

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2011-2012 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Court Interpreting Equipment

During the last few months, the Court Interpreting Technology Workgroup (formerly known as the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup) began meeting via teleconference to develop technical and budgetary standards on the future implementation of court interpreting technology. During these meeting sessions, early discussions were held regarding current market conditions for interpreting technology which led the Workgroup to make the following determinations:

- Moving forward with an ITN (Invitation to Negotiate) process may be premature at this time because the technology market for interpreting is in the introductory and growth stages.
- The development of technical standards may be premature at this time as technological service requirements have yet to be defined.
- The development of budgetary *guidelines* is preferable (as opposed to mandated standards) given that circuits will need some flexibility as they explore future opportunities to integrate interpreting technology.

In consideration of the above determinations and in using the existing standards for the management of *court reporting* technology as a framework, the members developed their recommendations to address cost guidelines for future purchases of remote interpreting including maintenance, refresh timeframes, asset inventory needs, and centralized calling centers. Additionally, to assist the circuits in the possible future purchase of integrated remote interpreting solutions, included in the report is a brief summary of the current understanding of the interpreting technology market today as well as survey results that reveal what each circuit plans in relation to integrated remote interpreting.

A brief summary of the Court Interpreting Technology Workgroup's recommendations is provided in the table below.

#	Recommendations	TCBC Recommendation
<b>Cost Guidelines for Future Purchases</b>		
1	Projection of future costs and the evaluation of circuit funding requests should be based on the estimated cost guidelines as outlined in the report for courtrooms, hearing rooms, standalone carts, and interpreter offices.	Approve
<b>Maintenance</b>		
2	A simple 13% funding formula applied to initial hardware and software costs (excluding installation/training costs) should be used as a guideline to assess the required budgetary amount needed to support the maintenance of integrated audio/video remote interpreting technology hardware and software.	Approve
<b>Refresh</b>		
3	A hardware replacement schedule for the projection of future costs and for the evaluation of circuit funding requests should be based on the timeframe guidelines as outlined in the report for hardware components.	Approve

<b>Data Collection and Analysis</b>		
4	For purposes of managing court interpreting hardware and software resources, circuits shall maintain and annually submit an asset inventory to the OSCA following the guidance from the OSCA on appropriate format, content, and reporting frequency.	Approve
<b>Future Considerations</b>		
5	As the need for due process technology grows the trial courts should explore the future possibility of sharing interpreting resources across circuit boundaries through the implementation of an intra-state integrated remote interpreting technological model.	Approve

Last year, as part of the FY 2010-11 LBR the TCBC approved to file a court interpreting equipment request based on circuit requests. A total amount of \$272,000 in OCO and \$32,000 in non-recurring Expense was requested. These amounts were not funded by the Legislature. However, \$17,000 non-recurring expense was allocated to the 11<sup>th</sup> circuit in May 2010 for interpreting refresh.

For the FY 2011-12 LBR, the circuits are requesting \$395,646 for expansion and \$89,050 for refresh.

**Options:**

*Expansion*

Option One- File LBR based on circuit requests that are within the Court Interpreting Technology Workgroup's recommended cost model guidelines.

Option Two- Do not file LBR.

*Refresh*

Option One- File LBR based on circuit requests.

Option Two- Do not file LBR.

**Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

Approve the Court Interpreting Technology Workgroup's recommendations. For expansion and refresh, file LBR based on option one.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Approve the Court Interpreting Technology Workgroup's recommendations. File LBR for both expansion (\$341,250 OCO and \$54,396 Non-Recurring Expenses) and refresh (\$89,050 OCO) based on option one.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting July 24, 2010  
Court Interpreting**

**Expansion**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2011/12 LBR Circuit Requests</b>					<b>TCBC RECOMMENDATION Option 1 FY 2011/12 LBR for Expansion</b>
	<b>Number of Courtrooms</b>	<b>Number of Hearing Rooms</b>	<b>OCO</b>	<b>Expenses (Non Recurring)</b>	<b>Total</b>	
11	2	0	\$21,000	\$0	<b>\$21,000</b>	<b>\$21,000</b>
13	12	2	\$46,600	\$49,996	<b>\$96,596</b>	<b>\$96,596</b>
17	44	0	\$273,650	\$4,400	<b>\$278,050</b>	<b>\$278,050</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$341,250</b>	<b>\$54,396</b>	<b>\$395,646</b>	<b>\$395,646</b>

**Refresh**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>TCBC RECOMMENDATION Option 1 FY 2011/12 LBR Circuit Requests (OCO)</b>
9	\$12,050
11	\$77,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$89,050</b>

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2011-2012 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Court Reporting Equipment

Since the approval of the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup's recommendations<sup>1</sup> in 2008, some clarification questions arose regarding the possible need to amend the approved policies. At their June 2010 meeting, the Workgroup developed supplemental recommendations to address these questions. The following table provides a summary listing of these supplemental recommendations.

#	Court Reporting Technology Workgroup Supplemental Recommendations	TCBC Recommendation
<b>Should state funds be used to purchase videoconferencing/wireless networking devices for court reporting services?</b>		
1	State funds should not be used for the purchase of videoconferencing/wireless networking devices for court reporting services.	Approve
<b>Should there be a TCBC policy to guide the circuits on the future purchase of additional laptops and/or other recording devices for emergency needs?</b>		
2	As part of the November 2008 report, the TCBC approved to request funding for a statewide break-fix contingency fund of \$100,000 for emergency and/or unforeseen failures of court reporting technology. Currently, however, the break-fix contingency fund has not been funded by the legislature. Until such time that this fund is appropriated, it is recommended that circuit's individual emergency requests for court reporting continue to be evaluated on a case by case basis.	Approve
<b>How often should <i>portable</i> encoders be refreshed?</b>		
3	As laptops or standalone workstations may also be utilized as encoders, it is recommended that those refresh timeframes be used as applicable. If there is not a hardware refresh timeframe that applies to the encoder device being used, industry standards should be referenced as part of the circuit's funding request for consideration by the TCBC.	Approve
<b>May state funds be used to purchase audio mixers?</b>		
4	Pursuant to Section 29.008 (1)(a)(2)(f), audio mixers are a county funded obligation as they are considered a necessary component of a courtroom's sound reinforcement system. However, if the mixer is also supporting digital court recording as an integral part of that system, then state funding may be used to purchase these items.	Approve

<sup>1</sup>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.

For the FY 2010-11 LBR, the TCBC approved a court reporting equipment request of \$3,242,938 for expansion; \$158,280 for existing equipment maintenance needs; and \$1,907,111 for refresh. These requested funding amounts were not funded by the Legislature. However, \$1,907,111 was allocated to the circuits in April 2010 (from FY 2009-10 unobligated funds) for refresh.

For the FY 2011-12 LBR, the circuits are requesting \$1,408,320 for expansion; \$283,193 for existing equipment maintenance needs; and \$3,579,430 for refresh.

**Options:**

***Expansion***

Option One- File LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved cost standards and include the 1<sup>st</sup> circuit's request of \$19,600 to expand archiving abilities; the 15<sup>th</sup> circuit's request of \$45,854 to expand current storage capacity and 17<sup>th</sup> circuit's request of \$2,750 for on-record indicator lights. Also, include funding for completion of the digital expansion phase-in plan.

Option Two- Do not file LBR.

***Maintenance on Existing Technology Base***

Option One- File LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved 13% maintenance formula and include the 10<sup>th</sup> circuit's request of \$60,000 to change from a time and materials maintenance contract to a standard maintenance contract with different vendor.

Option Two- Do not file LBR.

***Refresh***

Option One- File LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved refresh standards for state purchased components (as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory).

Option Two- File LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved refresh standards for state purchased components (as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory). Include the 4<sup>th</sup> circuit's request of \$143,208 to refresh county purchased state obligated due process equipment, the 10<sup>th</sup> circuit's request of \$170,000 to transition from a time and materials maintenance contract to a standard maintenance contract with different vendor, the 11<sup>th</sup> circuit's request of \$901,990 to refresh county purchased state obligated due process equipment and to upgrade from standalone to central/remote recording configuration, and the 19<sup>th</sup> circuit's request of \$341,741 to refresh county purchased state obligated due process equipment.

Option Three- Do not file LBR.

**Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:**

Approve the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup’s supplemental recommendations.

For expansion and maintenance on existing technology base, file LBR based on option one.

For refresh, file LBR based on option two. Conduct a preliminary assessment using the Due Process Technology Inventory on all future refresh costs associated with state obligated court reporting equipment purchased using county funds.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Approve the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup’s supplemental recommendations.

File LBR for expansion (\$862,803 OCO; \$407,119 Non-Recurring Expenses; and \$115,225 Maintenance) based on option one. However, do not request funding for completion of the DCR expansion phase-in plan.

File LBR for recurring maintenance (\$241,622 Maintenance) on existing technology based on option one.

File LBR for refresh (\$3,172,874 OCO and \$406,556 Non-Recurring Expenses) based on option two. Conduct a preliminary assessment using the Due Process Technology Inventory on future refresh costs associated with state obligated court reporting equipment purchased using county funds.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting July 24, 2010**

**Court Reporting**

**FY 2011/12 LBR and DCR Equipment Expansion**

Circuit	FY 2011/12 LBR										DCR Equipment Expansion <sup>1</sup>			TCBC RECOMMENDATION		
	Circuit Requests						Circuit Requests Within Standard (Including Special Requests)									
	# of CR	# of HR	OCO	Expenses (Non Recurring)	Maintenance (Recurring)	Total Requests	OCO	Expenses (Non Recurring)	Maintenance (Recurring)	Total Requests Within Standard	# of CR	# of HR	DCR Equipment Expansion Additional Cost	# of CR	# of HR	FY 2011/12 LBR for Expansion
1 <sup>2</sup>	6	2	\$88,400	\$93,700	\$22,632	<b>\$204,732</b>	\$88,400	\$93,700	\$22,632	<b>\$204,732</b>	3	1	\$95,760	6	2	<b>\$204,732</b>
2	5	0	\$91,000	\$0	\$8,000	<b>\$99,000</b>	\$91,000	\$0	\$8,000	<b>\$99,000</b>	6	0	\$155,974	5	0	<b>\$99,000</b>
3	0	5	\$8,119	\$45,534	\$0	<b>\$53,653</b>	\$8,119	\$45,534	\$0	<b>\$53,653</b>	0	0	\$0	0	5	<b>\$53,653</b>
4	4	3	\$82,982	\$8,395	\$10,965	<b>\$102,342</b>	\$71,582	\$550	\$9,377	<b>\$81,509</b>	8	0	\$207,965	4	3	<b>\$81,509</b>
5	8	9	\$174,720	\$185,250	\$46,796	<b>\$406,766</b>	\$174,720	\$185,250	\$46,796	<b>\$406,766</b>	8	10	\$385,692	8	9	<b>\$406,766</b>
6	0	0	\$51,610	\$5,325	\$5,345	<b>\$62,280</b>	\$51,610	\$5,325	\$5,345	<b>\$62,280</b>	8	4	\$279,056	0	0	<b>\$62,280</b>
7	5	0	\$54,000	\$41,000	\$11,400	<b>\$106,400</b>	\$54,000	\$41,000	\$11,400	<b>\$106,400</b>	0	0	\$0	5	0	<b>\$106,400</b>
8	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	0	0	\$0	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
9	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	0	0	\$0	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
10	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	0	14	\$248,817	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
11	2	0	\$59,450	\$0	\$0	<b>\$59,450</b>	\$57,110	\$0	\$0	<b>\$57,110</b>	29	0	\$753,874	2	0	<b>\$57,110</b>
12	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	0	0	\$0	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
13	9	0	\$182,733	\$33,560	\$7,220	<b>\$223,513</b>	\$182,733	\$33,560	\$7,220	<b>\$223,513</b>	2	0	\$51,991	9	0	<b>\$223,513</b>
14	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	2	5	\$140,855	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
15 <sup>2</sup>	0	0	\$45,854	\$0	\$0	<b>\$45,854</b>	\$45,854	\$0	\$0	<b>\$45,854</b>	12	3	\$365,266	0	0	<b>\$45,854</b>
16	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	0	0	\$0	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
17 <sup>2</sup>	0	0	\$0	\$2,750	\$0	<b>\$2,750</b>	\$2,750	\$0	\$0	<b>\$2,750</b>	27	0	\$701,883	0	0	<b>\$2,750</b>
18	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	0	0	\$0	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
19	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	4	2	\$139,528	0	0	<b>\$0</b>
20	4	0	\$34,925	\$2,200	\$4,455	<b>\$41,580</b>	\$34,925	\$2,200	\$4,455	<b>\$41,580</b>	2	0	\$51,991	4	0	<b>\$41,580</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>\$873,793</b>	<b>\$417,714</b>	<b>\$116,813</b>	<b>\$1,408,320</b>	<b>\$862,803</b>	<b>\$407,119</b>	<b>\$115,225</b>	<b>\$1,385,147</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$3,578,650</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>\$1,385,147</b>

CR = Courtroom HR = Hearing Room

Note: Additional FY 2011/12 funding for newly constructed rooms is being requested by circuit 1 (6 courtrooms/2 hearing rooms), circuit 5 (8 courtrooms/9 hearing rooms), circuit 7 (2 courtrooms), and circuit 11 (2 courtrooms).

<sup>1</sup> DCR Equipment Expansion is based on outfitting remaining courtrooms and hearing rooms (as of the November 2008 survey) with digital recording capacity per recommendation by the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. In addition, amounts provided for DCR Equipment Expansion Cost include 13 percent maintenance.

<sup>2</sup> Circuit 1 total request includes \$19,600 to expand archiving abilities. Circuit 15 is requesting \$45,854 to expand current storage capacity. Circuit 17 is requesting \$2,750 for 5 on-record indicator lights.

**Trial Court Budget Commission  
Meeting July 24, 2010**

**Court Reporting**

**Maintenance on Existing Technology Base**

Circuit	Total Maintenance			13 Percent Formula		TCBC RECOMMENDATION Option 1 FY 2011/12 LBR for Maintenance Within Standard (Including Special Requests)
	FY 2009/10 Estimated Maintenance Expenditures <sup>1</sup>	Circuit Requests FY 2011/12 Maintenance LBR	Total LBR and Estimated Maintenance Expenditures	State Purchases	13 Percent Maintenance <sup>2</sup>	
1	\$71,150	\$70,000	<b>\$141,150</b>	\$1,196,550	\$155,552	<b>\$70,000</b>
2	\$43,905	\$2,400	<b>\$46,305</b>	\$506,637	\$65,863	<b>\$2,400</b>
9	\$0	\$25,000	<b>\$25,000</b>	\$1,224,785	\$159,222	<b>\$25,000</b>
10 <sup>3</sup>	\$46,743	\$60,000	<b>\$106,743</b>	\$418,926	\$54,460	<b>\$60,000</b>
13	\$21,931	\$6,912	<b>\$28,843</b>	\$2,285,196	\$297,075	<b>\$6,912</b>
14	\$54,268	\$73,161	<b>\$127,429</b>	\$660,448	\$85,858	<b>\$31,590</b>
16	\$0	\$11,050	<b>\$11,050</b>	\$112,560	\$14,633	<b>\$11,050</b>
18	\$31,024	\$3,571	<b>\$34,595</b>	\$756,340	\$98,324	<b>\$3,571</b>
20	\$220,738	\$31,099	<b>\$251,837</b>	\$1,939,606	\$252,149	<b>\$31,099</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$489,759</b>	<b>\$283,193</b>	<b>\$772,952</b>	<b>\$9,101,048</b>	<b>\$1,183,136</b>	<b>\$241,622</b>

<sup>1</sup> FY 2009/10 Estimated Maintenance Expenditures include dollars from cost center 129 and 267. The estimate annualizes expenditures from July 2009 through May 2010 and estimates certified forward dollars.

<sup>2</sup> Based on policy recommendations of the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. Thirteen percent is applied to hardware and software purchases using state funds through fiscal year 2009/10 as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory.

<sup>3</sup> Circuit 10 is requesting \$60,000 maintenance and \$170,000 refresh in order to change from a time and materials maintenance contract with CourtSmart to a standard maintenance contract with another vendor.

**Trial Court Budget Commission**  
**Meeting July 24, 2010**  
**Court Reporting**  
**Refresh**

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>FY 2011/12 LBR Request (OCO and Expense)</b>	<b>Due Process Technology Inventory (State Only)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Option 1 FY 2011/12 LBR for Refresh Within Standard</b>	<b>TCBC RECOMMENDATION Option 2 FY 2011/12 LBR for Refresh Within Standard (Including Special Requests)</b>
1	\$215,157	\$778,385	\$215,157	\$215,157
2	\$172,995	\$409,385	\$172,995	\$172,995
3	\$185,700	\$442,279	\$185,700	\$185,700
4 <sup>2</sup>	\$143,208	\$52,833	\$52,833	\$143,208
5	\$228,748	\$1,005,918	\$228,748	\$228,748
6	\$42,400	\$333,804	\$42,400	\$42,400
7	\$99,000	\$674,634	\$99,000	\$99,000
8	\$77,081	\$586,761	\$77,081	\$77,081
9	\$126,700	\$1,593,385	\$126,700	\$126,700
10 <sup>2</sup>	\$170,000	\$15,536	\$15,536	\$170,000
11 <sup>2</sup>	\$901,990	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$901,990
12	\$37,410	\$101,556	\$37,410	\$37,410
13	\$41,800	\$1,035,284	\$41,800	\$41,800
14	\$0	\$269,560	\$0	\$0
15	\$0	\$152,393	\$0	\$0
16	\$20,100	\$43,797	\$20,100	\$20,100
17	\$113,000	\$116,438	\$113,000	\$113,000
18	\$110,100	\$374,288	\$110,100	\$110,100
19 <sup>2</sup>	\$341,741	\$301,987	\$301,987	\$341,741
20	\$552,300	\$553,620	\$552,300	\$552,300
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,579,430</b>	<b>\$8,845,843</b>	<b>\$2,396,847</b>	<b>\$3,579,430</b>

<sup>1</sup> Based on policy recommendations of the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. The amount includes refresh dollars through fiscal year 2011/12 based on the hardware replacement schedule (recommended by the Workgroup), less refresh allocations for fiscal year 2008/09 and 2009/10.

<sup>2</sup> Circuit 4 is requesting \$143,208 to refresh due process equipment originally purchased by the county. Circuit 10 is requesting \$60,000 maintenance and \$170,000 refresh in order to change from a time and materials maintenance contract with CourtSmart to a standard maintenance contract with another vendor. Circuit 11 is requesting \$901,990 to refresh due process equipment originally purchased by the county as well as transition from a standalone recording model to an 8 channel central/remote recording configuration. Circuit 19 is requesting \$341,741 to refresh due process equipment originally purchased by the county.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2011-2012 Legislative Budget Request

#### Issue: Needs Assessment

The Trial Court Budget Commission met on June 4, 2010, and decided to use the Needs Assessment to develop the trial court FY 2011-12 Legislative Budget Request (LBR) for recurring issues. The Needs Assessment calculation starts with the existing base budget, then total funding need is calculated by circuit for all trial court elements based on institutionalized funding methodologies, which considers both the impact of recent budget cuts and insufficient funding levels experienced for several years.

<b>Needs Assessment by Element</b>	<b>LBR Amount</b>
ADR/Mediation	\$4,372,869
Case Management	\$10,684,103
Child Support Hearing Officers	\$0
Civil Traffic Infraction Hearing Officers	\$1,469,052
Court Administration	\$16,322,824
Court Interpreting - Direct Services	\$2,029,113
Court Reporting - Direct Services	\$10,095,366
Court Reporting - Cost Sharing	\$759,892
Expert Witness	\$0
General Magistrates	\$1,635,237
Law Clerks	\$6,742,396
Recurring OPS	\$1,186,225
Recurring OCO	\$887,117
Recurring Contracted Services	\$447,277
Senior Judges	\$878,350
Additional Compensation for County Judges	\$200,855
Self Help	\$4,475,593
<b>Needs Assessment Total</b>	<b>\$62,186,269</b>

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

Do not file an LBR for elements covered in the Needs Assessment as shown in the chart above.

## Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

### FY 2011-12 Legislative Budget Request – Other Requests

#### Issue: Expense and Operating Capital Outlay (OCO) – New/Renovated Courthouse Space

- A. 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit** – Construction of the new Okaloosa Courthouse facility is expected to be completed in July 2011. The circuit requests \$170,840 in non-recurring funding within the Expense category to furnish seven judges' chambers (including judicial assistant furnishings), five court administration personnel offices, one court administration conference room, two staff attorney offices, five court reporter offices, two hearing officer offices/hearing rooms, and four case management personnel offices.

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

- B. 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit** – Renovations to the Wakulla County Courthouse have been approved by the Wakulla County Board of County Commissioners with a tentative completion date of April-May 2011. The circuit requests \$8,705 in non-recurring OCO and \$7,569 in non-recurring Expense funding for a total of \$16,274 to furnish the newly renovated areas during July-August 2011 for two judges' chambers and judicial assistant offices and for offices for a user support analyst, integrated computer system interface developer, digital court reporter, and child support hearing officer.

Advanced planning for renovations to the Jefferson County Courthouse is also occurring with a tentative completion date in late 2011/early 2012. The circuit requests \$8,705 in non-recurring OCO and \$3,785 in non-recurring Expense funding for a total of \$12,490 to furnish two judges' chambers and judicial assistant offices and a general magistrate/child support hearing officer shared office.

The total non-recurring request for furnishings for the two renovations is \$28,764 (\$17,410 in the OCO category and \$11,354 in the Expenses category).

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

**C. 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit** – Construction of the new courthouse facility in Duval County has reached the midway point and is expected to be operational by May 2012. The circuit requests \$1,793,460 (\$777,127 Expense and \$1,016,333 OCO) in non-recurring funding to furnish various non-public spaces within the seven-story facility. It is anticipated that the majority of furnishings must be ordered during fiscal year 2011-12 in order to ensure that the new courthouse will have the necessary furnishings in place.

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

**D. 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit** – The Lake County Board of Commissioners has approved construction of an expansion to the existing Lake County Judicial Center. The circuit requests \$271,210 (\$101,410 Expense and \$169,800 OCO) in non-recurring funding to furnish various non-public spaces with the facility including seven judicial suites (including judicial assistant furnishings), judicial library/conference room, nine court administration offices, and one law clerk office.

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

**E. 13<sup>th</sup> Circuit** – Construction of the new Plant City Courthouse facility in Hillsborough County is expected to be completed in August 2011. The circuit requests \$67,016 (\$50,856 Expense and \$16,160 OCO) in non-recurring funding to furnish four judges' chambers (including judicial assistant furnishings), judicial library/conference room, and two general master offices.

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

**F. 15<sup>th</sup> Circuit** – Palm Beach County has begun renovations of both the courthouse and the associated jail. Upon completion, the new facility will be transformed into a full service satellite facility to support the western communities of Palm Beach County. The in-court

services projected to be provided include criminal, civil, traffic, and unified family matters.

The circuit requests \$98,756 (\$51,380 Expense and \$47,376 OCO) in non-recurring funding to furnish two judges' chambers (including judicial assistant furnishings), three conference rooms, senior judge and magistrate offices, court staff areas, and other shared office spaces that are a state responsibility to fund. Court staff will include court interpreters, court reporters, court technology, mediators, civil traffic hearing officer, and volunteer receptionist.

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

**G. 20<sup>th</sup> Circuit** – Collier County will add six new courtrooms and five judicial chambers by October 2010. In May 2010, surplus funds were used to purchase furnishings for two of the five judicial chambers.

The circuit requests \$69,724 (\$15,511 Expense and \$54,213 OCO) in non-recurring funding to provide furnishings for the remaining three judicial chambers (including judicial assistant areas) and other shared office spaces that are a state responsibility to fund.

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

File issue as requested.

*Note: All furniture requests for new courthouses or expansions included similar justification for not using current furnishings. No surplus furniture is available; current furnishings are not adequate or appropriate for continued use; and the existing furniture is old and unable to be moved without causing irreparable damage.*

**Issue: Other Non-recurring Equipment Requests**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit** – The circuit requests that five copier machines between 10 and 13 years old be replaced. It has been estimated that the circuit would save between \$1,185 and \$1,250 in maintenance costs annually if the copiers are replaced. The circuit requests \$22,500 (\$4,500 per copier x 5) in non-recurring funding within the OCO category for the replacement of copier machines. *Note: This request is in addition to the \$21,400 for the*

*2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit identified in the OCO requested in the FY 2011-12 statewide needs assessment.*

**Options:**

1. Do not approve the request.
2. File issue as requested.
3. File issue for \$1,100, i.e., the difference between the request and the needs assessment.

**Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:**

Table the request.