

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Court Interpreting

The funding methodology approved for the court interpreting element during last year's needs assessment is based on applying the average two year growth (23.4%) in non-English speaking population to prior year contractual expenditures and the cost of existing positions.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below. On the LBR forms, circuits were asked to estimate the amount of contractual funding they would no longer need to offset the cost of requested positions, which is also shown below.

Circuit	Positions	Contractual Savings	Contractual (105420)	Expense Recurring	Justification
2	1.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$51,289	(\$11,000)		\$2,400	Certified Spanish interpreter needed to cover interpretations for 837 persons and due to increasing demands for rare languages, such as the Mexican dialect Tzotzill, and the inability to hire certified contract interpreters. Additional expense requested to address travel to 5 other counties in a large rural circuit.
3			\$15,000		Shortfall in FY 2009-10 resulted in "borrowing" \$12K from another circuit. Balance of \$3K requested due to increasing demand for certified Spanish and Russian interpreters.
4	1.0 FTE Supervising Court Interpreter 1.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$112,235	(\$47,000)			Currently, a Contract and Grant Specialist handles the assignment of interpreters. Supervisor and interpreter needed to properly support increasing number of cases requiring foreign/sign language and provide efficiencies as contract interpreters are paid a minimum fee for two hours of service.
5	5.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$256,445	(\$65,000)			Circuit is requesting 5 new positions to be able to better provide certified interpreting services, based on 17.7% one year ethnic growth rate, and due to increasing trend in events reported.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Contractual Savings</b>	<b>Contractual (105420)</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>7</b>	1.0 FTE Court Operations Manager 3.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$219,571	(\$25,000)			Annual ethnic growth rate is 14.5%. Due to the upsurge of interpreter events, circuit has increased utilization of freelance interpreters. Request to control costs and provide consistent quality services.
<b>8</b>			\$20,000		Based on 09-10 allocation of \$42,363, it is anticipated the 8th circuit will be \$20K short in 10-11 and therefore, unable to cover increased demand for interpreter services.
<b>9</b>	2.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$102,578	(\$98,000)			Positions requested to hire one Creole and one Spanish interpreter. Circuit has experienced significant increase in these interpretations over the last four years. It will now be more cost efficient to hire full-time interpreters as opposed to continuing to rely on freelance interpreting services.
<b>11</b>	4.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$205,156		\$105,933		Positions requested for criminal traffic cases due to increasing workload demands. Contractual requested to restore \$105,933 reduction to 09-10 allocation.
<b>12</b>	1.0 FTE Supervising Court Interpreter 3.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$214,813	(\$200,000)			Circuit wishes to change from a contractual to a hybrid model in an effort to obtain better cost efficiencies. Currently, contractual interpreters incur mileage costs, require a two hour minimum fee, and are less flexible in scheduling.
<b>13</b>	1.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$51,289				As an alternative to receiving additional contractual funds, based on the projected growth rate.
<b>14</b>			\$12,000		Based on expending 100% of the total 09-10 allotment with continued growth.
<b>15</b>	1.0 FTE Supervising Court Interpreter Total cost = \$60,946				Funding of this position will allow for the circuit to dedicate (and compensate) one staff interpreter to manage the office, creating a more efficient and organized office, thereby reducing the reliance on costly freelance interpreters.
<b>18</b>			\$16,000		The 09-10 allocation of \$47,618 is less than estimated costs for 08-09 (\$55K). Circuit requests \$16K to increase 09-10 budget to cover deficit and to allow for growth.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Contractual Savings</b>	<b>Contractual (105420)</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>19</b>	3.0 FTE Court Interpreter Total cost = \$153,867	(\$120,000)			With continued growth, increasing demand for certified interpreters for trials, and rising contractual costs, circuit requests 2 Spanish and 1 Creole interpreters to assure availability, quality control, and cost containment.
<b>20</b>	1.0 FTE Court Interpreter (2 Part-time) Total cost = \$55,124	(\$69,956)		\$14,824	Population growth of 118% between 2000 and 2006 which is increasing demand for in-courtroom sessions. Funding of two part-time positions will prevent unnecessary premium contract dollars being spent. Additional expense requested to restore funding lost during cuts.
<b>Total</b>	<b>28.0 FTE at \$1,483,313</b>	<b>(\$635,956)</b>	<b>\$168,933</b>	<b>\$17,224</b>	

**Options:**

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$2,029,113). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that should be reduced when allocating the new positions.

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (\$1,073,372). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, reduce each circuit's contractual allotment by the contractual savings amount indicated.

**Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$2,029,113). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that should be reduced when allocating the new positions.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$2,029,113). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that should be reduced when allocating the new positions.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009**

**Court Interpreting  
Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR**

Circuit	FY 2009/10 FTE	FY 2009/10 Salaries, Benefits, & Expenses <sup>1</sup>	FY 2009/10 Contractual Allotment	FY 2009/10 Total Budget	Estimated FY 2008/09 Contractual Expenditures <sup>2</sup>	FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment (Growth Rate = 23.4% <sup>3</sup> )	Option 1 Total FY 2010/11 Additional Need	FY 2010/11 Requested FTE	FY 2010/11 Estimated Salaries, Benefits & Expenses	FY 2010/11 Contractual Cost Savings	FY 2010/11 Requested Contractual	FY 2010/11 Requested Expense (Recurring)	FY 2009/10 Total Budget and FY 2010/11 LBR	Option 2 Requests Within the Needs Assessment
1	0		\$70,768	\$70,768	\$64,036	\$79,020	\$8,252	0					\$70,768	\$0
2	0		\$23,067	\$23,067	\$20,545	\$25,352	\$2,285	1	\$51,289	(\$11,000)		\$2,400	\$65,756	\$2,285
3	0		\$26,953	\$26,953	\$26,713	\$32,964	\$6,011	0			\$15,000		\$41,953	\$6,011
4	0		\$233,760	\$233,760	\$204,782	\$252,701	\$18,941	2	\$112,235	(\$47,000)			\$298,995	\$18,941
5	0		\$168,183	\$168,183	\$145,547	\$179,605	\$11,422	5	\$256,445	(\$65,000)			\$359,628	\$11,422
6	0		\$275,152	\$275,152	\$261,413	\$322,583	\$47,431	0					\$275,152	\$0
7	1	\$58,763	\$165,181	\$223,944	\$147,124	\$254,064	\$30,120	4	\$219,571	(\$25,000)			\$418,515	\$30,120
8	1	\$51,269	\$42,363	\$93,632	\$42,354	\$115,531	\$21,899	0			\$20,000		\$113,632	\$20,000
9	9	\$510,253	\$227,635	\$737,888	\$201,686	\$878,533	\$140,645	2	\$102,578	(\$98,000)			\$742,466	\$102,578
10	6	\$321,450	\$87,586	\$409,036	\$83,976	\$500,296	\$91,260	0					\$409,036	\$0
11	52	\$3,077,714	\$337,811	\$3,415,525	\$350,513	\$4,230,432	\$814,907	4	\$205,156		\$105,933		\$3,726,614	\$311,089
12	0	\$0	\$289,456	\$289,456	\$280,042	\$345,572	\$56,116	4	\$214,813	(\$200,000)			\$304,269	\$214,813
13	9	\$441,092	\$122,931	\$564,023	\$115,497	\$686,831	\$122,808	1	\$51,289				\$615,312	\$51,289
14	0	\$0	\$69,699	\$69,699	\$59,775	\$73,762	\$4,063	0			\$12,000		\$81,699	\$4,063
15	13	\$682,644	\$101,213	\$783,857	\$89,749	\$953,134	\$169,277	1	\$60,946				\$844,803	\$60,946
16	2	\$103,169	\$17,145	\$120,314	\$17,467	\$148,865	\$28,551	0					\$120,314	\$0
17	15.5	\$800,199	\$123,878	\$924,077	\$116,163	\$1,130,791	\$206,714	0					\$924,077	\$0
18	1	\$45,077	\$47,618	\$92,695	\$51,699	\$119,422	\$26,727	0			\$16,000		\$108,695	\$16,000
19	2	\$127,744	\$375,441	\$503,185	\$333,150	\$568,743	\$65,558	3	\$153,867	(\$120,000)			\$537,052	\$153,867
20	7	\$363,099	\$445,544	\$808,643	\$418,724	\$964,769	\$156,126	1	\$55,124	(\$69,956)		\$14,824	\$808,635	\$69,948
Reserve			\$118,531	\$118,531		\$118,531							\$118,531	
<b>Total</b>	<b>118.5</b>	<b>\$6,582,473</b>	<b>\$3,369,915</b>	<b>\$9,952,388</b>	<b>\$3,030,955</b>	<b>\$11,981,501</b>	<b>\$2,029,113</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>\$1,483,313</b>	<b>(\$635,956)</b>	<b>\$168,933</b>	<b>\$17,224</b>	<b>\$10,985,902</b>	<b>\$1,073,372</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>								<b>\$2,029,113</b>						

<sup>1</sup> Includes salaries, benefits, and expenses provided by OSCA, Budget Office.

<sup>2</sup> Based on fiscal year 2008-09 expenditures (as of June 30, 2009) provided by OSCA, Budget Office and estimated certified forward dollars.

<sup>3</sup> Growth rate applied to FY 2008-09 expenditures plus FY 2009-10 position costs. The growth rate was derived from the percentage increase in the ethnic population in Florida averaged across all circuits from CY 2004 to CY 2006 (averaged over 2 years), published by the RAND and FedStats. Ethnic statistics are used as a proxy for "Percent of People in Florida who speak a language other than English at home".

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Expert Witness

The funding methodology approved for the expert witness element during last year's needs assessment is based on applying the statewide percent growth in non-custody expenditures to the current year contractual budget.

In June 2009, the TCBC approved a policy to prohibit the use of SCRTF revenues to perform custody evaluations while still allowing circuits to use due process cost recovery funds to perform these evaluations.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Contractual (105420)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>4</b>	\$15,046	Relates to 10% continued growth over the base budget amount.
<b>8</b>	\$20,000	Based on 09-10 allocation of \$52,303, it is anticipated the circuit will be \$20K short and unable to cover increases in vendor services.
<b>8</b>	\$50,000	Custody Evaluations - GAL, Expert Witness, and Cost Recovery funds are no longer available or adequate to provide custody evaluation services. Judges are expressing concern and the legislature has imposed a duty on the courts to make decisions in family cases that are in the best interests of the children, with limited and often biased information.
<b>13</b>	\$72,367	The 13th Circuit's 09-10 funding was reduced to a level which may not meet the demand for psych evaluations in 10-11.
<b>18</b>	\$35,000	Circuit takes extraordinary measures to manage expert costs, including asking the defense and prosecution to stipulate to one competency evaluation. Costs are difficult to contain b/c attorneys have no incentive given that the court covers these costs.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$192,413</b>	

#### Options:

Option One- Do not file LBR as a decline in expenditures is projected for FY 2010-11 and there is an existing \$323,888 reserve for this element.

#### Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Do not file LBR as a decline in expenditures is projected for FY 2010-11 and there is an existing \$323,888 reserve for this element.

#### Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:

Do not file LBR as a decline in expenditures is projected for FY 2010-11 and there is an existing \$323,888 reserve for this element.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Court Reporting

The funding methodology approved for the court reporting element during last year's needs assessment is based on a funding ceiling applied to all recurring dollars budgeted for each circuit and adding the cost of bringing cost sharing dollars into the court's budget. The ceiling is calculated using \$50 per steno/real-time hour, \$25 per digital/analog hour, and \$7 per transcript page (using projected FY 2010-11 Uniform Data Reporting System figures). In conjunction with the FY 2010-11 LBR process, the TCBC requested that the Funding Methodology Committee review the court reporting ceiling calculation to determine if certain modifiers should be applied.

Circuit direct services requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below. On the LBR forms, circuits were asked to estimate the amount of contractual funding they would no longer need to offset the cost of requested positions, which is also shown below.

Circuit	Positions	Contractual Savings	Direct Service Contractual Requests (105420)	Expense Recurring	Justification
2	1.0 FTE Court Reporter II Total cost = \$68,374		\$19,704		Handle increased backlog created by high turnover (due to only hiring at minimum), reduced contractual budget, increased jury trials, increased turnaround time for appellate transcripts, and increased number of transcripts requested by PD. Contractual requested to restore to level before cuts, used for transcript production.
4	1.0 FTE ECR Manager Total cost = \$63,216	(\$40,000)	\$148,064		Currently, CRS Mgr handles all duties related to both steno and DCR for six locations across 3 counties. ECR Mgr is needed to properly manage DCR to ensure standards are being met. Further, contractual savings of \$40K would result as ECR Mgr could begin preparing statistical reports now being prepared by contractual agency. Will also eliminate clerk performing digital monitoring in Clay County. Anticipated 10% increase in court reporting services due to rising crime rates and new SA standards resulting in a 61% increase in criminal trials.
5	3.5 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$175,605		\$15,000		FTE requested to properly staff DCR equipment previously installed during 08-09 for Lake and Marion County expansion projects. Increase in contractual costs paid to clerk to cover increased number of courtrooms/hearing rooms currently under construction for Sumter County Expansion Project.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Contractual Savings</b>	<b>Direct Service Contractual Requests (105420)</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>6</b>	4.0 FTE Court Reporter I 1.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$302,489	(\$343,992)			DCR cut in RIF. Currently, using cost recovery to maintain growing number of transcript requests. However, cost recovery funds are now short while transcript production continues to fall behind. 36.7% growth in filings over last 7 years has resulted in the need for full-time stenographers. Will save a significant amount in contractual costs.
<b>7</b>	1.0 FTE Court Reporter II 1.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$117,999				Position is requested to operationalize new equipment being requested in 10-11 LBR for the Richard O. Watson Judicial Center multi-phase renovation (\$60K for 3 courtrooms). CRII cut in RIF, needed to maintain current caseload.
<b>8</b>	2.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$99,250				Positions cut in RIF. Currently, staff are having to travel to courthouses and due to no funding for overtime pay, reporters must flex additional workload or receive comp time at time and a half.
<b>9</b>	3.0 FTE Court Reporter I 2.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$288,898				Increase in judges/magistrates since 1997; overtime transcription was halted due to budgetary constraints; transcript requests have increased; appellate transcripts are being filed as late as 90 days. Steno reporters are no longer able to cover circuit criminal courts. As such, DCR's are covering those courts when not in trial. This increase in workload for simultaneous proceedings is causing coverage problems.
<b>10</b>	7.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$347,375				Workload continues to increase for both monitoring and transcript production. No new positions have been funded despite requests over the last 2 years.
<b>11</b>	1.0 FTE CR Manager 1.0 FTE Program Coordinator 1.0 FTE Court Reporter I 1.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. I Total cost = \$296,692	(\$49,400)			Mgr and AA cut in RIF. Since the RIF, workload has been distributed among 3 employees in the Circuit Criminal Division. This has caused delays in transcript appeals, research, and calendar coordination. Increased workload in UFC and 1 <sup>st</sup> appearances. Circuit is assuming responsibility of researching, administering steno requests and managing years worth of steno notes due to the demise of Capitol Reporters.
<b>14</b>	1.0 FTE Court Reporter I Total cost = \$63,216	(\$50,000)		\$5,000	Position is requested to provide more control and oversight over the record, easier scheduling, and more reliability. Additional expense requested for travel throughout six counties.
<b>15</b>	1.0 FTE CR Manager Total cost = \$74,122				Currently, staff stenographer handles all duties related to managing CR program. Position needed to properly manage office and compensate this person ensuring fair labor standards are being met.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Contractual Savings</b>	<b>Direct Service Contractual Requests (105420)</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>18</b>	2.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$99,250		\$53,500		Positions needed for expanding responsibilities such as providing DCR playbacks for juries, written transcripts, redacted recordings, and testifying in court proceedings. Brevard County requests additional contractual funds to continue to pay current vendor. Economic turmoil juxtaposed with the provision of the due process requirements, it is unclear if another vendor has the business structure to meet the demands of this court.
<b>20</b>	6.0 FTE Digital Court Reporter Total cost = \$297,750	(\$156,000)		\$25,000	One FTE cut in RIF. Positions requested as part of a 3 year plan to obtain a grand total of 16.5 new positions to meet goal of 1 DCR per every 2 courtrooms. Current overall staffing ratio of 4.4:1. Additional expense requested for travel and to partially restore funding lost during cuts.
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.5 FTE at \$2,294,236</b>	<b>(\$639,392)</b>	<b>\$236,268</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	

For the ceiling calculation, staff recommends three adjustments:

- 1) Separate out equipment maintenance expenditures from direct services costs as there was a new standard approved for maintenance in December 2008.
- 2) Add \$25 per media copy (e.g., CD's).
- 3) Apply a 10% non-direct services modifier based on the current statewide average percent of the recurring court reporting budget devoted to overhead/coordination.

**Options:**

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$10,855,258 using the adjusted ceiling calculation) and adding the cost of bringing cost sharing dollars into the court's budget. If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that may be reduced when allocating the new positions.

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (\$2,332,509 using the adjusted ceiling calculation) and adding the cost of bringing cost sharing dollars into the court's budget. If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, reduce each circuit's contractual allotment by the contractual savings amount indicated.

**Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$10,855,258 using the adjusted ceiling calculation) and adding the cost of bringing cost sharing dollars into the court's budget (\$759,892). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that may be reduced when allocating the new positions.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$10,855,258 using the adjusted ceiling calculation) and adding the cost of bringing cost sharing dollars into the court's budget (\$759,892). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that may be reduced when allocating the new positions.

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting August 18, 2009**  
**Court Reporting**  
**Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR**

Circuit	FY 2009/10 Total Adjusted Budget <sup>1</sup>	FY 2010/11 Requested FTE	FY2010/11 Requested Salaries, Benefits, & Expenses	FY 2010/11 Requested Expense	FY 2010/11 Contractual Savings	FY 2010/11 Requested Direct Service Contractual	FY 2009/10 Total Budget and LBR	Option 1 FY 2010/11 Adjusted Needs Assessment <sup>2</sup>	Option 2 Requests Within the Adjusted Needs Assessment
1	\$1,141,671	0	\$0				\$1,141,671	\$1,375,577	\$0
2	\$627,624	1	\$68,374			\$19,704	\$715,702	\$1,309,485	\$88,078
3	\$359,613	0	\$0				\$359,613	\$386,948	\$0
4	\$1,494,927	1	\$63,216		(\$40,000)	\$148,064	\$1,666,207	\$2,646,463	\$211,280
5	\$786,491	3.5	\$175,605			\$15,000	\$977,096	\$948,806	\$162,315
6	\$2,144,728	5	\$302,489		(\$343,992)		\$2,103,225	\$2,879,892	\$302,489
7	\$846,380	2	\$117,999				\$964,379	\$1,010,531	\$117,999
8	\$819,331	2	\$99,250				\$918,581	\$912,364	\$93,033
9	\$2,237,175	5	\$288,898				\$2,526,073	\$2,672,342	\$288,898
10	\$916,579	7	\$347,375				\$1,263,954	\$1,164,485	\$247,906
11	\$2,760,685	5	\$296,692		(\$49,400)		\$3,007,977	\$4,627,066	\$296,692
12	\$989,456	0	\$0				\$989,456	\$2,141,697	\$0
13	\$1,814,578	0	\$0				\$1,814,578	\$2,792,435	\$0
14	\$412,497	1	\$63,216	\$5,000	(\$50,000)		\$430,713	\$722,755	\$68,216
15	\$1,229,529	1	\$74,122				\$1,303,651	\$1,557,542	\$74,122
16	\$256,264	0	\$0				\$256,264	\$234,458	\$0
17	\$2,271,275	0	\$0				\$2,271,275	\$4,010,058	\$0
18	\$986,723	2	\$99,250			\$53,500	\$1,139,473	\$2,337,319	\$152,750
19	\$973,787	0	\$0				\$973,787	\$651,536	\$0
20	\$1,015,372	6	\$297,750	\$25,000	(\$156,000)		\$1,182,122	\$1,244,103	\$228,731
Reserve	\$685,920	0					\$685,920	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$24,770,604</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>\$2,294,236</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>(\$639,392)</b>	<b>\$236,268</b>	<b>\$26,691,716</b>	<b>\$35,625,862</b>	<b>\$2,332,509</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>								<b>\$10,855,258</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Includes salaries, benefits, and expenses and FY 2009/10 contractual allocations provided by OSCA, Budget Office for cost centers 129, 267, and 729 and adjusted for FY 2008/09 Estimated Maintenance Expenditures.

<sup>2</sup> The adjusted needs assessment was calculated by summing \$50 multiplied by steno/real-time hours, \$25 multiplied by digital/audio hours, \$7 per transcript page and \$25 per media copy. A Non Direct Services Modifier of 10% was applied.

<b>Cost sharing increase</b>	<b>\$759,892</b>
------------------------------	------------------

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Due Process Equipment

In December 2008, the TCBC approved several new policies related to the purchase of court reporting equipment, including standard allowable costs, refresh timeframes, and a 13% maintenance formula as recommended by the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. FY 2009-10 court reporting equipment requests were approved based on these policies and added to the total needs assessment figure for the court reporting element. Policies do not currently exist regarding the purchase of court interpreting equipment.

Circuit equipment requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the following tables. The first table contains requests for court interpreting equipment. The second table contains requests for maintenance or refresh of existing court reporting equipment. The third table contains requests for expansion of court reporting equipment, such as continued DCR implementation or the addition of new courtrooms/hearing rooms.

Court Interpreting Technology			
Circuit	OCO	Expense Non-Recurring	Justification
3	\$155,000		Implementation of 5 courtrooms. Requesting polycom VCON systems to provide remote interpreting services. These systems will also allow digital recording capabilities between 5 courtrooms and their adjacent jail facilities.
11		\$17,000	Refresh of existing wireless interpretation systems.
13	\$117,000	\$15,000	Implementation of 3 courtrooms. Requesting funds in order to create efficiencies by implementing a centralized model for remote interpreting services from Tampa to Plant City.
14	\$50,000		Implementation of 16 courtrooms. Requesting funds to enhance existing AV systems and for additional audio mixers with required option cards, microphones, headsets, video systems, and monitors to allow for remote interpreting across the circuit.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$322,000</b>	<b>\$32,000</b>	

#### Options:

Option One- File LBR based on circuit requests.

Option Two- Do not file LBR.

#### Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File LBR based on circuit requests. However, ask the Commission on Trial Court Performance and Accountability (in collaboration with the Florida Courts Technology Commission) to develop recommendations for the use of remote interpreting technology, including cost standards for purchasing equipment, as part of their development of standards of operation and best practices.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Defer approval of the circuit court interpreting equipment requests pending the submission of additional detail from the circuits regarding specific component types and costs associated with these components which will be presented to the Executive Committee at their next meeting.

<b>Court Reporting Refresh Technology</b>			
<b>Circuit</b>	<b>OCO</b>	<b>Expense Non-Recurring</b>	<b>Maintenance Recurring</b>
<b>1</b>	\$38,400		
<b>3</b>			\$63,617
<b>4</b>	\$111,516	\$53,502	\$4,456
<b>5</b>	\$21,299	\$14,047	\$8,357
<b>6</b>	\$90,384	\$5,500	
<b>7</b>	\$122,650		
<b>8</b>	\$96,200	\$19,600	
<b>10</b>	\$170,000		\$60,000
<b>11</b>	\$149,280		
<b>12</b>	\$37,898	\$6,150	\$31,600
<b>13</b>	\$26,400		
<b>14</b>	\$151,300		\$63,914
<b>15</b>	\$47,026	\$6,716	\$6,000
<b>16</b>	\$43,900		\$7,600
<b>17</b>		\$81,600	\$1,200
<b>18</b>	\$108,542		\$2,650
<b>19</b>	\$195,410	\$21,900	
<b>20</b>	\$11,200	\$353,600	\$6,339
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,421,405</b>	<b>\$562,615</b>	<b>\$255,733</b>

<b>Court Reporting Expansion Technology</b>			
<b>Circuit</b>	<b>OCO</b>	<b>Expense Non-Recurring</b>	<b>FY 2011-12 Maintenance Recurring</b>
<b>2</b>	\$229,000		\$22,000
<b>3</b>	\$23,100	\$26,900	
<b>4</b>	\$107,391	\$7,490	\$13,786
<b>5</b>	\$33,020	\$40,300	\$11,380
<b>6</b>	\$19,200	\$2,890	\$1,440
<b>7</b>	\$83,800	\$3,300	\$10,000
<b>11</b>	\$281,735		\$51,122
<b>12</b>	\$24,000		
<b>14</b>	\$129,500		\$14,900
<b>15</b>	\$75,771	\$179,071	
<b>20</b>	\$152,730	\$3,600	\$18,760
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,159,247</b>	<b>\$263,551</b>	<b>\$143,388</b>

There are four circuits that require special attention.

First, the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting refresh equipment funding (\$14,200 in OCO and \$9,600 in Expense) in order to continue the deployment of in-house software in 8 courtrooms in Alachua County. The circuit began development of this court reporting software in FY 2008-09 as an alternative to paying outside vendors (in order to significantly reduce licensing and maintenance costs). The TCBC approved the development of the software contingent upon it being designed as open source so that may be used statewide per the principles outlined by the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. It was also approved by the TCBC contingent on being within cost standards and that OSCA ISS provide oversight/coordination of the project. As with all court reporting technology, this software must also be in compliance with approved FCTC technical and functional standards.

Currently, the software does not meet the FCTC technical standards. In May 2009, the circuit indicated that the software meets the technical standards for hearing rooms but not courtrooms. As such, previous FY 2008-09 year-end funds (\$21,000 in OCO) were allocated to the circuit for 2 courtrooms and 9 hearing rooms under the condition that the circuit would keep CourtSmart software running parallel until the software meets the standards and has been tested for a certain period of time. The Court Reporting Technology Workgroup will need to review the software for compliance after the test period (FY 2009-10). Further, during FY 2009-10, OSCA ISS and the circuit will develop a plan for the deployment of the software to other circuits and an on-going plan for the long-term maintenance of the software (e.g., hiring programmers, etc.).

Second, the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting refresh funding (\$170,000 in OCO and \$60,000 in maintenance) in order to change from a time and materials maintenance contract with CourtSmart to a standard maintenance contract with another vendor. The circuit states that they are in need of additional functionality (primarily for backup/recovery), but do not feel that their current provider can meet their needs even if the newest CourtSmart software is purchased. The circuit states that this will reduce long-term costs. This request was submitted per the TCBC's approved policy stating that if a circuit wishes to change vendors, a special request would be filed for the TCBC's consideration.

Third, the 12<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting expansion funding (\$24,000 in OCO) in order to purchase 2 lap-tops for emergency use. The circuit is currently completely outfitted with court reporting technology. Although this request is within cost standards, back-up technology is not currently contemplated by the standards for expansion purposes.

Fourth, the 15<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting expansion funding (\$75,771 in OCO and \$179,071 in Expense) in order to purchase 19 video packages to upgrade/migrate from FTR local monitoring systems to a FTR central monitoring system that will cover 13 courtrooms and 6 hearing rooms. This request will bring the circuit's court reporting technology within the FCTC technical standards by providing video capability for digital court reporting. This request is also within cost standards.

## **Options:**

### ***Refresh and Maintenance of Existing Technology***

Option One- File LBR based on those circuit requests that are within: 1) the approved cost standards and 2) the 13% maintenance formula. Also, include the special requests for the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit (with a requirement for the circuit to run

parallel CourtSmart software until the new software becomes compliant) and 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

Option Two- Same as Option One, but do not include the special requests for the 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Circuits.

***Expansion of Technology***

Option One- File LBR based on those circuit requests that are: 1) within the approved cost standards, 2) in compliance with the digital expansion phase-in plan, and 3) within the 13% maintenance formula. Also, include the special requests for the 12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Circuits.

Option Two- Same as Option One, but do not include the special requests for the 12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Circuits.

**Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

***Refresh and Maintenance of Existing Technology***

File LBR based on those circuit requests that are within: 1) the approved cost standards and 2) the 13% maintenance formula. Also, include the special requests for the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit (with a requirement for the circuit to run parallel CourtSmart software until the new software becomes compliant) and 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

***Expansion of Technology***

File LBR based on those circuit requests that are: 1) within the approved cost standards, 2) in compliance with the digital expansion phase-in plan, and 3) within the 13% maintenance formula. Also, include the special requests for the 12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Circuits.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

***Refresh and Maintenance of Existing Technology***

File LBR based on those circuit requests that are within: 1) the approved cost standards and 2) the 13% maintenance formula. Also, include the special requests for the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit (with a requirement for the circuit to run parallel CourtSmart software until the new software becomes compliant) and 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

***Expansion of Technology***

File LBR based on those circuit requests that are: 1) within the approved cost standards, 2) in compliance with the digital expansion phase-in plan, and 3) within the 13% maintenance formula. Also, include the special requests for the 12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Circuits.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009**

**Court Reporting  
Maintenance of Existing Stenography and DCR Equipment**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2008/09 Estimated Maintenance Expenditures<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Maintenance LBR</b>	<b>Total LBR and Estimated Maintenance Expenditures</b>	<b>State Purchases and FY 2008/09 OCO Allotment</b>	<b>13 Percent Maintenance<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>TCBC RECOMMENDED FY 2010/11 LBR for Maintenance</b>
3	\$13,542	\$63,617	<b>\$77,159</b>	\$654,411	\$85,073	-\$7,915	<b>\$63,617</b>
4	\$61,730	\$4,456	<b>\$66,186</b>	\$849,487	\$110,433	-\$44,247	<b>\$4,456</b>
5	\$61,595	\$8,357	<b>\$69,952</b>	\$1,253,005	\$162,891	-\$92,939	<b>\$8,357</b>
12	\$12,721	\$31,600	<b>\$44,321</b>	\$773,061	\$100,498	-\$56,177	<b>\$31,600</b>
14	\$53,969	\$63,914	<b>\$117,883</b>	\$627,924	\$81,630	\$36,253	<b>\$27,661</b>
15	\$5,251	\$6,000	<b>\$11,251</b>	\$468,342	\$60,885	-\$49,633	<b>\$6,000</b>
16	\$0	\$7,600	<b>\$7,600</b>	\$101,200	\$13,156	-\$5,556	<b>\$7,600</b>
17	\$92,931	\$1,200	<b>\$94,131</b>	\$282,409	\$36,713	\$57,417	<b>\$0</b>
18	\$73,808	\$2,650	<b>\$76,458</b>	\$874,381	\$113,670	-\$37,212	<b>\$2,650</b>
20	\$212,302	\$6,339	<b>\$218,641</b>	\$1,914,404	\$248,873	-\$30,231	<b>\$6,339</b>
Reserve	\$1,010		<b>\$1,010</b>				
<b>Total LBR</b>	<b>\$588,859</b>	<b>\$195,733</b>	<b>\$784,592</b>	<b>\$7,798,625</b>	<b>\$1,013,822</b>	<b>-\$230,240</b>	<b>\$158,280</b>

<sup>1</sup> FY 2008/09 Estimated Maintenance Expenditures include dollars from cost center 129 and 267 and estimated certified forward dollars.

<sup>2</sup> Based on policy recommendations of the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. Thirteen percent is applied to state hardware purchases through fiscal year 2007/08 as reported on the digital court reporting inventory and fiscal year 2008/09 OCO reserve approved for DCR Equipment.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009**

**Court Reporting  
Refresh of Existing Stenography and DCR Equipment**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 LBR Request (OCO and Expense)</b>	<b>Court Reporting Technology Inventory FY 2010/11 Refresh<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>TCBC RECOMMENDED FY 2010/11 LBR for Refresh</b>
1	\$38,400	\$568,485	<b>\$38,400</b>
2	\$0	\$227,243	<b>\$0</b>
3	\$0	\$225,220	<b>\$0</b>
4	\$165,018	\$107,957	<b>\$107,957</b>
5	\$35,346	\$419,893	<b>\$35,346</b>
6	\$95,884	\$386,601	<b>\$95,884</b>
7	\$122,650	\$611,479	<b>\$122,650</b>
8	\$92,000	\$228,563	<b>\$92,000</b>
9	\$0	\$1,022,500	<b>\$0</b>
10	\$0	\$68,182	<b>\$0</b>
11	\$149,280	\$129,432	<b>\$129,432</b>
12	\$44,048	\$132,615	<b>\$44,048</b>
13	\$26,400	\$412,771	<b>\$26,400</b>
14	\$151,300	\$196,054	<b>\$151,300</b>
15	\$53,742	\$120,666	<b>\$53,742</b>
16	\$43,900	\$48,242	<b>\$43,900</b>
17	\$81,600	\$156,311	<b>\$81,600</b>
18	\$108,542	\$396,808	<b>\$108,542</b>
19	\$217,310	\$548,609	<b>\$217,310</b>
20	\$364,800	\$572,627	<b>\$364,800</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,790,220</b>	<b>\$6,580,258</b>	<b>\$1,713,311</b>

<sup>1</sup> Based on policy recommendations of the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. The amount includes fiscal year 2009/10 and 2010/11 refresh dollars based on the hardware replacement schedule (recommended by the Workgroup), less allocations for fiscal year 2008/09 year end spending plan.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009**

**Court Reporting**

**Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR and Expansion of Stenography and DCR Equipment**

Circuit	Total Need <sup>1</sup>		FY 2010/11 LBR						FY 2010/11 DCR Equipment Expansion <sup>2</sup>				FY 2010/11 LBR and DCR Expansion	TCBC RECOMMENDED FY 2010/11 LBR for Expansion
	# of CR	# of HR	# of CR	# of HR	OCO	Expenses (Non Recurring)	Maintenance (Recurring)	Total	# of CR	# of HR	DCR Equipment Expansion Additional Cost	13 Percent Maintenance		
1	3	1	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2	1	\$61,738	\$8,026	\$69,764	\$69,764
2	13	0	11	0	\$229,000	\$0	\$22,000	\$251,000	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$251,000	\$250,640
3	0	7	0	2	\$23,100	\$26,900	\$0	\$50,000	0	3	\$47,184	\$6,134	\$103,318	\$86,728
4	12	0	8	0	\$107,391	\$7,490	\$13,786	\$128,667	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$128,667	\$120,282
5	10	12	2	2	\$33,020	\$40,300	\$11,380	\$84,700	5	6	\$209,393	\$27,221	\$321,314	\$319,466
6	8	4	0	0	\$19,200	\$2,890	\$1,440	\$23,530	5	3	\$162,209	\$21,087	\$206,826	\$206,826
7	5	0	4	0	\$83,800	\$3,300	\$10,000	\$97,100	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$97,100	\$93,620
8	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10	0	14	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	9	\$141,552	\$18,402	\$159,954	\$159,954
11	29	0	29	0	\$281,735	\$0	\$51,122	\$332,857	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$332,857	\$332,857
12	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	11	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	7	0	\$161,035	\$20,935	\$181,970	\$181,970
14	2	5	2	5	\$129,500	\$0	\$14,900	\$144,400	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$144,400	\$133,498
15	25	9	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	17	6	\$485,453	\$63,109	\$548,562	\$548,562
16	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	27	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	18	0	\$414,090	\$53,832	\$467,922	\$467,922
18	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
19	4	2	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	3	1	\$84,743	\$11,017	\$95,760	\$95,760
20	6	0	6	0	\$152,730	\$3,600	\$18,760	\$175,090	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$175,090	\$175,090
<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$1,059,476</b>	<b>\$84,480</b>	<b>\$143,388</b>	<b>\$1,287,344</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>\$1,767,397</b>	<b>\$229,763</b>	<b>\$3,284,504</b>	<b>\$3,242,938</b>

<sup>1</sup> Total Need includes DCR Expansion Plan as recommended by the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup in November 2008 and LBR for DCR New Construction. In addition, the total need for circuit 14 has been amended to reflect 2 courtrooms and 5 hearing rooms.

<sup>2</sup> Total courtrooms and hearing rooms are based on FY 2010/11 LBR plus adding 2/3 of courtrooms and hearing rooms per recommendation by the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Law Clerks

The funding methodology approved for the law clerk element during last year's needs assessment is based on a ratio of one law clerk per every two judges. The following analysis only considers *existing* judges. The certification of *new* judges, along with associated support staff (e.g., law clerks), will be addressed directly by the Supreme Court.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

Circuit	Positions	Expense Recurring	Justification
<b>1</b>	1.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to give assistance to judges in researching legal issues and preparing orders.
<b>4</b>	3.0 FTE Post Conviction Law Clerk 0.5 FTE Law Clerk		Positions needed to alleviate backlog with motions and reduce delay in resolution of capital post conviction motions. 0.5 FTE cut in RIF, needed to give assistance to judges in researching legal issues and preparing orders.
<b>5</b>	5.0 FTE Law Clerk		Positions needed to provide legal research for larger caseloads and increasingly complex litigation.
<b>6</b>	3.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF. Currently, focusing only on mission-critical cases (post-conviction and capital cases). Unable to fully assist judges in mortgage foreclosure cases. Overworked, underpaid staff leaving.
<b>7</b>	2.5 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to give assistance to judges in researching legal issues and preparing orders.
<b>9</b>	2.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to give assistance to judges in researching legal issues and preparing orders. Increased workload volume.
<b>10</b>	1.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to give assistance to judges in researching legal issues and preparing orders. Increased workload. Current law clerk position vacant under hiring freeze.
<b>11</b>	5.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed based on 3 law clerks per judge staffing ratio to provide legal services to judiciary.
<b>12</b>	2.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to review civil commitment motions from Florida Civil Commitment Center.
<b>13</b>	1.0 FTE Senior Law Clerk 4.5 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to provide supervision of law clerks and legal research support to judges. Current 3:1 ratio does not account for law clerk support for county court judges. Increased workload in circuit court makes it impossible to consistently assist county court judges.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>15</b>	2.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to give assistance to judges in researching legal issues and preparing orders in multiple case types.
<b>17</b>	1.0 FTE Post Conviction Law Clerk 4.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to address significant backlog, handle post conviction relief matters and alleviate workload of other law clerks.
<b>18</b>	1.0 FTE Post Conviction Law Clerk 6.0 FTE Law Clerk		Positions needed to handle post conviction matters, free up other law clerks, and give assistance to judges in researching legal issues.
<b>19</b>	1.0 FTE Senior Law Clerk 1.0 FTE Law Clerk		FTE cut in RIF, needed to provide supervision of law clerks and provide legal research support in criminal, civil, appellate, and administrative law cases.
<b>20</b>	2.5 FTE Law Clerk	\$17,139	0.5 FTE cut in RIF. Positions needed due to increased circuit civil and criminal filings and to achieve 2 law clerks per judge ratio. Additional expense requested to restore funding lost during cuts.
<b>Total</b>	<b>49.0 FTE</b>	<b>\$17,139</b>	

### **Options:**

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (95.0 FTE). Also, include the 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's \$17,139 recurring expense request.

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (46.0 FTE). Also, include the 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's \$17,139 recurring expense request.

### **Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (95.0 FTE). However, add one additional law clerk for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit to avoid penalizing them for their existing law clerk position devoted to suits filed against DOC and the Florida Parole Commission. Do not file the 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's \$17,139 recurring expense request.

### **Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (95.0 FTE). However, add one additional law clerk each for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Circuits to avoid penalizing them for their existing law clerk position devoted to suits filed against DOC/Florida Parole Commission and Jimmy Ryce Cases, respectively. Do not file the 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's \$17,139 recurring expense request.

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting August 18, 2009**  
**Trial Court Law Clerks**  
**Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Number of Judges<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Law Clerks<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Total Budget</b>	<b>Option 1 FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment Law Clerk FTE (1 law clerk : 2 judges)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Total FY 2010/11 Additional Need</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Budget and FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 LBR</b>	<b>Option 2 Requests Within the Needs Assessment</b>
1	24	9.0	\$552,440	12.0	\$190,389	\$742,829	1.0	1.0
2 <sup>4</sup>	16	8.0	\$530,255	9.0	\$60,877	\$591,132	0.0	0.0
3	7	3.0	\$184,431	3.5	\$33,649	\$218,080	0.0	0.0
4	35	13.5	\$844,349	17.5	\$257,687	\$1,102,036	3.5	3.5
5	31	10.5	\$667,913	15.5	\$317,315	\$985,228	5.0	5.0
6	45	14.0	\$957,019	22.5	\$541,353	\$1,498,372	3.0	3.0
7	27	8.5	\$530,352	13.5	\$321,150	\$851,502	2.5	2.5
8	13	6.0	\$375,993	6.5	\$33,649	\$409,642	0.0	0.0
9	43	14.0	\$887,170	21.5	\$477,890	\$1,365,060	2.0	2.0
10	28	10.0	\$635,197	14.0	\$253,852	\$889,049	1.0	1.0
11	80	25.0	\$1,725,251	40.0	\$951,945	\$2,677,196	5.0	5.0
12 <sup>4</sup>	21	7.0	\$435,579	11.5	\$287,501	\$723,080	2.0	2.0
13	45	16.0	\$1,011,614	22.5	\$419,262	\$1,430,876	5.5	5.5
14	11	6.0	\$379,007	5.5	\$0	\$379,007	0.0	0.0
15	35	11.5	\$678,457	17.5	\$380,778	\$1,059,235	2.0	2.0
16	4	1.0	\$52,068	2.0	\$63,463	\$115,531	0.0	0.0
17	58	17.0	\$1,138,407	29.0	\$761,556	\$1,899,963	5.0	5.0
18	26	9.0	\$621,690	13.0	\$253,852	\$875,542	7.0	4.0
19	19	5.0	\$315,363	9.5	\$292,336	\$607,699	2.0	2.0
20	31	10.5	\$686,877	15.5	\$321,150	\$1,008,027	2.5	2.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>204.5</b>	<b>\$13,209,432</b>	<b>301.5</b>	<b>\$6,219,654</b>	<b>\$19,429,086</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>46.0</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>				<b>97.0</b>				

<sup>1</sup> Includes current circuit court judges only.

<sup>2</sup> Includes post conviction trial court law clerks.

<sup>3</sup> The Fourteenth Circuit has a negative net need; they are being held harmless.

<sup>4</sup> FY 2010/11 needs assessment includes an additional 1.0 FTE law clerk in the Second Circuit and Twelfth Circuit to avoid penalizing them for the circuits existing law clerk devoted to DOC/Parol Commission law suits and Jimmy Ryce cases, respectively.

Note: Resources associated with new judges are handled through the certification process.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: General Magistrates

The funding methodology approved for the general magistrate element during last year's needs assessment is based on a case weighted methodology and a ratio of one administrative support position per magistrate.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

Circuit	Positions	Contracted Services (100777)	Justification
1	1.0 FTE General Magistrate 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF, needed to provide relief to judges, particularly in family law cases.
2	1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF, needed to provide administrative support to magistrate.
4	1.0 FTE General Magistrate 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		Positions needed for the efficient and effective operation of the UFC and to address increased caseload demands.
5	2.0 FTE General Magistrate 2.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		Positions needed based on approved case weighted funding methodology and 1:1 admin. support ratio.
6	0.75 FTE General Magistrate 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I	\$40,000	FTE cut in RIF, needed to meet demands in probate, guardianship, mental health, and family cases. Overworked, underpaid staff leaving. Prior to the budget cuts, circuit had contractual magistrates to cover special dockets to clear backlogs and to provide emergency coverage.
8	1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF, needed to provide administrative support to magistrate.
10	1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF, needed to provide administrative support to magistrate, especially in pro se' cases.
11	1.0 FTE General Magistrate 4.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF, needed for efficient and effective case processing. Admin. support needed for magistrates in family cases.
12	1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF, needed for full-time assistance to the Family Court magistrate.
13	1.0 FTE General Magistrate 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		Positions needed for creation and operation of specialty divisions, where cases require an inordinate amount of time.
17	1.5 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF, needed to restore full functionality of operations and reduce delays.
18	2.0 FTE General Magistrate 2.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		Positions needed to address backlog in the family division.
19	1.0 FTE General Magistrate 1.5 FTE Admin. Secretary I		0.5 FTE cut in RIF. Positions needed to provide relief to judges and address case backlog.
20	1.0 FTE General Magistrate 3.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		Positions needed based on approved case weighted funding methodology and 1:1 admin. support ratio. (\$13,280 in expense was also requested. However, the FMC & TCBC did not approve any additional expense requests.)
<b>Total</b>	<b>32.75 FTE</b>	<b>\$40,000</b>	

**Options:**

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (6.5 GM and 19.0 admin. support FTE).

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (2.0 GM and 10.5 admin. support FTE).

**Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (6.5 GM and 19.0 admin. support FTE).

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (6.5 GM and 19.0 admin. support FTE).

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting August 18, 2009**  
**General Magistrates**  
**Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 General Magistrate FTE</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Admin Support FTE</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Total General Magistrate Need<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment GM FTE<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment Admin FTE<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Total FY 2010/11 Additional Need</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Budget and FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested GM FTE</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested Admin FTE</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested Contracted Services</b>	<b>Option 2 GM FTE Requests Within the Needs Assessment</b>	<b>Option 2 Admin FTE Requests Within the Needs Assessment</b>
1	3.0	2.5	\$413,560	4.9	5.0	5.0	\$333,860	\$747,420	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0
2	2.0	1.0	\$249,931	2.2	2.0	2.0	\$45,092	\$295,023	0.0	1.0		0.0	1.0
3	1.0	0.0	\$101,839	1.3	1.0	1.0	\$45,092	\$146,931	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
4	7.0	6.0	\$1,032,472	6.5	7.0	7.0	\$45,092	\$1,077,564	1.0	1.0		0.0	1.0
5	5.0	5.0	\$755,217	6.2	6.0	6.0	\$144,384	\$899,601	2.0	2.0		1.0	1.0
6	7.25	7.0	\$1,171,353	6.4	7.25	7.0	\$0	\$1,171,353	0.75	1.0	\$40,000	0.0	0.0
7	3.5	4.0	\$533,648	4.8	5.0	5.0	\$195,948	\$729,596	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
8	2.0	1.0	\$258,694	2.2	2.0	2.0	\$45,092	\$303,786	0.0	1.0		0.0	1.0
9	6.0	4.0	\$775,133	6.9	7.0	7.0	\$234,568	\$1,009,701	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
10	4.0	3.0	\$540,184	4.8	5.0	5.0	\$189,476	\$729,660	0.0	1.0		0.0	1.0
11	11.0	11.0	\$1,938,228	10.9	11.0	11.0	\$0	\$1,938,228	1.0	4.0		0.0	0.0
12	4.0	3.0	\$571,555	3.7	4.0	4.0	\$45,092	\$616,647	0.0	1.0		0.0	1.0
13	7.0	7.0	\$1,134,022	7.3	7.0	7.0	\$0	\$1,134,022	1.0	1.0		0.0	0.0
14	2.0	1.0	\$247,214	2.1	2.0	2.0	\$45,092	\$292,306	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
15	7.0	6.0	\$1,125,076	5.5	7.0	6.0	\$0	\$1,125,076	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
16 <sup>5</sup>	0.0	0.0	\$58,944	0.5	0.0	0.0	\$0	\$58,944	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
17	9.5	8.5	\$1,430,734	7.8	9.5	8.5	\$0	\$1,430,734	0.0	1.5		0.0	0.0
18	4.0	3.0	\$541,451	4.4	4.0	4.0	\$45,092	\$586,543	2.0	2.0		0.0	1.0
19	3.0	2.5	\$395,550	3.3	3.0	3.0	\$24,464	\$420,014	1.0	1.5		0.0	0.5
20	5.0	3.0	\$626,556	5.4	5.0	5.0	\$90,184	\$716,740	1.0	3.0		0.0	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>93.25</b>	<b>78.50</b>	<b>\$13,901,361</b>	<b>97.1</b>	<b>99.75</b>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>\$1,528,528</b>	<b>\$15,429,889</b>	<b>10.75</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>\$40,000</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>10.5</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>					<b>6.50</b>	<b>19.0</b>							

<sup>1</sup> Includes salaries, benefits, and expenses provided by OSCA, Budget Office.

<sup>2</sup> Total Need based on 2007 Judicial Resource Study weights applied to fiscal year 2010/11 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 & indebtedness, real property & mortgage foreclosure, eminent domain, other circuit civil, probate, guardianship, trust, Baker Act, substance abuse, other social, small claims, replevins, and other civil (non-monetary).

<sup>3</sup> Includes current FTE plus any positive net need greater than .5, rounding up, holding circuits with a negative need harmless at current staffing levels.

<sup>4</sup> Assumes a 1:1 ratio of admin support to GM.

<sup>5</sup> The 16th circuit uses contracted services for general magistrates.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Child Support Hearing Officers

The funding methodology approved for the child support hearing officer element during last year's needs assessment is based on a case weighted methodology and a ratio of one administrative support position per hearing officer.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

Circuit	Positions	Justification
5	2.0 FTE CSE Hearing Officer 2.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I	Positions needed based on approved case weighted funding methodology and 1:1 admin. support ratio.
6	0.5 FTE Admin. Secretary I	Currently using OPS dollars, so unable to have an acceptable level of efficiency and effectiveness for CSEHO.
12	0.5 FTE Admin. Secretary I 0.5 FTE Admin. Secretary I	FTE needed to upgrade positions to full-time and alleviate backlog.
20	1.0 FTE CSE Hearing Officer 1.5 FTE Admin. Secretary I	Positions needed based on the recommended funding methodology and extensive travel for a 5 county circuit.
<b>Total</b>	<b>8.0 FTE</b>	

#### Options:

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (7.5 hearing officer and 12.0 admin. support FTE).

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (3.0 hearing officer and 3.5 admin. support FTE).

Option Three- Do not file LBR as there is a negative statewide need if circuits are not held harmless.

#### Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Do not file LBR as there is a negative statewide need if circuits are not held harmless.

#### Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:

Do not file LBR as there is a negative statewide need if circuits are not held harmless. Direct the Funding Methodology Committee to review the possible reallocation of positions when developing recommendations for FY 2010-11 allocations.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers

The funding methodology approved for the civil traffic infraction hearing officer element during last year's needs assessment is based on increasing hourly payments from \$50 to \$75 and applying a 28.9% (based on this rate change) to the \$7,299 per county judge ratio.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Contractual (100200)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>5</b>	\$40,000	Based on 08-09 allocation level, circuit will not cover projected civil traffic needs due to increased case filings.
<b>8</b>	\$60,000	Funding is needed to hire a CTIHO to hear civil traffic cases.
<b>11</b>	\$246,840	Funding needed to address increase in caseload and to provide a \$10 increase in hourly pay.
<b>18</b>	\$30,000	Based on total annual 09-10 allocation of \$41,612, circuit anticipates a shortage of funds by end of fiscal year. Total annual need is estimated to be \$72K.
<b>20</b>	\$69,317	To fully restore and continue program in FY 2010-11.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$446,157</b>	

#### Options:

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$1,469,052).

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (\$184,640).

#### Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$1,469,052).

#### Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$1,469,052).

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009**

**Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers  
Fiscal Year 2010/11**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Current County Judges<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>FY 2007/08 Beginning Total Budget</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Estimated Allocation<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Reasonable County Judges<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Option 1 FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Circuit Requests</b>	<b>Option 2 Requests Within the Needs Assessment</b>
1	8	\$58,392	\$24,660	8	\$75,267		\$0
2	5	\$36,495	\$16,178	5	\$47,042		\$0
3	1	\$7,299	\$4,513	2	\$18,817		\$0
4	20	\$145,980	\$95,335	26	\$244,619		\$0
5	8	\$58,392	\$22,439	9	\$84,676	\$40,000	\$40,000
6	24	\$175,176	\$67,530	24	\$225,802		\$0
7	15	\$109,485	\$65,648	17	\$159,943		\$0
8	5	\$72,015	\$47,504	6	\$92,827	\$60,000	\$45,323
9	22	\$204,147	\$182,000	24	\$263,145		\$0
10	12	\$87,588	\$50,000	13	\$122,309		\$0
11	43	\$430,849	\$578,400	49	\$555,364	\$246,840	\$0
12	9	\$65,691	\$83,694	9	\$84,676		\$0
13	17	\$175,945	\$127,420	22	\$226,793		\$0
14	4	\$29,736	\$20,298	4	\$38,330		\$0
15	19	\$138,681	\$96,674	24	\$225,802		\$0
16	4	\$42,683	\$53,186	4	\$55,018		\$0
17	32	\$233,568	\$186,861	38	\$357,520		\$0
18	17	\$124,083	\$41,613	18	\$169,351	\$30,000	\$30,000
19	7	\$57,962	\$25,088	8	\$75,267		\$0
20	19	\$138,681	\$52,645	20	\$188,168	\$69,317	\$69,317
<b>Totals</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>\$2,392,848</b>	<b>\$1,841,684</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>\$3,310,736</b>	<b>\$446,157</b>	<b>\$184,640</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>					<b>\$1,469,052</b>		

<sup>1</sup> Includes counties that currently receive CTIHO funding.

<sup>2</sup> Multiplied six month allocation by two to estimate FY 2009/10 annual allocation.

<sup>3</sup> Includes county judges certified in FY 2009/10.

<sup>4</sup> Based on increasing current rates to \$75 per hour across the state by applying a 28.9% increase to the \$7,299 per relevant judge for each circuit.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Senior Judges

The funding methodology approved for the senior judge element during last year's needs assessment is based on the total 7,322 days appropriated in FY 2007-08 (before the cuts), a \$400 per day rate (increased from current rate of \$350), holding 200 days in reserve, and a proportional distribution based on judicial need calculated during the most recent certification process.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

Circuit	Contractual (105420)	Justification
20	\$24,500	Funding for 70 additional senior judge days due to increased population and caseload.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$24,500</b>	

#### Options:

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$878,350).

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (\$24,500).

#### Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$878,350).

#### Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$878,350).

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009**

**Senior Judge Days  
Fiscal year 2010/11**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Allotment Days<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Current Total Budget</b>	<b>Number of Days<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Option 1 FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 LBR</b>	<b>Option 2 Requests Within Needs Assessment</b>
1	249	\$87,150	304	\$121,600		
2	162	\$56,700	198	\$79,200		
3	89	\$31,150	109	\$43,600		
4	359	\$125,650	439	\$175,600		
5	298	\$104,300	364	\$145,600		
6	440	\$154,000	538	\$215,200		
7	281	\$98,350	344	\$137,600		
8	151	\$52,850	185	\$74,000		
9	442	\$154,700	540	\$216,000		
10	263	\$92,050	322	\$128,800		
11	761	\$266,350	931	\$372,400		
12	196	\$68,600	240	\$96,000		
13	398	\$139,300	487	\$194,800		
14	138	\$48,300	169	\$67,600		
15	348	\$121,800	426	\$170,400		
16	47	\$16,450	57	\$22,800		
17	549	\$192,150	671	\$268,400		
18	276	\$96,600	338	\$135,200		
19	197	\$68,950	241	\$96,400		
20	343	\$120,050	419	\$167,600	\$24,500	\$24,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,987</b>	<b>\$2,095,450</b>	<b>7,322</b>	<b>\$2,928,800</b>	<b>\$24,500</b>	<b>\$24,500</b>
<b>Reserve</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>\$80,000</b>		
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>				<b>\$878,350</b>		

<sup>1</sup> Current Allotment Days based on FY 2009/10 judicial need weighted caseload.

<sup>2</sup> Number of Days applies the proportion of FY 2009/10 days allotted to beginning FY 2007/08 allocation.

Note: Needs Assessment based on a rate of \$400 per day.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: ADR/Mediation

The funding methodology approved for the alternative dispute resolution/mediation element during last year's needs assessment is based on a funding ceiling applied to all recurring dollars budgeted for each circuit. The ceiling is calculated using a standard cost per mediation session held with modifiers applied for coordination, multiple counties, and the use of volunteers. In conjunction with the FY 2010-11 LBR process, the TCBC requested that the Funding Methodology Committee review the multi-county modifier to determine if it should be revised to a multi-court facility modifier.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below. On the LBR forms, circuits were asked to estimate the amount of contractual funding they would no longer need to offset the cost of requested positions and the increased number of mediation sessions held should they be allocated new positions, which are also provided below.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Contractual Savings</b>	<b>Contractual (105415)</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>2</b>	1.0 FTE Mediator Total cost = \$65,704	(\$12,782)	\$51,914		To support already astounding workload and to increase mediations in outlying counties. Contractual requested to restore some funds lost last year. <i>With new resources, will increase mediation sessions held by 150+.</i>
<b>5</b>	0.5 FTE Mediator 2.0 FTE Mediation Services Coordinator Total cost = \$166,178				Total number of mediation sessions held has increased 58% from 05-06 to 07-08. No increase to staff since July 2006. Provide increased oversight in Marion County. <i>With new resources, will increase mediation sessions held by 21%.</i>
<b>6</b>	0.5 FTE Court Program Specialist I Total cost = \$25,937				Position needed to offset additional coordination workload resulting from the new mediation model which has caused a 75.4% increase in cases referred to family mediation. <i>With new resources, will increase mediation sessions held by 240.</i>
<b>9</b>	1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I Total cost = \$102,910				Compared to other large circuits, the 9th processes 30-50% more cases with the least amount of staff. Position is needed to bring the 9th up to same staffing levels as other large circuits and to perform coordination/case mgmt functions. <i>With new resources, will increase mediation sessions held by 10%.</i>
<b>11</b>	2.0 FTE Mediator Total cost = \$131,408				Currently, family and dependency sessions are scheduled for 1.5 hours. Positions are needed due to SCAO 09-19 which states family mediations should be scheduled for any amount of time between 2-3 hours. This will impact the number of cases that can be scheduled and mediated per day per mediator. <i>With new resources, will increase mediation sessions held by 772.</i>
<b>14</b>			\$30,000		The 08-09 allocation was depleted, and in addition to using \$18,800 from local Bay County Mediation fund, the 14th had to borrow another \$10K from other circuits to meet existing demands. <i>With new resources, will increase mediation sessions held by 14% in family and 55.6% in dependency.</i>

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Contractual Savings</b>	<b>Contractual (105415)</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>18</b>	1.0 FTE Mediator Total cost = \$65,704	(\$10,000)			Circuit over spent 08-09 budget allocation despite \$25K loan from the 1st Circuit. Therefore, circuit is requesting one full-time position to cover future projected needs. <i>With new resources, will increase mediation sessions held by 10%.</i>
<b>20</b>	1.0 FTE Mediator 1.0 FTE Admin. Assistant III Total cost = \$120,575			\$11,000	Circuit continues to experience increasing caseloads (71.7% increase between 04-05 and 08-09) which is consistent with overall population growth. Difficulties in obtaining contract mediators in Hendry and Glades. Partial restoration of expense budget is also requested to cover travel expenses. <i>Will not increase mediation sessions held with new resources.</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.0 FTE at \$678,416</b>	<b>(\$22,782)</b>	<b>\$81,914</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	

### Options:

#### *Ceiling Calculation*

Option One- Retain the multi-county modifier.

Option Two- Replace the multi-county modifier with the multi-court facility modifier.

#### *LBR*

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$3,726,422 or \$4,372,869 adjusted). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that may be reduced when allocating the new positions.

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (\$629,138). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, reduce each circuit's contractual allotment by the contractual savings amount indicated.

### Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

#### *Ceiling Calculation*

Replace the multi-county modifier with the multi-court facility modifier.

#### *LBR*

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$4,372,869 adjusted). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that may be reduced when allocating the new positions.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

*Ceiling Calculation*

Replace the multi-county modifier with the multi-court facility modifier.

*LBR*

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (\$4,372,869 adjusted). If new positions are appropriated by the Legislature for FY 2010-11, determine the amount of each circuit's contractual allotment that may be reduced when allocating the new positions.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009  
Mediation Arbitration Services  
Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR**

Circuit	FY 2009/10 FTE	FY 2009/10 Salaries Benefits, and Expenses <sup>1</sup>	FY 2009/10 Contractual Allotment	FY 2009/10 Total Budget	FY 2010/11 Requested FTE	FY 2010/11 Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses	FY 2010/11 Requested Recurring Expenses	FY 2010/11 Requested Contractual Services <sup>2</sup>	FY 2010/11 Total Request	FY 2009/10 Budget and FY 2010/11 LBR	Option 1 FY 2010/11 Original Needs Assessment	Option 1 FY 2010/11 Adjusted Needs Assessment	Option 2 FY 2010/11 Requests Within Original Needs Assessment	Option 2 FY 2010/11 Requests Within Adjusted Needs Assessment
1	3.0	\$157,983	\$96,871	\$254,854	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$254,854	\$272,815	\$272,815	\$0	\$0
2	4.0	\$252,397	\$86,153	\$338,550	1.0	\$65,704		\$39,132	\$104,836	\$443,386	\$343,976	\$343,976	\$5,426	\$5,426
3	3.0	\$160,715	\$33,688	\$194,403	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$194,403	\$217,616	\$217,616	\$0	\$0
4	9.0	\$508,381	\$10,096	\$518,477	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$518,477	\$502,145	\$502,145	\$0	\$0
5	4.0	\$254,613	\$158,467	\$413,080	2.5	\$166,178			\$166,178	\$579,258	\$917,437	\$917,437	\$166,178	\$166,178
6	7.5	\$408,527	\$384,533	\$793,060	0.5	\$25,937			\$25,937	\$818,997	\$1,247,943	\$1,292,513	\$25,937	\$25,937
7	3.0	\$171,379	\$91,389	\$262,768	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$262,768	\$391,787	\$391,787	\$0	\$0
8	4.0	\$240,104	\$67,740	\$307,844	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$307,844	\$418,047	\$418,047	\$0	\$0
9	9.5	\$546,164	\$496,524	\$1,042,688	2.0	\$102,910			\$102,910	\$1,145,598	\$1,460,946	\$1,460,946	\$102,910	\$102,910
10	6.0	\$323,472	\$9,993	\$333,465	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$333,465	\$573,927	\$594,425	\$0	\$0
11	11.0	\$710,375	\$112,681	\$823,056	2.0	\$131,408			\$131,408	\$954,464	\$1,468,133	\$1,637,533	\$131,408	\$131,408
12	6.0	\$394,964	\$4,906	\$399,870	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$399,870	\$418,278	\$433,217	\$0	\$0
13	11.0	\$579,292	\$530,253	\$1,109,545	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$1,109,545	\$1,086,297	\$1,169,858	\$0	\$0
14	4.0	\$253,948	\$6,970	\$260,918	0.0	\$0		\$30,000	\$30,000	\$290,918	\$254,378	\$254,378	\$0	\$0
15	10.5	\$652,352	\$98,215	\$750,567	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$750,567	\$1,528,202	\$1,704,533	\$0	\$0
16	3.0	\$167,191	\$427	\$167,618	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$167,618	\$83,469	\$83,469	\$0	\$0
17	12.0	\$749,522	\$78,904	\$828,426	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$828,426	\$921,138	\$1,027,424	\$0	\$0
18	6.5	\$376,009	\$202,530	\$578,539	1.0	\$65,704		(\$10,000)	\$55,704	\$634,243	\$864,122	\$894,984	\$65,704	\$65,704
19	5.0	\$289,678	\$7,849	\$297,527	0.0	\$0			\$0	\$297,527	\$419,558	\$419,558	\$0	\$0
20	8.0	\$380,922	\$454,509	\$835,431	2.0	\$120,575	\$11,000		\$131,575	\$967,006	\$1,221,528	\$1,221,528	\$131,575	\$131,575
Reserve			\$374,634	\$374,634						\$374,634				
<b>Total</b>	<b>130.0</b>	<b>\$7,577,988</b>	<b>\$3,307,332</b>	<b>\$10,885,320</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>\$678,416</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	<b>\$59,132</b>	<b>\$748,548</b>	<b>\$11,633,868</b>	<b>\$14,611,742</b>	<b>\$15,258,189</b>	<b>\$629,138</b>	<b>\$629,138</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>												<b>\$4,372,869</b>		

<sup>1</sup> Includes salaries, benefits, and expenses provided by OSCA, Budget Office.

<sup>2</sup> Requested Contractual Services includes contractual savings for circuit 2 of \$12,782 and circuit 18 of \$10,000.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Case Management

The funding methodology approved for the case management element during last year's needs assessment is based on a ratio of one position per every 5,500 applicable filings and a floor of 8 positions.

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

Circuit	Positions	Expense Recurring	Contracted Services (100777)	Justification
<b>1</b>	2.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. III			CPSI needed to assist Escambia pro se litigants with questions and hearing procedures and to assist judges. CPSI needed to provide case management, interagency cooperation, and response to violations in Okaloosa DV cases. AAI needed for Drug Court Program, providing administrative support, client case management, and grant management.
<b>2</b>	1.0 FTE Drug Court Manager 1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 3.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I 0.5 FTE Admin. Asst. I	\$7,000		FTE cut in RIF. Mgr needed to oversee drug court operations. AAI needed to prepare reports and keep necessary data for drug court evaluation. CPSII needed to provide case management for family, civil, and independent living dockets. CPI's needed for case management in pro se simplified dissolution, dependency, civil, and criminal cases. Additional expense requested for travel to 5 other counties in large rural circuit.
<b>4</b>	1.0 FTE Drug Court Manager 3.0 FTE Sr. Court Program Specialist 3.0 FTE Program Coordinator 8.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 4.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I	\$3,000		Mgr. needed to monitor drug court budgets, oversee daily operations, and provide training. SCPS's needed to provide case management to Drug Court and Mental Health Court. Coordinators, CSPII's, & CPSI's needed for multiple divisions and enhancement of services in UFC. Additional expense requested for travel for case staffings and field visits in DV cases.
<b>5</b>	1.0 FTE Drug Court Manager 7.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II			FTE cut in RIF. Mgr. needed to manage drug court programs. CPSII's needed for Family Law Case Management Program, Sumter County Complex Civil Litigation cases, to maintain and assist in data collection and analysis, as well as perform administrative duties.
<b>6</b>	1.0 FTE Drug Court Manager 1.0 FTE Sr. Court Program Specialist 3.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 11.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I			FTE cut in RIF. Mgr. needed for continuation of existing drug court which is jeopardized by uncertain funding. SCPS needed for drug court in both counties including data reporting/entry. CPSII's needed to address overload, burnout, and lack of sufficient coverage in Pinellas' UFC and to maintain drug court data. CPSI's needed to keep up with rise in circuit civil, mortgage foreclosure, and UFC/DV filings, and to address overworked, underpaid staff leaving.
<b>7</b>	1.0 FTE Sr. Court Program Specialist 4.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II			FTE cut in RIF. SCPS needed to provide intensive oversight and instruction to line staff. CPSII's needed to address case mgmt. workload that will be discontinued by the clerk.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Contracted Services (100777)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>8</b>	4.0 FTE Sr. Court Program Specialist 1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I			FTE cut in RIF. SCPS needed to manage the diverse circuit civil case load in all 6 counties; provide system accountability; coordinate and aid in development of several specialty courts; increase efficiency and effectiveness in UFC especially in dependency cases; determine crossover cases and compliance with orders; provide education; and participate on local and state task forces. CPSI needed to produce weekly, master, and trial calendars. CPS II needed for tracking dependency/TPR cases, identification of UFC cases, attending shelter hearing cases, and identifying candidates for Dependency Drug Court.
<b>9</b>	1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 9.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I		\$158,526 (withdrawn at TCBC meeting)	FTE cut in RIF. CPSII needed to provide assistance to Family Court pro se litigants in Orange County. CPSI's needed to staff DV Unit and provide service to UFC; clear backlogs; coordinate and perform administrative functions in county civil cases; direct individuals to appropriate social service agencies, and reduce jail overcrowding. Contracted services funding requested to take over the injunction processing unit currently funded by the Osceola clerk.
<b>10</b>	1.0 FTE Drug Court Manager 5.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. I			FTE cut in RIF. Mgr and AAI needed for Drug Court operations and administration. CPSI's needed for pro se assistance, Violation of Probations, and Mental Health Court.
<b>11</b>	2.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 2.0 FTE Program Coordinator 10.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 20.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I 5.0 FTE Admin. Asst. I			FTE cut in RIF. Mgrs. needed for oversight and efficient/effective movement and closure of domestic relations cases and act as a Parenting Facilitator for non-legal child related issues in high conflict cases. Coordinators needed to begin the process of transitioning the misdemeanor calendaring function to an automated form and supervise probate case managers. CPSII's needed to process, track, and provide administrative support to complex civil cases; assist family judges in court and for docket review, file review and preparing orders; and maintain monitoring of crossover cases. CPSI's needed for civil appeals and criminal, Drug Court, DV, juvenile, child support, probate, and UFC cases. AAI's needed for complex civil litigation, family, delinquency, crossover, and traffic cases. Will be able to save \$65,682 in contracted services in 122, 210, & 110 combined.
<b>12</b>	4.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II			FTE cut in RIF, needed to maintain personal contact with pro se litigants in UFC and provide information to judges in DV cases.
<b>13</b>	1.0 FTE Drug Court Manager 12.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 2.0 FTE Secretary Specialist			FTE cut in RIF. Mgr, 2.0 CPSII's, and 1.0 Sec. Spec. needed to expand post-adjudicatory drug court, due to participation in expansion plan, which will double caseload. Other CPSII's needed to review and coordinate increased number of family pro se cases and to flag filings, track cases, and correspond with parties in several court divisions. Sec. Spec. needed to support the work of CPS staff so they can focus on family case mgmt. duties.
<b>14</b>	1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II	\$1,500		FTE cut in RIF, needed to allow higher level of service to criminal bench and alleviate work overflow of Drug Court staff. Additional expense requested for limited circuit-wide travel to rural counties.
<b>15</b>	1.0 FTE Sr. Court Program Specialist 2.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I			SCPS needed to perform case management for appellate filings. CPSI's needed to address approximately 39,000 languishing county civil cases and for early intervention and active oversight of criminal cases.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Contracted Services (100777)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>16</b>	1.0 FTE Director of Case Management 1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I			FTE cut in RIF. Mgr. needed for supervision of personnel in several programs, statistical analysis, and performance monitoring of long range goals of unified case resolution. CPSI needed for case management in civil and probate court.
<b>17</b>	2.0 FTE Sr. Court Program Specialist 7.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 3.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. II 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. I 1.0 FTE Senior Secretary			FTE cut in RIF. All requested positions needed for restoration of a complete unit that provided services to judges and ensured compliance with time standards.
<b>18</b>	10.5 FTE Court Program Specialist II			FTE cut in RIF. Positions needed to address caseload increases and non-mandatory case mgmt workload shifted from clerks, and to alleviate Drug Court backlog.
<b>19</b>	1.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 3.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist I			FTE cut in RIF. Mgr needed for UFC case management services for all counties. CPSII's needed for UFC cases and to provide equal, circuit-wide access to Drug and Mental Health Courts. CPSI's needed to reduce delays in litigant contact and setting of UFC cases.
<b>20</b>	1.0 FTE Drug Court Manager 7.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II	\$25,449		FTE cut in RIF. Mgr needed for expansion of pretrial drug court program circuit-wide. CPSII's needed to provide Differentiated Case Management for UFC and circuit civil cases. Additional expense requested to restore funds lost in cuts.
<b>Total</b>	<b>182.0 FTE</b>	<b>\$36,949</b>	<b>\$158,526</b>	

### **Options:**

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (180.0 FTE). Also, include the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (144.5 FTE). Also, include the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit's contracted services request and the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

### **Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (180.0 FTE). Do not file the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

### **Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (180.0 FTE). Do not file the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting August 18, 2009**

**Case Management**

**Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 FTE<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Projected Filings<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Option 1 FY 2010/11 Total Needs Assessment<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Total Additional Need</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Budget and FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested FTE</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested Expense Recurring</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested Contracted Services</b>	<b>Option 2 Requests Within the Needs Assessment</b>
1	10	\$576,503	93,180	17	370,433	\$946,936	3			3
2	4.5	\$258,471	53,332	10	289,156	\$547,627	5.5	\$7,000		5.5
3	6	\$332,116	25,170	8	109,742	\$441,858	0			0
4	20	\$1,038,824	176,028	32	712,545	\$1,751,369	19	\$3,000		12
5	9	\$442,656	112,159	20	614,414	\$1,057,070	8			8
6	19	\$996,001	173,898	32	675,575	\$1,671,576	16			13
7	14	\$844,471	120,559	22	445,043	\$1,289,514	5			5
8	4	\$252,667	51,939	9	298,655	\$551,322	6			5
9	18	\$1,048,357	177,391	32	768,194	\$1,816,551	10		\$158,526	10
10	9.5	\$596,320	101,873	19	490,086	\$1,086,406	7			7
11	43	\$2,614,084	327,434	60	956,757	\$3,570,841	39			17
12	8	\$447,080	78,615	14	329,226	\$776,306	4			4
13	20	\$1,092,477	182,379	33	713,323	\$1,805,800	15			13
14	6	\$352,598	46,307	8	109,742	\$462,340	1	\$1,500		1
15	18	\$961,907	161,346	29	600,052	\$1,561,959	3			3
16	6	\$357,502	10,792	8	147,331	\$504,833	2			2
17	28	\$1,578,085	232,540	42	752,169	\$2,330,254	15			14
18	12	\$626,953	116,216	21	493,839	\$1,120,792	10.5			9
19	6	\$323,654	75,723	14	442,969	\$766,623	5			5
20	14	\$726,679	135,388	25	614,414	\$1,341,093	8	\$25,449		8
<b>Total</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>15,467,405</b>	<b>2,452,270</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>\$9,933,665</b>	<b>\$25,401,070</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>\$36,949</b>	<b>\$158,526</b>	<b>144.5</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>				<b>180</b>						

<sup>1</sup>Total FTE include positions in cost centers 122 and 217 (drug court).

<sup>2</sup> Includes salaries, benefits, and expenses provided by OSCA, Budget Office.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes civil traffic infraction filings.

<sup>4</sup> The current funding methodology is based on a 1:5,500 filings ratio and a floor of 8.0 FTE.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Court Administration

The funding methodology approved for the court administration element during last year's needs assessment is based on applying a 23.1% growth rate to a threshold level of positions (12 in small circuits, 17 in medium circuits, 27 in large circuits, and 42 in Miami-Dade) as a representation of the workload required to support the increased level of trial court judges, staff, and other resources requested for the upcoming budget year. Additionally, the size designation for the 17<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuits was shifted up to the next size level contingent on the trial courts receiving the necessary funding for new positions and the circuits providing appropriate justification for new positions based on growth in workload.

As displayed in the following table, certain positions should be funded for each circuit, regardless of size designation, including: one trial court administrator, one court technology officer, one general counsel, one general counsel support position, and one chief deputy court administrator. The circuits have the flexibility to determine the rest of the operations/administration positions based on what best suits their needs.

	TCA	CTO	General Counsel/ Support	Operations/ Administration	Total	23.1% Applied
Small	1.0	1.0	2.0	8.0	<b>12.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>
Medium	1.0	1.0	2.0	13.0	<b>17.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>
Large	1.0	1.0	2.0	23.0	<b>27.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>
Very Large	1.0	1.0	2.0	38.0	<b>42.0</b>	<b>52.0</b>

Circuit requests for the FY 2010-11 LBR are reflected in the table below.

Circuit	Positions	Expense Recurring	Justification
<b>1</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. III 1.0 FTE Clerical Assistant		General Counsel needed to assist in formulating and implementing statutory/rule-compliant policies and long range goals for the circuit. AAIII needed for complex administrative, program coordination, and clerical support. Clerical Asst. needed for clerical and administrative support currently being performed by staff performing essential functions. Contract Services funds requested to cover annual maintenance services for copiers and other equipment circuit-wide.
<b>2</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Chief Deputy Court Administrator 1.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 1.0 FTE Sr. Court Analyst II 2.0 FTE Admin. Asst. I		FTE cut in RIF. General Counsel needed to allow several staff who have been partially fulfilling this role to perform their primary duties full time. Chief Deputy needed to provide executive direction in absence of TCA and to perform duties now performed by various other staff. Mgr. needed to serve as liaison for coordination and communication with numerous constitutional officers and county commissioners throughout the circuit. SCAII needed to audit collection and expenditure of revenues collected by clerk and county government and to handle survey and statistical requests. AAI's needed as receptionists and as admin support to judges.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>3</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. II		FTE cut in RIF. General Counsel needed to supervise law clerks, coordinate and respond to post-conviction motions, and ensure correct procedure and law when responding to employment, budgetary and local governmental issues. AAI needed to assist employees at the Columbia County Annex. Paying current employees at a higher pay grade to perform these duties.
<b>4</b>	3.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 1.0 FTE Contracts & Grants Administrator 1.0 FTE Personnel Specialist 1.0 FTE Budget Specialist 1.0 FTE Accountant III 4.0 FTE Admin. Asst. III 4.0 FTE Admin. Secretary II 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF. Mgr. needed for on-site operations oversight in all three counties. Grants Admin. needed to identify, apply for, and manage grants, as well as administer contracts. Two positions needed to assist Human Resources Department and Budget Manager. Accountant needed to process invoices, transactions, purchase orders, and FLAIR reporting. Admin. positions needed for law clerk and human resources support and receptionist, scheduling, and clerical duties.
<b>5</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Chief Deputy Court Administrator 3.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 1.0 FTE Finance & Accounting Manager 2.0 FTE Admin. Asst. III 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. I		Positions needed to review and quantify court services objectives, direct support for all state staff and oversee planning, and provide technical assistance to court staff circuit-wide
<b>6</b>	1.0 FTE Sr. Attorney II 1.0 FTE Admin. Services Mgr 1.0 FTE Fiscal Assistant 3.25 FTE Admin. Asst. I 1.0 FTE Secretary Specialist		FTE cut in RIF. Sr. Atty needed for Deputy Court Counsel to handle internal workload to free up Court Counsel. Mgr needed to hire one person to handle all facilities issues. Currently, TCA must do direct service duties, instead of handling system-wide matters. Fiscal Asst. needed for processing time sensitive invoices and assist overworked, underpaid staff leaving. Admin. positions needed to for clerical and administrative support.
<b>7</b>	0.5 FTE Admin. Asst. III 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. II		FTE cut in RIF, needed to provide administrative and clerical support to the senior level manager in St. Johns and Putnam Counties and TCA.
<b>8</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Chief Deputy Court Administrator 1.0 FTE Senior Court Program Specialist 1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 1.0 FTE Court Analyst 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. II		FTE cut in RIF. General Counsel needed as chief legal advisor, representative for the court, and policy/procedure development. Chief Deputy needed for administration of court programs, liaison to court related agencies and public, and to provide budgetary authority. SCPS needed for grant acquisition at local, state, and federal levels and to act as court's liaison for collaborative grant efforts. CPSII needed to maintain court-appointed counsel registry and to provide support for court administration circuit-wide. Ct. Analyst needed to assemble and maintain court data and provide staff support for court committees. AAI needed to handle sensitive materials for Chief Judge and to provide administrative support.
<b>10</b>	1.0 FTE Chief Deputy Court Administrator 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		AAI cut in RIF. Chief Deputy needed for delegation of increased TCA administrative duties and improved administration of justice in all counties. AAI needed for the timely processing of invoices.
<b>11</b>	1.0 FTE Court Program Specialist II 1.0 FTE Purchasing Specialist 2.0 FTE Admin. Asst. III 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. I 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		FTE cut in RIF. CPSII needed to monitor UFC and complex civil cases necessary to ensure efficient/timely disposition. Purchasing Specialist needed for ongoing procurement services and inventory control. AAI's needed to provide complex administrative support in managing daily operations and clerical support functions in family cases. AAI needed to calendar domestic relations cases. ASI needed to cover front office and handle receptionist/secretarial duties.
<b>12</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Family Court Manager 1.0 FTE Accountant IV 1.0 FTE Accountant I 2.5 FTE Admin. Asst. II 0.5 FTE Admin. Asst. I		FTE cut in RIF. General Counsel needed to assist Chief Judge with administrative orders, procedure development, and lawsuits filed against judges. Mgr needed to oversee UFC staff and programs. Accountants needed to alleviate workload on other staff. Admin. positions needed to track court files and legal assignments for law clerks and to assist General Counsel. Contracted services funds needed for mailing services, advertising, etc.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Positions</b>	<b>Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>13</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Admin. Services Mgr 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. III		Mgr cut in RIF, needed to assist in the management of the state budget, procurement, project management and other administrative areas. General Counsel needed as 13 <sup>th</sup> is one of few large circuits w/o this state funded resource. AAIII needed to support legal department. Contracted Services requested for a multimedia producer to create, modify and maintain content for circuit website pages, as well as troubleshoot, automate specified tasks, and create workflow and performance measures reports.
<b>14</b>	1.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I	\$5,000	Mgr cut in RIF. Positions needed to equitably distribute workload in a circuit with a wide geographical area and reduce need for routine overtime. Additional expense requested for circuit-wide travel to 6 counties.
<b>17</b>	1.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 1.0 FTE Sr. Network Analyst 1.0 FTE Court Analyst 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I 2.0 FTE Senior Secretary		FTE cut in RIF. Positions needed to restore services provided to the judiciary, including monthly and quarterly statistical reporting, and relieve other staff of having to provide support services previously covered by these eliminated positions.
<b>18</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 Chief Deputy Court Administrator 1.0 FTE Budget Manager 0.75 FTE Admin. Asst. II		FTE cut in RIF. General Counsel needed to support the Chief Judge and Court Administration on legal decisions associated with human resources, public records, and other issues. Chief Deputy needed as Seminole courthouse is 65 miles from TCA, so on-site supervisor is prudent. Budget Mgr and AAII needed to give adequate service to internal and external customers. OCO requested to replace old copiers.
<b>19</b>	1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. II 1.0 FTE Admin. Secretary I		ASI cut in RIF, needed to provide responses to public and judicial inquires and perform other support duties. AAII needed to provide support to the Human Resources Manager.
<b>20</b>	1.0 FTE General Counsel 1.0 FTE Court Operations Mgr 1.0 FTE Sr. Operations Consultant 1.0 FTE Personnel Specialist 1.0 FTE Accounting Services Supervisor 4.0 FTE Director of Admin. Services 2.0 FTE Admin. Asst. III 1.0 FTE Admin. Asst. II	\$26,873	Positions needed to have staffing standard levels consistent for a circuit recently designated as "Large" during needs assessment. Additional expense requested to restore funds lost in cuts.
<b>Total</b>	<b>94.5 FTE</b>	<b>\$31,873</b>	

### **Options:**

Option One- File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (239.50 FTE). Also, include the 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

Option Two- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the need calculated under the funding methodology (94.0 FTE). Also, include the 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

### **Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (239.50 FTE). Do not file the 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

### **Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File LBR based on the statewide need calculated under the funding methodology (239.50 FTE). Do not file the 14<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit's recurring expense requests.

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting August 18, 2009**  
**Court Administration**  
**Fiscal Year 2010/11 LBR**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 FTE</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Expenses<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Aug 2007 Approved FTE Thresholds</b>	<b>Option 1 FY 2010/11 Total Need (23.1%)</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Total Additional Need</b>	<b>FY 2009/10 Budget and FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested FTE</b>	<b>FY 2010/11 Requested Expense Recurring</b>	<b>Option 2 Requests Within the Needs Assessment</b>
1	11	\$832,239	17	21	\$652,275	\$1,484,514	3		3
2	7	\$603,378	12	15	\$573,205	\$1,176,583	6		6
3	8	\$612,745	12	15	\$522,827	\$1,135,572	2		2
4	17	\$1,355,025	27	33	\$947,368	\$2,302,393	16		16
5	12.5	\$933,610	17	21	\$619,146	\$1,552,756	9		8.5
6	22.75	\$1,708,469	27	33	\$613,746	\$2,322,215	7.25		7.25
7	12.5	\$962,261	17	21	\$619,146	\$1,581,407	1.5		1.5
8	8	\$738,153	12	15	\$522,827	\$1,260,980	6		6
9	19	\$1,800,156	27	33	\$828,947	\$2,629,103	0		0
10	12	\$894,447	17	21	\$641,248	\$1,535,695	2		2
11	38	\$3,408,639	42	52	\$838,894	\$4,247,533	6		6
12	11	\$833,938	17	21	\$744,386	\$1,578,324	7		7
13	20	\$1,633,325	27	33	\$821,074	\$2,454,399	3		3
14	6	\$479,308	12	15	\$641,248	\$1,120,556	2	\$5,000	2
15	23	\$1,587,704	27	33	\$599,210	\$2,186,914	0		0
16	6.5	\$485,327	12	15	\$619,146	\$1,104,473	0		0
17	21	\$1,640,036	42	52	\$1,865,673	\$3,505,709	6		6
18	12.25	\$994,026	17	21	\$643,446	\$1,637,472	3.75		3.75
19	8	\$639,958	17	21	\$878,090	\$1,518,048	2		2
20	9	\$933,888	27	33	\$1,478,068	\$2,411,956	12	\$26,873	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>284.5</b>	<b>\$23,076,632</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>\$15,669,970</b>	<b>\$38,746,602</b>	<b>94.5</b>	<b>\$31,873</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>TCBC Recommended LBR</b>				<b>239.5</b>					

<sup>1</sup> Includes salaries, benefits, and expenses provided by OSCA, Budget Office.

Note: In August 2007 increased thresholds for Court Counsel and Operations/Administration were approved for small and medium circuits. The new threshold approved for Court Counsel was 2.0 FTE for small and medium circuits. The new thresholds approved for Operations/Administration for small and medium circuits were 8.0 FTE and 13.0 FTE, respectively. The needs assessment applies a 23.1% growth rate to the approved thresholds as a representation of increased workload required to support the FY 2010-11 need for all trial court resources and also shifts the 19th circuit to medium, the 20th circuit to large and the 17th circuit to extra large.

## **Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission**

### **Other FY 2010-2011 Legislative Budget Requests**

#### **Issue: Salaries and Benefits**

- A) The 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit has noted their circuit's number one priority is the lifting of hiring freeze so that 17 current vacancies can be filled immediately.

#### **Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Not necessary to file an issue. This issue was addressed in the Salary Budget Management section of the proposed FY 2009-10 Budget and Pay Administration memorandum.

- B) The 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting a 12% pay increase (4 years x 3%) for all FTE to remedy the fact that state employees have not received a pay increase since October 1, 2006.

#### **Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

- C) The 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting \$212,000 for one-time bonus payments (106 FTE x \$2,000).

#### **Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

**Issue: Other Personal Services (OPS)**

A) A statewide need of \$1,186,225 for FY 10-11 has been calculated based on FY 06-07 allocations and applying a 5.8% growth rate per year.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File an LBR issue based on the statewide need.

Circuit	Recurring OPS			
	Total FY 2006/07 Allocations	FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment <sup>1</sup>	Total FY 2009/10 Budget	Total FY 2010/11 Additional Need
1	19,887	24,501	0	<b>24,501</b>
2	15,669	19,304	0	<b>19,304</b>
3	8,437	10,394	0	<b>10,394</b>
4	80,735	99,466	0	<b>99,466</b>
5	23,503	28,956	0	<b>28,956</b>
6	38,569	47,517	0	<b>47,517</b>
7	40,108	49,413	0	<b>49,413</b>
8	38,861	47,877	0	<b>47,877</b>
9	35,556	43,805	0	<b>43,805</b>
10	22,298	27,471	0	<b>27,471</b>
11	312,265	384,710	0	<b>384,710</b>
12	17,477	21,532	0	<b>21,532</b>
13	34,953	43,062	0	<b>43,062</b>
14	11,450	14,106	0	<b>14,106</b>
15	31,940	39,350	0	<b>39,350</b>
16	70,421	86,759	0	<b>86,759</b>
17	50,622	62,366	0	<b>62,366</b>
18	24,106	29,699	0	<b>29,699</b>
19	16,874	20,789	0	<b>20,789</b>
20	22,298	27,471	0	<b>27,471</b>
Reserve	46,816	57,677	0	<b>57,677</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>962,845</b>	<b>1,186,225</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,186,225</b>

- B)** The 15<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting \$35,000 in recurring OPS funding for temporary assistance in areas where absences can result in backlogs of work, lack of clerical assistance, or inability to respond to the needs of the public. The request narrative notes that uncovered absences may result in slow response and assistance to inquiries by the public; possible delay of case processing and an over-extension of the non-absent workforce. This request is within the \$39,500 in OPS funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 15<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

- C)** The 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit is requesting \$100,000 in recurring OPS funding to cover judicial assistant absences. The request narrative notes that lack of funding has caused hardship to judges, attorneys, and the public when JAs are away from the office longer than a few days. The circuit further notes that if the request is not funded, judicial officers will operate at unacceptable levels of service when JAs are absent. This request is outside of the \$29,699 in OPS funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

**Issue: Expenses – General**

The 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit requests \$50,000 in recurring Expense funding in FY 10-11 and an additional \$41,243 in recurring Expense funding in FY 11-12. The request narrative notes that this is a partial restoration of Expense category funding.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

**Issue: Expenses and Operating Capital Outlay (OCO) – New/Renovated Courthouse Space**

- A) The 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit requests \$44,000 (\$28,000 Expense and \$16,000 OCO) in non-recurring funding to completely furnish 2 additional judges' chambers (including JA furnishings) as part of the St. Johns County Courthouse renovation project expected to be completed in late 2010/early 2011.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

- B) The 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit requests \$118,500 (\$33,900 Expense and \$84,600 OCO) in non-recurring funding for FY 2010-2011 and \$107,200 (\$18,200 Expense and \$89,000 OCO) in non-recurring funding for FY 2011-2012 to furnish new judicial chambers and judicial assistant offices. The request narrative notes that a new ten story courthouse with 22 judicial chambers was opened in Lee County in June, that renovations will be completed in Hendry County in August to include a new courtroom and accompanying judicial chambers, and that by October 2010 Collier County will add five new judicial chambers, a large conference room and a break room. Existing furniture is old and unable to be moved without causing irreparable damage and, in some instances, there is no furniture to move because space, e.g., conference room, is being added, not replaced.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File requested funding for FY 10-11 only.

**Issue: Operating Capital Outlay (OCO) – General**

A) A statewide need of \$887,117 for FY 10-11 has been calculated based on FY 07-08 allocations and applying a 5.8% growth rate per year (less FY 09-10 allocations).

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File an LBR issue based on the statewide need.

Circuit	Recurring OCO			
	Total FY 2007/08 Allocations	FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment <sup>1</sup>	Total FY 2009/10 Budget	Total FY 2010/11 Additional Need
1	22,000	25,828	6,762	<b>19,066</b>
2	22,000	25,828	4,428	<b>21,400</b>
3	14,000	16,436	1,000	<b>15,436</b>
4	100,000	117,400	30,739	<b>86,661</b>
5	22,500	26,415	6,916	<b>19,499</b>
6	40,000	46,960	12,296	<b>34,664</b>
7	33,500	39,329	10,126	<b>29,203</b>
8	30,000	35,220	9,221	<b>25,999</b>
9	47,100	55,295	14,450	<b>40,845</b>
10	35,000	41,090	10,759	<b>30,331</b>
11	234,644	275,472	68,000	<b>207,472</b>
12	35,000	41,090	10,759	<b>30,331</b>
13	106,256	124,745	22,284	<b>102,461</b>
14	25,000	29,350	7,349	<b>22,001</b>
15	30,000	35,220	9,221	<b>25,999</b>
16	10,000	11,740	3,074	<b>8,666</b>
17	113,000	132,662	34,907	<b>97,755</b>
18	50,000	58,700	15,370	<b>43,330</b>
19	10,000	11,740	3,074	<b>8,666</b>
20	20,000	23,480	6,148	<b>17,332</b>
Reserve	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>1,174,000</b>	<b>286,883</b>	<b>887,117</b>

- B)** The 15th Circuit requests \$58,555 in non-recurring OCO funds to purchase three evidence presentation unit – one permanent installation at the main courthouse at a cost of \$16,510, one portable ADA-compliant unit as a back-up at a cost of \$25,535 for the main courthouse, and one portable evidence presentation unit at a cost of \$16,510 for the four remote courthouses. Currently, the circuit has one mobile presentation unit that is inoperable and out of warranty. This request is outside of the \$25,999 in additional OCO funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 15<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

- C)** The 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit requests \$36,000 in non-recurring OCO funds to replace old copiers. This request is within the \$43,330 in additional OCO funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

**Issue: Contracted Services – General**

A) A statewide need of \$447,277 for FY 10-11 has been calculated based on FY 07-08 allocations and applying a 5.8% growth rate per year (less FY 09-10 allocations). See attached chart.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File an LBR issue based on the statewide need.

Circuit	Recurring Contracted Services			
	Total FY 2007/08 Allocations	FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment <sup>1</sup>	Total FY 2009/10 Budget <sup>2</sup>	Total FY 2010/11 Additional Need
1	26,835	31,504	23,185	<b>8,319</b>
2	25,874	30,376	22,355	<b>8,021</b>
3	5,916	6,945	5,159	<b>1,786</b>
4	103,480	121,486	82,150	<b>39,337</b>
5	32,078	37,660	28,291	<b>9,369</b>
6	147,097	172,692	127,091	<b>45,601</b>
7	26,162	30,714	22,604	<b>8,110</b>
8	53,079	62,315	47,972	<b>14,343</b>
9	51,080	59,968	44,133	<b>15,835</b>
10	13,730	16,119	11,863	<b>4,256</b>
11	353,987	415,581	321,491	<b>94,090</b>
12	15,000	17,610	14,400	<b>3,210</b>
13	158,000	185,492	137,088	<b>48,404</b>
14	5,000	5,870	4,320	<b>1,550</b>
15	43,763	51,378	37,812	<b>13,566</b>
16	6,000	7,044	61,344	<b>1,044</b>
17	196,031	230,140	169,371	<b>60,769</b>
18	22,928	26,917	19,810	<b>7,107</b>
19	39,082	45,882	33,767	<b>12,115</b>
20	162,728	191,043	140,597	<b>50,446</b>
Reserve	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,487,850</b>	<b>1,746,736</b>	<b>1,354,803</b>	<b>447,277</b>

**B)** The 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit requests \$10,000 recurring funding in the Contracted Services category for maintenance contracts. The request narrative reflects that the current allocation is not enough to cover the annual contracted maintenance services for copiers and other equipment within all four of the circuit's counties. For the past several fiscal years, in order to pay these services annually, the circuit has typically requested a transfer of funds from Expense. However, due to decreasing Expense allocations, the circuit notes that they no longer have the ability to transfer those funds as the need to keep them for expense items is increasing. Further, the circuit notes that maintenance contracts are a cost savings as they eliminate the vendor's ability to charge for labor, parts, etc. each time they are called to repair a broken machine and that, due to the average equipment age, the machines are constantly being repaired and maintained as part of the existing maintenance contracts. This request is outside of the \$8,319 in additional Contractual Services funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request.

**C)** The 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit requests \$2,500 recurring funding in the Contracted Services category to pay copier maintenance, shipping services and advertisements. The request narrative notes that the current allocation of \$500 is not sufficient to meet the circuit's contracted services needs. (Note: The 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit's FY 09-10 allotments for Contracted Services are \$4,679 in circuit budget and \$480 in county budget.) This request is outside of the \$1,786 in additional Contractual Services funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request

**D)** The 12<sup>th</sup> Circuit requests \$10,000 recurring funding in the Contracted Services category to pay for mailing services, advertising for vacant positions and other necessary contracted services. The request narrative notes that the circuit has no contracted services allotment in the circuit budget, only in the county budget. This request is outside of the \$3,210 in additional Contractual Services funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 12<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request

**E)** The 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit requests \$2,600 recurring funding in the Contracted Services category for maintenance of a stand-alone copy machine used for the reproduction of written transcripts. The request narrative notes that failure to fund the request will result in an alternative means of replication being sought which will waste time and money. This request is within the \$7,107 in additional Contractual Services funding calculated in the FY 10-11 statewide needs assessment for the 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Do not approve the request

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting August 18, 2009**  
**FY 2010/11 Needs Assessment/LBR by Element Summary**

Element	TCBC Recommended LBR
ADR/Mediation	\$4,372,869
Case Management	\$9,933,665
Child Support Hearing Officers	\$0
Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers	\$1,469,052
Court Administration	\$15,669,970
Court Interpreting - Direct Services	\$2,029,113
Court Reporting - Direct Services	\$10,855,258
Expert Witness	\$0
General Magistrates	\$1,528,528
Law Clerks	\$6,219,654
Recurring Contracted Services	\$391,933
Recurring OCO	\$887,117
Recurring OPS	\$1,186,225
Senior Judges	\$878,350
<b>Subtotal (Includes the 2% employee salary restore)</b>	<b>\$55,421,734</b>
<b>Self Help</b>	<b>\$4,123,900</b>
<b>Additional Compensation for County Judges</b>	<b>\$200,855</b>
New/Renovated Courthouse Space Furnishings - One Time	\$162,500
Court Reporting - One Time Equipment Costs	\$5,055,740
Court Reporting - Maintenance	\$591,431
Court Reporting - Cost Sharing	\$759,892
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$66,316,052</b>
<b>2% Judge Pay Restore</b>	<b>\$3,712,293</b>
<b>Pay Plan - Existing Employees</b>	<b>\$14,505,428</b>
<b>Pay Plan - New Positions</b>	<b>\$5,886,492</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$90,420,265</b>