasons and that the circuit is returning the position to be allocated to another circuit (see Attachment B).

### *Current Issue*

Currently, the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 11<sup>th</sup> circuits indicate a rounded net need of 1.5 FTE hearing officers (see Column G of Attachment A). Of the three circuits, the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit demonstrates the highest unrounded net need (Maximum Total Need minus current allotment) and the least impact to the 1:1 ratio of hearing officers to administrative support. The 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit has been contacted by OSCA staff and has indicated an interest in utilizing the 0.5 FTE. OSCA staff also contacted the Department of Revenue, which recommended the additional half-time child support hearing officer for the 17<sup>th</sup> Circuit based on the current workload in each circuit and consultation with regional managers.

Based on the criteria established for allocating positions, staff recommends allocating the available 0.5 FTE hearing officer position to the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

### **Decision Needed:**

Approve or do not approve staff's recommendation.

### **FMC Recommendation:**

Approve staff's recommendation.

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting December 13, 2013**  
**Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officers**  
**FY 2013/14 Allotment, Total Need and Net Need**

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Circuit	FY 2013/14 Allotment <sup>1</sup>		Total Need			Net Need <sup>4</sup>	
	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer FTE Allotment	Administrative Support FTE Allotment	Maximum Total Need <sup>2</sup>	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer Maximum Total Need (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Administrative Support Maximum Total Need <sup>3</sup> (Rounded to the nearest whole FTE)	Child Support Enforcement Hearing Officer Net Need	Administrative Support Net Need
1	2.25	2.25	2.8	3	3	0.75	0.75
2	1.5	1	0.9	1	1	-0.5	0.0
3	1	0.5	0.9	1	1	0	0.5
4	2.5	2.5	3.9	4	4	1.5	1.5
5	2.5	2	3.8	4	4	1.5	2
6	3	3	2.6	3	3	0	0
7	1.5	0.5	2.4	2	2	0.5	1.5
8	2.5	2.75	1.9	2	2	-0.5	-0.75
9	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	4	0.5	0.5
10	2	1	2.9	3	3	1	2
11	3.5	3	4.8	5	5	1.5	2
12	2.5	2.5	3.2	3	3	0.5	0.5
13	2.5	2	3.5	4	4	1.5	2
14	1.5	1	1.6	2	2	0.5	1
15	2	2	1.7	2	2	0	0
16	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0
17	2	2	2.6	3	3	1	1
18	2	2	2.3	2	2	0	0
19	2	1	1.8	2	2	0	1
20	1.25	1	2.0	2	2	0.75	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>49.1</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>

<sup>1</sup> FY 2013/14 Allotment includes the Executive Committee FTE reallocation decision in December 2013. In addition, circuit 8 has 0.25 FTE more Administrative Support FTE than CSEHO FTE.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Administrative Support Maximum Total Need assumes a 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to CSEHO.

<sup>4</sup> Net Need is the difference between Maximum Total Need and FY 2013/14 Allotment. Circuits 4, 5, 11, and 13 have the highest positive CSEHO net FTE need and circuits 5, 10, 11, and 13 have the highest positive Administrative Support net FTE need. Circuits 2 and 8 have the highest negative CSEHO net FTE need and circuit 8 has the highest negative Administrative Support net FTE need.



**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**  
**THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA**

**MANUEL MENENDEZ, JR.**  
CHIEF JUDGE

**MICHAEL L. BRIDENBACK**  
COURT ADMINISTRATOR

December 4, 2013

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

Dear Judge Steinbeck:

As you are aware, I received notice from you on August 7, 2013, that the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) approved the allocation of a 0.5 FTE child support hearing officer to the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit. Upon receiving this notice, I directed my court administrator to develop a plan for use of this position that would maximize the benefits to the litigants and the court. It was my expectation that this additional resource was needed and would greatly enhance the processing of IV-D child support enforcement matters in this circuit.

After a series of meetings with all of the stakeholders, including judges, our two full time hearing officers, the five full-time General Magistrates that are assigned to the Unified Family Division, the Department of Revenue (DOR) staff and the Office of the Attorney General (AOG) staff, to my surprise, we found that this additional resource could not be adequately staffed. Specifically, we found that:

- 1) AOG/DOR does not have the "resources" to staff another hearing officer calendar.
- 2) DOR/AOG already maximizes the number of hearing slots available on the existing hearing officer calendars.
- 3) Adding another hearing officer calendar would not gain any efficiency in terms of when hearings would be held due to AOG staff coverage needs in surrounding circuits (6<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup>, etc.)
- 4) An additional hearing officer would create gaps in existing hearing officer calendars that would create inefficiencies in the processing of IV-D cases.

Honorable Margaret O. Steinbeck  
December 4, 2013  
Page Two

Based on these findings, I regret that I must return this position to the TCBC to be allocated to another circuit. I appreciate your consideration of the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit's resource needs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Manuel Menendez, Jr.", written in a cursive style.

Manuel Menendez, Jr.  
Chief Judge

cc: Lisa Goodner, State Courts Administrator  
Michael L. Bridenback, Court Administrator

### **Agenda Item III.: FY 2014-15 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request – Criminal Judicial Viewers**

**Background:**

In a June 25, 2013, letter, Chief Justice Polston directed the Trial Court Budget Commission (TCBC) to review potential funding sources to support technology in the trial courts and submit its recommendations to the Supreme Court when they are developed. In response to the letter, Judge Margaret Steinbeck, Chair of the TCBC, established the TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup (Workgroup) and charged the Workgroup with developing recommendations responsive to the Court's request.

At a fall 2013 legislative committee meeting, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Criminal and Civil Justice (Subcommittee) requested that the State Courts System provide the Subcommittee with a cost estimate of resources that would be required to ensure secure transmission of judicial orders in the criminal division from the courts to the clerks.

The Workgroup held its initial meeting on November 20, 2013, via conference call and determined that judicial viewers in the criminal division of court were instrumental to ensuring that court orders could be securely transmitted to the clerks in an electronic format. In response to the Subcommittee's request, the Workgroup decided to develop a supplemental legislative budget request (LBR) for FY 2014/15. The Workgroup approved a local approach for identifying resources needed to implement criminal judicial viewers. This approach was adopted to ensure circuits had adequate resources to implement the viewers based on their current status and timelines, while allowing for flexibility in their local jurisdiction implementation strategies.

On December 12, 2013, the Workgroup met to discuss the short-term and long-term objectives for trial court technology funding. They received an update on the current status of judicial viewers by circuit and discussed the project outline for the supplemental FY 2014/15 LBR and out-year requests for funding. Decisions of the Workgroup at the meeting were limited to the development of the supplemental FY 2014/15 LBR. To assist in achieving uniformity statewide, the Workgroup approved the following framework to be used by OSCA staff in their review of circuits' requests for resources:

*Non-Recurring Costs*

- 1) The hardware, software license, and programming resources requested should be limited to implementation of criminal judicial viewers for judges and judicial assistants only, with a limit of one computer per person.
- 2) Circuits should request adequate resources to ensure secure transmission of judges' orders from the judicial viewers to the clerks' case maintenance systems (CMS) through the E-

Filing Portal. Circuits that plan on transmitting orders directly to the clerks' CMS should seek county funding, per the FCTC policy decision stated below.

- 3) Circuits should request resources for disaster recovery (redundancy).

*Recurring Bandwidth Costs*

The Workgroup recognized that implementation of criminal judicial viewers and secure transmission of judges' order to the clerks' CMS may create a demand for increased bandwidth capacity in circuits' network lines. Because the courts currently receive a recurring appropriation from the Legislature for statewide bandwidth costs, the Workgroup made a decision that the request should include additional recurring dollars for the circuits to expand bandwidth needed to implement criminal judicial viewers.

*Recurring Judicial Viewer Maintenance Costs*

The Workgroup further recognized that criminal judicial viewers would require recurring annual maintenance. The Workgroup made a decision not to request recurring maintenance resources for criminal judicial viewers as part of the FY 2014/15 supplemental LBR and recommended that they temporarily be funded from existing court expense for FY 2014/15. The Workgroup discussed seeking recurring maintenance resources in FY 2015/16 as part of their comprehensive technology funding strategy for trial court technology.

*Recurring Secure Transmission Maintenance Costs*

Additionally, the Workgroup acknowledged the need for recurring maintenance for secure transmission, but did not discuss the funding source for those costs at the December 12, 2013, meeting.

*Source of Funding*

The Workgroup agreed to recommend requesting general revenue dollars in the supplemental LBR for FY 2014/15. Due to the timeframe for submitting the request, no other revenue sources were considered by the Workgroup. The Workgroup discussed other revenue sources for future funding and directed OSCA staff to explore those options for the April 2014 meeting.

*Narrative Justification of Funding Request*

The Workgroup reviewed and provided suggested edits for the narrative justification of the funding request. The following narrative will be provided to the TCBC for consideration to include in the recommended supplemental LBR for FY 2014/15:

*Benefits of Judicial Viewers*

*The statewide implementation of judicial viewers provides numerous benefits to the trial courts and provides for a system wide standard level of capability, as defined by the Court Application Processing Systems (CAPS) functional requirements. Judicial viewers have facilitated efficiencies to the core functions of the courts in case processing and management. Statewide implementation of judicial viewers also serves a valuable public interest by providing a means for secure electronic transmission of documents among the courts and the clerks of court offices. By providing secure methods, potential threats to public safety, such as the recent release of two inmates based on fraudulent documents, can be reduced.*

*Such efficiencies include:*

- Improved efficiencies in judicial and staff time*
- Electronic capabilities that aid in case management*
- Immediate availability and increased accessibility of documents for judges and staff*
- Reduced file movement among judges, judicial staff, and the clerk of court office*
- Cost savings associated with reduced reliance on paper files: less paper, toner, storage, etc.*

**State Funding of Secure Transmission – Florida Courts Technology Commission (FCTC)  
Policy Decision:**

On December 18, 2013, the FCTC met via conference call and made the following decisions:

- 1) Approved the policy to allow funds for secure transmission of court documents via the portal to be requested through state funding and if a local court wants to go directly to the clerk's CMS, it must use county funds.
- 2) Approved the policy stating that if the transmission of court documents is sent directly to the local CMS, the security measures (i.e. encryption, authentication, firewall protection, etc.) must be no less than the security measures currently in place for the portal.

**OSCA Staff Review of Requests:**

The Workgroup directed OSCA ISS and Resource Planning staff to conduct a review of requests for technology resources submitted by the circuits to ensure that the requests fell within the established framework and cost standards. The decision from the FCTC regarding state funding for secure transmission was applied in the development of the requests for funding from the circuits. Based on the Workgroup's direction, OSCA ISS and Resource Planning staff conducted an intensive review of each circuit's request for resources. The requests were assessed to confirm

that the resources requested fell within the framework established by the Workgroup and were within cost standards. Draft summary and itemized charts of the circuit's requests were provided to the Workgroup.

**Decisions Considered by the TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup on January 3, 2014:**

- 1) Include recurring secure transmission maintenance costs with recurring judicial viewer maintenance costs, to be funded from existing court expense for FY 2014/15.
- 2) Recommend to the TCBC to file the supplemental FY 2014/15 LBR for **\$4,662,447** in non-recurring general revenue for implementation of criminal judicial viewers and the secure transmission of judges' orders to the clerks of court, and **\$187,960** in recurring general revenue for bandwidth costs. Total request of **\$4,850,407**.
- 3) Recommend to the TCBC that the recurring maintenance costs for criminal judicial viewers **\$997,784** and the recurring maintenance costs associated with the secure transmission of judges' orders to the clerks of court **\$39,600** be temporarily covered from the existing court expense in FY 2014/15. The total covered in FY 2014/15 from the expense reserve would be **\$1,037,384**. The Workgroup will come back to the TCBC at a later date with recommendations for a comprehensive funding strategy of technology in the trial courts.

**Final Recommendations of the TCBC Trial Court Technology Funding Strategies Workgroup:**

The Workgroup reviewed the draft summary and itemized charts of the circuit requests. They discussed the variations of the requests across the circuits. The Workgroup noted that the recurring and non-recurring requests represented the costs needed for each circuit to: 1) achieve a standard level of implementation for criminal viewers (excluding the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit); and 2) ensure a secure transmission of judicial orders to the clerks of court. The variations in the amount requested by each circuit exist due to: a) the current stage of the circuit's implementation; b) prior county funding; c) utilization of in-house version vendor solutions; and d) varying clerks' case maintenance systems. The Workgroup approved OSCA staff to modify the charts based on additional input from the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit regarding costs specific to the secure transmission of orders and a verification by staff to ensure that the judicial viewer annual maintenance cost applied to criminal viewers only. Additionally, OSCA staff reviewed and reduced the request, if needed, to ensure that the viewer maintenance did not exceed the standard 18% maintenance cost threshold. With those modifications completed (see **Attachment A and Attachment B**), the Workgroup recommends to the TCBC:

- 1) To file the supplemental FY 2014/15 LBR for **\$3,840,587** in non-recurring general revenue for implementation of criminal judicial viewers and the secure transmission of judges' orders to the clerks of court, and **\$727,841** in recurring general revenue for bandwidth cost, judicial viewer annual maintenance cost, and secure transmission annual maintenance cost, for a total request of **\$4,568,428**.
- 2) To include the above Narrative Justification of Funding Request with the supplemental FY 2014/15 LBR.

**TCBC Decisions Needed:**

Approve the two recommendations of the Workgroup listed above.

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting January 6, 2014**  
**Proposed FY 2014/15 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request**  
**Criminal Judicial Viewers/Secure Transmission of Orders to the Clerks of Court**

Circuit	Non-Recurring Costs					Recurring Costs				Total LBR Recurring & Non-Recurring Costs
	Hardware (NR)	Programming-Licensing (NR)	Secure Transmission (NR)	Disaster Recovery (NR)	Total Non-Recurring Costs	Bandwidth (R)	Judicial viewer annual maintenance cost (R)	Secure transmission annual maintenance cost (R)	Total Recurring Maintenance Costs	
1	\$0	\$0	\$26,000	\$0	\$26,000	\$0	\$41,472	\$4,000	\$45,472	\$71,472
2	\$22,400	\$0	\$22,000	\$0	\$44,400	\$83,614	\$31,104	\$3,200	\$117,918	\$162,318
3	\$0	\$0	\$18,000	\$40,000	\$58,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$2,400	\$17,400	\$75,400
4	\$60,000	\$450,000	\$81,770	\$3,600	\$595,370	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$595,370
5	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$52,000	\$82,000	\$0	\$38,880	\$4,800	\$43,680	\$125,680
6	\$0	\$0	\$6,019	\$0	\$6,019	\$0	\$56,000	\$0	\$56,000	\$62,019
7	\$0	\$120,477	\$0	\$0	\$120,477	\$0	\$17,261	\$0	\$17,261	\$137,738
8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$46,627	\$46,627	\$0	\$24,000	\$0	\$24,000	\$70,627
9	\$0	\$0	\$38,000	\$129,000	\$167,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,400	\$6,400	\$173,400
10	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$54,000	\$54,000	\$60,995	\$36,000	\$0	\$96,995	\$150,995
11	\$29,484	\$0	\$137,200	\$0	\$166,684	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$166,684
12	\$0	\$100,000	\$38,000	\$0	\$138,000	\$43,351	\$0	\$4,400	\$47,751	\$185,751
13	\$114,170	\$416,000	\$6,019	\$133,250	\$669,439	\$0	\$46,000	\$0	\$46,000	\$715,439
14	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$154,125	\$154,125	\$0	\$16,000	\$0	\$16,000	\$170,125
15	\$0	\$0	\$9,000	\$20,940	\$29,940	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,940
16	\$0	\$0	\$1,162	\$0	\$1,162	\$0	\$8,000	\$0	\$8,000	\$9,162
17	\$0	\$338,000	\$284,000	\$144,000	\$766,000	\$0	\$76,000	\$0	\$76,000	\$842,000
18	\$21,500	\$50,000	\$0	\$47,500	\$119,000	\$0	\$46,000	\$0	\$46,000	\$165,000
19	\$0	\$0	\$22,000	\$260,000	\$282,000	\$0	\$33,696	\$3,200	\$36,896	\$318,896
20	\$28,000	\$136,344	\$30,000	\$120,000	\$314,344	\$0	\$21,268	\$4,800	\$26,068	\$340,412
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$275,554</b>	<b>\$1,610,821</b>	<b>\$749,170</b>	<b>\$1,205,042</b>	<b>\$3,840,587</b>	<b>\$187,960</b>	<b>\$506,681</b>	<b>\$33,200</b>	<b>\$727,841</b>	<b>\$4,568,428</b>

**Note: Recurring and non-recurring requests represent the costs needed for each circuit to: 1) achieve a standard level of implementation for criminal viewers (excluding the 11th Circuit); and, 2) ensure a secure transmission of judicial orders. Variations in the amount requested by each circuit exist due to: a) the current stage of the circuit's implementation; b) prior county funding; c) utilization of in-house versus vendor solutions; and, d) varying clerks' case maintenance systems.**

**Trial Court Budget Commission**

Attachment B

**Meeting January 6, 2014**

**Proposed FY 2014/15 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request**

**Criminal Judicial Viewers/Secure Transmission of Orders to the Clerks of Court - Request Detail**

Circuit	Requested Required Resources	Requested Amount		Total Amount Requested
		Non-Recurring	Recurring	
<b>1</b>	To implement Mentis circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division <b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b> License fees Implementation Services Annual Software Maintenance <b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>	\$20,000 \$6,000	\$4,000	
<b>1st Total</b>		<b>\$26,000</b>	<b>\$45,472</b>	<b>\$71,472</b>
<b>2</b>	To implement Mentis circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division <b>Hardware:</b> 24" Monitors for 3-Judges/2-JA's 30" Monitors for 11-Courtrooms Desktop computers for 11-Courtrooms/2-Judges/1-JA <b>Additional Bandwidth</b> <b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b> License fees Implementation Services Annual Software Maintenance <b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>	\$1,250 \$7,150 \$14,000	\$83,614 \$3,200	
<b>2nd Total</b>		<b>\$44,400</b>	<b>\$117,918</b>	<b>\$162,318</b>
<b>3</b>	To implement Mentis circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division <b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b> License fees Implementation Services Annual Software Maintenance <b>Disaster Recovery</b> Redundant Servers <b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>	\$12,000 \$6,000	\$2,400	
<b>3rd Total</b>		<b>\$58,000</b>	<b>\$17,400</b>	<b>\$75,400</b>
<b>4</b>	To implement CORE circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division <b>Hardware:</b> Application and Database Servers <b>Integration/Programming:</b> Contract programming to integrate CORE to the viewers <b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b> Programming - Integration to portal <b>Disaster Recovery</b> Back up Appliance	\$60,000 \$450,000 \$81,770 \$3,600		
<b>4th Total</b>		<b>\$595,370</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$595,370</b>
<b>5</b>	To implement Mentis circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division <b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b> License fees Implementation Services Annual Software Maintenance <b>Disaster Recovery</b> Redundant Servers Backup/archiving software <b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>	\$24,000 \$6,000	\$4,800	
<b>5th Total</b>		<b>\$82,000</b>	<b>\$43,680</b>	<b>\$125,680</b>
<b>6</b>	To implement JAWS circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division <b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b> Programming - Integration to portal <b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>	\$6,019		
<b>6th Total</b>		<b>\$6,019</b>	<b>\$56,000</b>	<b>\$62,019</b>

**Trial Court Budget Commission**

Attachment B

Meeting January 6, 2014

**Proposed FY 2014/15 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request**

Criminal Judicial Viewers/Secure Transmission of Orders to the Clerks of Court - Request Detail

Circuit	Requested Required Resources	Requested Amount		Total Amount Requested
		Non-Recurring	Recurring	
7	In Process of making decision on judicial viewer (Pioneer estimates)			
	<b>Software Licenses:</b>			
	License Costs	\$120,477		
	<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>		\$17,261	
<b>7th Total</b>		<b>\$120,477</b>	<b>\$17,261</b>	<b>\$137,738</b>
8	To implement ICMS circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Disaster Recovery</b>			
	Unitrends Rack Mount Backup Appliance	\$29,125		
	Redundant Servers and Software Licenses	\$17,502		
	<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>		\$24,000	
<b>8th Total</b>		<b>\$46,627</b>	<b>\$24,000</b>	<b>\$70,627</b>
9	To implement Mentis circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>			
	License fees	\$32,000		
	Implementation Services	\$6,000		
	Annual Software Maintenance		\$6,400	
	<b>Disaster Recovery</b>			
	NAS Device	\$35,000		
SQL Licenses	\$50,000			
Redundant Servers	\$44,000			
<b>9th Total</b>		<b>\$167,000</b>	<b>\$6,400</b>	<b>\$173,400</b>
10	To implement ICMS circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Additional Bandwidth</b>		\$60,995	
	<b>Disaster Recovery</b>			
	Layer 3 Switch	\$18,000		
	Rack UPS	\$18,000		
	Redundant Servers	\$18,000		
	<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>		\$36,000	
<b>10th Total</b>		<b>\$54,000</b>	<b>\$96,995</b>	<b>\$150,995</b>
11	In Process of making decision on judicial viewer			
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>			
	Monitors	\$29,484		
	Share Point Site	\$100,000		
	Redundant Servers	\$30,400		
NAS Device	\$6,800			
<b>11th Total</b>		<b>\$166,684</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$166,684</b>
12	To implement Mentis in Desoto & Manatee County/Pioneer in Sarasota County as JV for criminal			
	<b>Integration/Programming</b>			
	Pioneer - Initial UI, Web and Service development, testing and remediation	\$100,000		
	<b>Additional Bandwidth</b>		\$43,351	
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders (Desoto &amp; Manatee County - Mentis)</b>			
	License fees	\$12,000		
	Implementation Services	\$6,000		
	Annual Software Maintenance		\$2,400	
<b>Secured Transmission of Orders (Sarasota County - Pioneer)</b>				
License fees	\$10,000			
Implementation Services	\$10,000			
Annual Software Maintenance		\$2,000		
<b>12th Total</b>		<b>\$138,000</b>	<b>\$47,751</b>	<b>\$185,751</b>

**Trial Court Budget Commission**

Attachment B

Meeting January 6, 2014

**Proposed FY 2014/15 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request**

**Criminal Judicial Viewers/Secure Transmission of Orders to the Clerks of Court - Request Detail**

Circuit	Requested Required Resources	Requested Amount		Total Amount Requested
		Non-Recurring	Recurring	
13	To implement JAWS circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Hardware:</b>			
	Redundant Servers	\$60,000		
	Monitors for each courtroom	\$15,934		
	22" Monitors	\$8,236		
	Additional storage shelves for SAN	\$30,000		
	<b>Integration/Programming:</b>			
	Software application development of new code and modifications necessary for criminal	\$416,000		
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>			
	Programming - Integration to portal	\$6,019		
<b>Disaster Recovery</b>	Redundant Servers	\$20,000		
	iSCSI Switches	\$8,000		
	SAN Storage shelves	\$30,000		
	Back up Appliance	\$25,000		
	Software Licenses	\$48,500		
	SSL Certificate	\$1,750		
	<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>		\$46,000	
	<b>13th Total</b>		<b>\$669,439</b>	<b>\$46,000</b>
14	To implement ICMS circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Disaster Recovery</b>			
	Redundant Servers	\$75,000		
	Recovery-822 Backup Appliance	\$29,125		
	SQL Licensing Fees	\$50,000		
<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>		\$16,000		
<b>14th Total</b>		<b>\$154,125</b>	<b>\$16,000</b>	<b>\$170,125</b>
15	To implement ICMS circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>			
	Programming - Integration to portal	\$9,000		
<b>Disaster Recovery</b>	Redundant Servers and back up	\$20,940		
	<b>15th Total</b>	<b>\$29,940</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$29,940</b>
16	To implement JAWS circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>			
	Programming - Integration to portal	\$1,162		
<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>		\$8,000		
<b>16th Total</b>		<b>\$1,162</b>	<b>\$8,000</b>	<b>\$9,162</b>
17	To implement an In-House system as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Integration/Programming:</b>			
	Programming the in-house system to meet criminal division needs	\$338,000		
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>			
	Programming - Integration to portal	\$284,000		
	<b>Disaster Recovery</b>			
	Redundant Servers	\$120,000		
Back up Appliance	\$24,000			
<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>		\$76,000		
<b>17th Total</b>		<b>\$766,000</b>	<b>\$76,000</b>	<b>\$842,000</b>

**Trial Court Budget Commission**

Attachment B

**Meeting January 6, 2014**

**Proposed FY 2014/15 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request**

**Criminal Judicial Viewers/Secure Transmission of Orders to the Clerks of Court - Request Detail**

Circuit	Requested Required Resources	Requested Amount		Total Amount Requested
		Non-Recurring	Recurring	
<b>18</b>	To implement ICMS in Brevard County/In-House system in Seminole County as JV for criminal			
	<b>Hardware:</b>			
	Computers for Judges benches	\$15,000		
	Monitors for Judges benches	\$6,500		
	<b>Integration/Programming:</b>			
	Contract programming to integrate Clerks CMS to the viewers	\$50,000		
	<b>Disaster Recovery</b>			
Redundant Servers	\$28,000			
Disk arrays	\$16,000			
Temporary internet connectivity	\$1,500			
Switches/Network components	\$2,000			
<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>			\$46,000	
<b>18th Total</b>		<b>\$119,000</b>	<b>\$46,000</b>	<b>\$165,000</b>
<b>19</b>	To implement Mentis circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>			
	License fees	\$16,000		
	Implementation Services	\$6,000		
	Annual Software Maintenance		\$3,200	
	<b>Disaster Recovery</b>			
	Redundant Servers	\$80,000		
Microsoft SQL and Server Licensing	\$140,000			
Mentis Disaster Recover Integration	\$40,000			
<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>			\$33,696	
<b>19th Total</b>		<b>\$282,000</b>	<b>\$36,896</b>	<b>\$318,896</b>
<b>20</b>	To implement Mentis circuit wide as the judicial viewer for criminal division			
	<b>Hardware:</b>			
	Computers for courtroom upgrades	\$14,000		
	Monitors for Judges benches (Glades/Hendry)	\$3,000		
	Monitors for courtroom upgrade	\$11,000		
	<b>Software License:</b>			
	License fees	\$136,344		
<b>Secured Transmission of Orders</b>				
License fees	\$24,000			
Implementation Services	\$6,000			
Annual Software Maintenance		\$4,800		
<b>Disaster Recovery</b>				
(12) Redundant Servers	\$120,000			
<b>Recurring Maintenance Costs</b>			\$21,268	
<b>20th Total</b>		<b>\$314,344</b>	<b>\$26,068</b>	<b>\$340,412</b>
<b>Total Technology Cost Requested</b>		<b>\$3,840,587</b>	<b>\$727,841</b>	<b>\$4,568,428</b>

## **Agenda Item IV: Post-Adjudicatory Drug Court Study by OPPAGA**

### **Background:**

In the fiscal year 2013-14 budget, the Legislature appropriated \$5.8 million (\$5.5 million in non-recurring general revenue in the trial court budget and \$297,429 in recurring general revenue in OSCA's budget) to continue the eight post-adjudicatory expansion drug courts that originally were funded with federal grant funds. Of the non-recurring funding, \$5 million was for substance abuse treatment, drug testing, and ancillary services, and approximately \$500,000 was for 14 Other Personal Services (OPS) positions.

Budget proviso language directs the Legislature's Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) to evaluate the effectiveness of the post-adjudicatory or expansion drug courts, using output, cost, and outcome measures. Further, the "report shall also compare program performance across the 8 post-adjudicatory drug court programs and identify reasons that performance may vary across programs. The report shall include recommendations for improving the effectiveness of these programs." The report is due to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate by January 13, 2014.

### **Judicial Branch FY 2014-15 Budget Request:**

The trial court portion of the judicial branch legislative budget request (LBR) for fiscal year 2014-15 includes a placeholder of \$544,013 in recurring funding for the continuation of 14 OPS positions (eleven Court Program Specialists, two Drug Court Managers, and one Senior Court Program Specialist) as part of the post-adjudicatory drug court program currently in Broward, Escambia, Hillsborough, Marion, Orange, Pinellas, Polk, and Volusia counties.

The trial courts did not request funding for substance abuse treatment, drug testing, and ancillary services for FY 2014-15. The LBR notes that, if this issue is funded, the trial courts recommend that continuation of funding for treatment services be placed in the appropriate executive branch agency.

The LBR narrative also notes that the budget issue will be revised with any findings from the OPPAGA report, as necessary.

### **Key Findings from OPPAGA Report:**

The OPPAGA provided a draft of the report to the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) for review and comment. The OPPAGA anticipates releasing the final report during the week of January 6, as it is scheduled to present the findings to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Criminal and Civil Justice on January 9.

The draft report found that expansion drug courts result in cost savings through prison diversion and contribute to reduced recidivism. In particular, the report notes that the state would have saved \$7.6 million if all 769 successful completers had been prison bound. It also notes that drug courts reduce

future criminal justice costs by helping participants avoid criminal behavior. The report reflects that only 9 percent of drug court completers received a felony conviction within two years of completion, compared to 19 percent for a comparison group. The study also looked at offenders who completed expansion drug court more recently. The analysis shows that the probability of felony conviction for drug court completers is reduced by 49 percent.

Among the key findings from the report are:

- Many expansion drug court participants were diverted from prison;
- Drug court completion rates varied, affected by the availability and use of program options and judicial interaction;
- Costs varied significantly across the eight expansion drug courts;
- Additional costs associated with some residential treatment options and differences in local support resulted in variations in drug court costs;
- Participation in expansion drug court reduced recidivism; and
- Diverting prison-bound offenders to drug courts can provide some cost savings.

The draft report outlines two options for legislative action to maintain the effectiveness of the expansion drug courts:

- Require that judges sentencing offenders with scores of 22 points or less (a score typically requiring a non-state prison sanction) provide written justification for the drug court placement; and
- Because treatment options, including residential treatment, are a factor in increasing the success of drug court participants, require each drug court to have at least one residential treatment option for judges to use for participants who require this level of treatment. The report notes that courts could implement this more costly feature at current funding levels by reducing the number of program participants.

### **Decision Needed:**

The issue for the TCBC is whether to recommend any revisions to the FY 2014-15 LBR based on the draft OPPAGA report. Among the options are:

**Option 1:** Continue with original placeholder request of \$544,013 in recurring funding for the continuation of the 14 OPS drug court positions.

**Option 2:** Amend placeholder to convert OPS to FTE. Total recurring salary dollars needed for 14 FTE is \$885,888. If this option is approved, additional consideration should be given to utilizing existing unfunded FTE and only requesting the necessary salary dollars.

Prepared by OSCA Deputy State Courts Administrator's Office, January 5, 2014