

**Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission
FY 2012-2013 Legislative Budget Request**

Issue: Recurring Elements

For FY 2011-12, the TCBC decided not to file an LBR for recurring costs, with the exception of an increase for cost sharing court reporting. At the June 23, 2011, meeting, the TCBC approved using the official funding methodologies to request additional FY 2012-13 resources and identified the Case Management, General Magistrates, and Law Clerks as the elements which would be considered at the next meeting for requesting additional resources. Utilizing the official methodologies helps to restore some of the positions lost during prior years' budget cuts.

A. Case Management

The funding methodology approved for the Case Management element is based on a ratio of one position per every 5,500 applicable filings and a floor of 8 positions. If the funding methodology indicated a need for 0.5 FTE, the number was rounded up. Current FTE numbers were subtracted from the whole numbers identified by the funding methodology to obtain additional FTE need.

Options:

Option One - File a LBR for the Case Management element (144 FTEs for a total of \$8,353,385) based on the official methodology.

Option Two - Do not file LBR.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File a LBR for the Case Management element (144 FTEs for a total of \$8,353,385) based on the official methodology.

TCBC Recommendation:

File a LBR for the Case Management element (144 FTEs for a total of \$8,353,385) based on the official methodology.

**Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission
FY 2012-2013 Legislative Budget Request**

B. General Magistrates

The funding methodology approved for the General Magistrates element is based on a case weighted methodology for general magistrates and a ratio of one administrative support position per magistrate. If the funding methodology indicated a need for 0.5 FTE, the number was rounded up. Current FTE numbers were subtracted from the whole numbers identified by the funding methodology to obtain additional FTE need. This methodology does not expand on the use of these resources within the judicial system to divisions where general magistrates are not used statewide. The Commission would need to direct OSCA staff to study the issue of expanding the use of magistrates to other divisions before estimates can be produced.

Options:

Option One - File a LBR for the General Magistrates element (9.5 Magistrate FTEs; 22 Administrative Support FTEs; and \$93,403 in Contracted Services for a total of \$2,144,690) based on the official methodology.

Option Two - Do not file LBR.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File a LBR for the General Magistrates element (9.5 Magistrate FTEs; 22 Administrative Support FTEs; and \$93,403 in Contracted Services dollars for a total of \$2,144,690) based on the official methodology.

TCBC Recommendation:

File a LBR for the General Magistrates element (9.5 Magistrate FTEs; 22 Administrative Support FTEs; and \$93,403 in Contracted Services dollars for a total of \$2,144,690) based on the official methodology.

**Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission
FY 2012-2013 Legislative Budget Request**

C. Law Clerks

The funding methodology approved for the Law Clerks element is based on a ratio of one law clerk per every two judges. If the funding methodology indicated a need for 0.5 FTE, the number was rounded up. Current FTE numbers were subtracted from the whole numbers identified by the funding methodology to obtain additional FTE need. This analysis only considers existing judges. The certification of new judges for FY 2012-13, along with associated support staff (e.g., law clerks), will be addressed directly by the Supreme Court.

Options:

Option One - File a LBR for the Law Clerks element (107.5 FTEs for a total of \$7,208,893) based on the official funding methodology.

Option Two - Do not file LBR.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File a LBR for the Law Clerks element (107.5 FTEs for a total of \$7,208,893) based on the official funding methodology.

TCBC Recommendation:

File a LBR for the Law Clerks element (107.5 FTEs for a total of \$7,208,893) based on the official funding methodology.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011
Case Management
FY 2012/13 LBR

Circuit	FY 2011/12 Budget	Funding Methodology		TCBC RECOMMENDATION FY 2012/13 LBR	
	Current Number of FTE ¹	Projected Filings ²	Total Number of Needed FTE ³ (Rounded to whole FTE)	Number of New FTE	Total Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses ⁴
1	10	78,893	14	4	\$231,932
2	4.5	46,763	9	4.5	\$262,840
3	6	20,704	8	2	\$115,966
4	20	156,201	28	8	\$463,864
5	9	95,016	17	8	\$463,864
6	19	159,473	29	10	\$579,830
7	14	110,159	20	6	\$347,898
8	4	47,486	9	5	\$289,915
9	18	165,619	30	12	\$695,796
10	9.5	89,700	16	6.5	\$378,806
11	43	315,034	57	14	\$811,762
12	8	73,266	13	5	\$289,915
13	20	167,923	31	11	\$637,813
14	6	40,443	8	2	\$115,966
15	18	160,581	29	11	\$637,813
16	6	11,031	8	2	\$115,966
17	28	227,380	41	13	\$753,779
18	12	105,960	19	7	\$405,881
19	6	66,566	12	6	\$347,898
20	14	115,819	21	7	\$405,881
Total	275	2,254,017	419	144	\$8,353,385

¹ Current Number of FTE include positions in cost centers 122 and 217 (drug court).

² Projected Filings do not include civil traffic infractions.

³ Total Number of Needed FTE based on the current funding methodology of 1:5,500 filings ratio and a floor of 8.0 FTE.

⁴ Total Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses were provided by the OSCA, Budget Office. Expenses include \$2,359 non-recurring per FTE (\$342,055).

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011
General Magistrates
FY 2012/13 LBR

Circuit	FY 2011/12 Budget		Funding Methodology			TCBC RECOMMENDATION FY 2012/13 LBR			
	Current Number of General Magistrate FTE	Current Number of Admin Support FTE	Total General Magistrate Need ¹	Total Number of Needed General Magistrate FTE (Rounded to whole FTE)	Total Needed Admin Support FTE ²	Number of New General Magistrate FTE	Number of New Admin Support FTE	Contracted Services	Total Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses ³
1	3	2.5	4.7	5	5	2	2.5		\$330,466
2	2	1	2.3	2	2	0	1		\$47,711
3	1	0	1.2	1	1	0	1		\$47,711
4	7	6	6.8	7	7	0	1		\$47,711
5	5	5	6.4	6	6	1	1		\$152,347
6	7.25	7	6.5	7	7	0	0		\$0
7	3.5	4	4.8	5	5	1.5	1		\$206,581
8	2	1	2.3	2	2	0	1		\$47,711
9	6	4	7.2	7	7	1	3		\$247,769
10	4	3	4.9	5	5	1	2		\$200,058
11	11	11	11.5	12	12	1	1		\$153,703
12	4	3	4.0	4	4	0	1		\$47,711
13	7	7	7.8	8	8	1	1		\$152,845
14	2	1	2.2	2	2	0	1		\$47,711
15	7	6	5.8	6	6	0	0		\$0
16 ⁴	0	0	0.5	1	1	0	0	\$93,403	\$93,403
17	9.5	8.5	8.0	8	8	0	0		\$0
18	4	3	4.6	5	5	1	2		\$200,058
19	3	2.5	3.2	3	3	0	0.5		\$25,772
20	5	3	5.1	5	5	0	2		\$95,422
Total	93.25	78.5	99.7	101.0	101.0	9.5	22.0	\$93,403	\$2,144,690

¹ Total General Magistrate Need based on 2007 Judicial Resource Study weights applied to fiscal year 2012/13 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).

² Total Needed Admin Support FTE assumes a 1:1 ratio of Administrative Support to General Magistrate.

³ Total Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses were provided by the OSCA, Budget Office. Expenses include \$2,359 non-recurring per position (\$77,849).

⁴ Circuit 16 uses contracted services for General Magistrates. Contracted Services are the additional funds needed based on the total cost of the circuit 16 need of 1.0 General Magistrates and 1.0 Administrative Support compared to their base budget of \$58,944.

Note: Based on the current funding methodology, the Total General Magistrate Need for circuits 6, 15, and 17 is less than the current number of General Magistrate FTE. The FY 2012-13 LBR does not take into account the negative need of these circuits.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011
Trial Court Law Clerks
FY 2012/13 LBR

Circuit	FY 2011/12 Budget		Funding Methodology	TCBC RECOMMENDATION FY 2012/13 LBR	
	Number of Circuit Court Judges	Number of Current FTE ¹	Total Number of Needed FTE ² (Rounded up to whole FTE)	Number of New FTE	Total Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses ³
1	24	9	12	3	\$201,018
2 ⁴	16	8	9	1	\$67,006
3	7	3	4	1	\$67,006
4	35	13.5	18	4.5	\$303,443
5	31	9	16	7	\$469,042
6	45	14	23	9	\$603,054
7	27	8.5	14	5.5	\$370,449
8	13	6	7	1	\$67,006
9	43	14	22	8	\$536,048
10	28	10	14	4	\$268,024
11	80	25	40	15	\$1,005,090
12	21	7	11	4	\$268,024
13	45	14	23	9	\$603,054
14	11	6	6	0	\$0
15	35	11.5	18	6.5	\$437,455
16	4	1	2	1	\$67,006
17	58	17	29	12	\$804,072
18	26	9	13	4	\$268,024
19	19	5	10	5	\$335,030
20	31	9	16	7	\$469,042
Total	599	199.5	307	107.5	\$7,208,893

¹ Number of Current FTE includes positions in cost centers 258 and 257 (post conviction).

² Total Number of Needed FTE based on the current funding methodology of 1 Law Clerk to 2 Judges ratio and rounded up to whole FTE.

³ Total Salaries, Benefits, and Expenses were provided by the OSCA, Budget Office. Expenses include \$2,359 non-recurring per FTE (\$257,131).

⁴ The Second Circuit includes 1.0 FTE prison petition Law Clerk for FY 2011/12 and FY 2012/13.

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

**Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission
FY 2012-2013 Legislative Budget Request**

Issue: Court Reporting Cost Sharing

Background:

Last year, at the December 7, 2010 Trial Court Budget Commission meeting, the Commission approved the new cost sharing methodology and approved filing a Supplemental LBR for FY 2011-12 for the \$2,097,578 in funding. The Commission also recommended that the total cost sharing funding be part of the court's budget. Additionally, the Commission recognized the current situation with the Regional Councils and absent approval by the Legislature to move the full cost sharing budget to the court's budget, the Commission recommended seeking a statutory revision to allow the courts to directly bill the Regional Councils. At the June 23, 2011, meeting, the TCBC approved requesting the additional funds in the same manner as last year and to file a LBR with the understanding the \$2,097,578 amount from last year's LBR will be updated with more recent data.

The new cost sharing methodology assumes that the courts are currently providing a certain level of service to the entities and that the level of service would remain unchanged. AOSC10-1 states as a best practice that "Judicial circuits operating under the cost sharing arrangement are required to provide a "statement of services provided" to local state attorneys, public defenders, the Justice Administrative Commission, and the Office of the State Courts Administrator." These statements are a requirement of the new cost sharing methodology in order to guarantee the level of service remains unchanged for the budget year. Legislative staff has inquired as to the status of the circuits' compliance with this section of the Supreme Court AOSC 10-1. OSCA staff will work with the trial court administrators on their local agreements with a deadline of all circuits being in compliance by November 1, 2011.

Decisions Needed:

1. A decision is needed on whether or not to file a LBR for FY 2012-13 for the additional cost sharing budget. Using the approved funding methodology and updated UDR data for FY 2010-11, the additional funding needed is \$2,493,790 (see attached chart).

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File a LBR for the additional funding in the amount of \$2,493,790.

TCBC Recommendation:

File a LBR for the additional funding in the amount of \$2,493,790.

Court Reporting
FY 2011/12 Cost Sharing Comparison

Circuit	State Attorneys			Public Defenders			Justice Administrative Commission (JAC)*			Regional Counsels**			Total		
	FY 2011/12 Cost Sharing Contribution from State Attorneys	FY 2012/13 Transcript/ Media Production Costs	Additional Cost Sharing Contribution Needed	FY 2011/12 Cost Sharing Contribution from Public Defenders	FY 2012/13 Transcript/ Media Production Costs	Additional Cost Sharing Contribution Needed	FY 2011/12 Cost Sharing Contribution from JAC	FY 2012/13 Transcript/ Media Production Costs	Additional Cost Sharing Contribution Needed	Cost Sharing Contribution from Regional Counsels	FY 2012/13 Transcript/ Media Production Costs	Additional Cost Sharing Contribution Needed	Cost Sharing Contribution from Cost Sharing Entities	FY 2012/13 Transcript/ Media Production Costs	Total Additional Cost Sharing Contribution Needed
1	\$18,232	\$38,561	\$20,329	\$190,611	\$490,223	\$299,612	\$25,032	\$136,118	\$111,086	\$0.00	\$24,083	\$24,083	\$233,875	\$688,985	\$455,110
2	\$16,650	\$19,299	\$2,649	\$323,698	\$190,657	(\$133,041)	\$6,880	\$74,217	\$67,337	\$0.00	\$12,848	\$12,848	\$347,228	\$297,021	(\$50,207)
3	\$10,456	\$11,853	\$1,397	\$52,251	\$48,113	(\$4,138)	\$13,276	\$16,352	\$3,076	\$0.00	\$16,494	\$16,494	\$75,983	\$92,812	\$16,829
4	\$0	\$188	\$188	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$188	\$188
5	\$0	\$26,278	\$26,278	\$0	\$29,002	\$29,002	\$0	\$1,228	\$1,228	\$0.00	\$2,083	\$2,083	\$0	\$58,592	\$58,592
6	\$25,443	\$45,652	\$20,209	\$103,493	\$291,498	\$188,005	\$22,181	\$154,215	\$132,034	\$0.00	\$59,658	\$59,658	\$151,117	\$551,023	\$399,906
7	\$12,818	\$10,206	(\$2,612)	\$37,310	\$41,474	\$4,164	\$4,967	\$53,094	\$48,127	\$0.00	\$19,748	\$19,748	\$55,095	\$124,522	\$69,427
8	\$21,937	\$34,957	\$13,020	\$83,798	\$76,173	(\$7,625)	\$26,342	\$67,302	\$40,960	\$0.00	\$26,765	\$26,765	\$132,077	\$205,196	\$73,119
9	\$26,007	\$61,501	\$35,494	\$481,878	\$382,323	(\$99,555)	\$23,849	\$52,699	\$28,850	\$0.00	\$15,083	\$15,083	\$531,734	\$511,606	(\$20,128)
10	\$3,980	\$22,172	\$18,192	\$68,975	\$259,142	\$190,167	\$1,152	\$29,141	\$27,989	\$0.00	\$17,013	\$17,013	\$74,107	\$327,467	\$253,360
11	\$0	\$39,640	\$39,640	\$0	\$44,198	\$44,198	\$0	\$125,275	\$125,275	\$0.00	\$66,006	\$66,006	\$0	\$275,119	\$275,119
12	\$19,650	\$37,369	\$17,719	\$153,205	\$146,383	(\$6,822)	\$15,322	\$41,249	\$25,927	\$0.00	\$14,874	\$14,874	\$188,177	\$239,875	\$51,698
13	\$45,716	\$57,279	\$11,563	\$784,106	\$550,244	(\$233,862)	\$45,221	\$34,837	(\$10,384)	\$0.00	\$34,209	\$34,209	\$875,043	\$676,569	(\$198,474)
14	\$0	\$32,131	\$32,131	\$134,089	\$74,147	(\$59,942)	\$759	\$111,971	\$111,212	\$0.00	\$16,490	\$16,490	\$134,848	\$234,740	\$99,892
15	\$61,252	\$47,358	(\$13,894)	\$93,646	\$238,255	\$144,609	\$25,929	\$197,544	\$171,615	\$0.00	\$81,228	\$81,228	\$180,827	\$564,386	\$383,559
16	\$4,315	\$9,733	\$5,418	\$74,983	\$107,919	\$32,936	\$1,303	\$774	(\$529)	\$0.00	\$10,970	\$10,970	\$80,601	\$129,396	\$48,795
17	\$20,081	\$83,464	\$63,383	\$60,851	\$311,158	\$250,307	\$4,721	\$129,619	\$124,898	\$0.00	\$46,724	\$46,724	\$85,653	\$570,964	\$485,311
18	\$0	\$22,621	\$22,621	\$0	\$11,136	\$11,136	\$0	\$2,018	\$2,018	\$0.00	\$557	\$557	\$0	\$36,332	\$36,332
19	\$0	\$9,452	\$9,452	\$0	\$10,979	\$10,979	\$0	\$10,897	\$10,897	\$0.00	\$1,559	\$1,559	\$0	\$32,888	\$32,888
20	\$0	\$10,346	\$10,346	\$0	\$9,911	\$9,911	\$0	\$1,223	\$1,223	\$0.00	\$995	\$995	\$0	\$22,475	\$22,475
State	\$286,537	\$620,060	\$333,523	\$2,642,894	\$3,312,934	\$670,040	\$216,934	\$1,239,774	\$1,022,840	\$0.00	\$467,386	\$467,386	\$3,146,365	\$5,640,155	\$2,493,790

* By circuit contribution for the JAC is estimated

** The court system does not have statutory authority for cost recovery

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

FY 2012-13 Legislative Budget Request

Issue: Due Process Equipment - Court Interpreting

In July 2010, the TCBC approved several new guideline policies related to the purchase of court interpreting equipment including expansion cost models, refresh timeframes, and a 13% maintenance formula as recommended by the Court Interpreting Technology Workgroup.

For the FY 2011-12 LBR the TCBC approved to file a court interpreting equipment request for both expansion (\$341,250 OCO and \$54,396 Non-Recurring Expense) and refresh (\$89,050 OCO). However, these requested funding amounts were not funded by the Legislature.

For the FY 2012-13 LBR, the circuits are requesting a total of \$403,537 for expansion and \$5,600 for existing equipment maintenance needs.

Options:

Option One – For expansion, file LBR based on circuit requests that are within the approved cost model guidelines. For maintenance on existing equipment, file LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved 13% maintenance formula as applied to original hardware and software costs (previously purchased using state and/or county funds) as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory.

Option Two – Do not file LBR.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File LBR based on Option One (\$403,537 for expansion and \$2,308 in recurring maintenance).

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:

File LBR as recommended based on Option One (\$403,537 for expansion and \$2,308 in recurring maintenance).

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011
Court Interpreting
FY 2012/13 LBR - Expansion**

Circuit	Circuit Requests						TCBC RECOMMENDATION Circuit Requests Within Guidelines (Including Special Requests)			
	# of CR	# of HR	OCO	Expenses (Non Recurring)	FY 2013/14 Maintenance (Recurring)	Total Requests	OCO	Expenses (Non Recurring)	FY 2013/14 Maintenance (Recurring)	Option 1 Total Requests Within Guidelines
8	2	0	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
9	10	0	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$50,000
11	0	2	\$77,000	\$0	\$2,100	\$79,100	\$77,000	\$0	\$2,100	\$79,100
15	0	0	\$5,100	\$0	\$0	\$5,100	\$5,100	\$0	\$0	\$5,100
17	34	2	\$234,937	\$4,400	\$0	\$239,337	\$234,937	\$4,400	\$0	\$239,337
Total	46	4	\$397,037	\$4,400	\$2,100	\$403,537	\$397,037	\$4,400	\$2,100	\$403,537

CR = Courtroom

HR = Hearing Room

Note: **Circuit 8** request includes \$30,000 OCO to pilot remote interpreting for 2 courtrooms (one in Levy County Courthouse and one in Alachua County Criminal Justice Center) based on a similar set up proven to be effective in Circuit 9. **Circuit 9** request includes \$50,000 OCO to expand their existing centralized interpreting system in 10 additional courtrooms. **Circuit 11** request includes \$56,000 OCO to centralize existing remote interpretation system and \$21,000 OCO plus \$2,100 maintenance to expand remote interpretation to 2 hearing rooms. **Circuit 15** request includes \$5,100 OCO for 2 remote computers to allow interpreters to participate in a county funded remote interpreting pilot. **Circuit 17** request includes \$234,937 OCO and \$4,400 expense to provide for additional tieline systems to allow simultaneous remote interpretation from central location to 24 Northwing courtrooms, 10 satellite courtrooms, and 2 spares.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011
Court Interpreting
FY 2012/13 LBR
Maintenance on Existing Technology Base

Circuit	FY 2012/13 LBR Maintenance Requests	13 Percent Maintenance (State Obligated)¹	TCBC RECOMMENDATION Option 1 FY 2012/13 LBR for Maintenance Within Guidelines (State Obligated)
11	\$5,600	\$2,308	\$2,308
Total	\$5,600	\$2,308	\$2,308

¹ Based on policy recommendations of the Court Interpreting Technology Workgroup. Thirteen percent is applied to hardware and software purchased using state or county funds through fiscal year 2010/11 as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory.

Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission

FY 2012-13 Legislative Budget Request

Issue: Due Process Equipment - Court Reporting

For the FY 2011-12 LBR, the TCBC approved a court reporting equipment request of \$1,361,524 for expansion; \$283,193 for existing equipment maintenance needs; and \$3,579,430 for refresh. These requested funding amounts were not funded by the Legislature.

For the FY 2012-13 LBR, the circuits are requesting a total of \$729,749 for expansion; \$257,662 for existing equipment maintenance needs; and \$3,708,613 for refresh.

Options:

Option One- For expansion, file LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved cost standards. For maintenance on existing technology, file LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved 13% maintenance formula as applied to original hardware and software costs (previously purchased using state and/or county funds) as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory. For refresh, file LBR based on those circuit requests that are within the approved refresh timeframes as applied to original purchase dates of hardware (previously purchased using state and/or county funds) as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory.

Option Two- Do not file LBR.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

File LBR based on Option One and include the 3rd Circuit's request of \$66,494 for existing maintenance; the 11th Circuit's request of \$61,786 for maintenance on expansion equipment currently being installed in the Richard E. Gerstein Building; and the 11th Circuit's request of \$622,815 to refresh/upgrade existing equipment to centralized recording (\$718,307 for expansion; \$233,014 for existing maintenance; and \$3,708,613 for refresh).

To provide continued funding to the trial courts for the replacement of outdated court reporting equipment, direct the OSCA staff to work with the circuits during the upcoming fiscal year to determine estimated annual court reporting refresh costs for consideration of requesting a recurring appropriation within the State Court System's budget in future years. Provide the results of this refresh analysis for the TCBC's consideration of the FY 2013-14 LBR.

Trial Court Budget Commission Recommendation:

File LBR as recommended and include the 5th Circuit's request of \$156,330 OCO and \$20,323 maintenance for expansion of Lake County Judicial Center (\$894,960 for expansion; \$212,691 for existing maintenance needs; and \$3,708,613 for refresh).

Direct the OSCA staff to work with the circuits during the upcoming fiscal year to determine estimated annual court reporting refresh costs for the TCBC's consideration of the FY 2013-14 LBR.

Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011
Court Reporting
FY 2012/13 LBR - Expansion

Circuit	Circuit Requests						TCBC RECOMMENDATION Circuit Requests Within Standards			
	# of CR	# of HR	OCO	Expenses (Non Recurring)	FY 2013/14 Maintenance (Recurring)	Total Requests	OCO	Expenses (Non Recurring)	FY 2013/14 Maintenance (Recurring)	Option 1 Total Requests Within Standards
1	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
2	5	0	\$91,000	\$0	\$8,000	\$99,000	\$91,000	\$0	\$8,000	\$99,000
3	5	0	\$41,475	\$72,400	\$0	\$113,875	\$36,581	\$65,852	\$0	\$102,433
4	0	4	\$44,312	\$0	\$5,317	\$49,629	\$44,312	\$0	\$5,317	\$49,629
5	5	11	\$260,190	\$117,250	\$49,067	\$426,507	\$260,190	\$117,250	\$49,067	\$426,507
6	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
7	1	1	\$26,500	\$16,000	\$2,500	\$45,000	\$26,500	\$16,000	\$2,500	\$45,000
8	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
9	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
10	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
11	2	0	\$59,450	\$0	\$5,945	\$65,395	\$59,450	\$0	\$5,945	\$65,395
12	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
13	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
14	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
15 ¹	0	0	\$102,558	\$0	\$1,688	\$104,246	\$102,558	\$0	\$1,688	\$104,246
16	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
17 ¹	0	0	\$0	\$2,750	\$0	\$2,750		\$2,750		\$2,750
18	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
19	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
20	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				NA
Total	18	16	\$625,485	\$208,400	\$72,517	\$906,402	\$620,591	\$201,852	\$72,517	\$894,960

CR = Courtroom HR = Hearing Room

¹ Circuit 15 request includes \$89,816 OCO to upgrade to centralized recording; \$12,742 OCO for 1 steno that includes Stentura, Case Catalyst License, PC, laptop and \$1,688 maintenance. Circuit 17 request includes \$2,750 in Expenses for on-record indicator lights that are necessary for five additional CourtSmart licenses which were recently purchased.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011**

Court Reporting

FY 2012/13 LBR - Maintenance on Existing Technology Base

Circuit	FY 2010/11 Estimated Maintenance Expenditures¹	FY 2012/13 LBR Maintenance Requests	Total Estimated Maintenance Expenditures and LBR Requests	13 Percent Maintenance (State Obligated)²	TCBC RECOMMENDATION Option 1 FY 2012/13 LBR for Maintenance Within Standards (State Obligated)
1	\$58,565	\$50,000	\$108,565	\$170,021	\$50,000
2	\$43,135	\$2,400	\$45,535	\$69,259	\$2,400
3 ³	\$54,167	\$66,494	\$120,661	\$95,099	\$66,494
4	\$91,148	\$5,696	\$96,844	\$126,984	\$5,696
5	\$113,380	\$1,234	\$114,614	\$327,821	\$1,234
6	\$180,819	\$0	\$180,819	\$280,865	NA
7	\$84,374	\$2,616	\$86,990	\$138,689	\$2,616
8	\$3,570	\$0	\$3,570	\$256,785	NA
9	\$6,286	\$0	\$6,286	\$201,854	NA
10	\$42,848	\$0	\$42,848	\$147,260	NA
11	\$0	\$61,786	\$61,786	\$54,124	\$61,786
12	\$13,191	\$0	\$13,191	\$213,212	NA
13	\$79,154	\$0	\$79,154	\$418,316	NA
14	\$54,536	\$3,000	\$57,536	\$114,719	\$3,000
15	\$60,003	\$0	\$60,003	\$53,009	NA
16	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,060	NA
17	\$90,692	\$0	\$90,692	\$225,711	NA
18	\$29,302	\$0	\$29,302	\$135,492	NA
19	\$77,012	\$0	\$77,012	\$180,692	NA
20	\$254,353	\$44,113	\$298,466	\$273,818	\$19,465
Total	\$1,336,535	\$237,339	\$1,573,874	\$3,499,790	\$212,691

¹ FY 2010/11 Maintenance Expenditures include dollars from cost center 129 and 267 and was provided by OSCA, Budget Office.

² Based on policy recommendations of the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. Thirteen percent is applied to hardware and software purchased using state or county funds through fiscal year 2010/11 as reported in the Due Process Technology Inventory.

³ Circuit 3 estimated fiscal year 2010/11 maintenance expenditures includes funds expended from a temporary (non-recurring) allocation approved by the TCBC. Circuit 11 estimated 13 Percent Maintenance does not take into account expansion installations currently underway in the Richard E. Gerstein building. Total state investment of this expansion project is reported at \$129,432.

**Trial Court Budget Commission
Meeting July 29, 2011
Court Reporting
FY 2012/13 LBR - Refresh**

Circuit	FY 2012/13 LBR Request (OCO and Expense)	Due Process Technology Inventory (Previously purchased with state and/or county funds.)¹	TCBC RECOMMENDATION Option 1 FY 2012/13 LBR for Refresh Within Standards (Previously purchased with state and/or county funds.)
1	\$270,090	\$763,465	\$270,090
2	\$172,995	\$356,601	\$172,995
3 ³	\$195,725	\$514,794	\$195,725
4	\$127,931	\$266,189	\$127,931
5	\$183,234	\$1,533,889	\$183,234
6	\$82,625	\$1,128,502	\$82,625
7	\$125,180	\$458,477	\$125,180
8	\$0	\$1,998,255	NA
9	\$0	\$1,394,099	NA
10	\$108,000	\$299,409	\$108,000
11 ²	\$622,815	\$365,782	\$622,815
12	\$0	\$1,469,995	NA
13	\$0	\$2,048,555	NA
14	\$14,000	\$282,798	\$14,000
15	\$47,610	\$163,757	\$47,610
16	\$0	\$53,231	NA
17	\$10,000	\$1,315,015	\$10,000
18	\$470,000	\$725,364	\$470,000
19	\$465,071	\$811,653	\$465,071
20	\$813,337	\$1,137,519	\$813,337
Total	\$3,708,613	\$17,087,348	\$3,708,613

¹ Based on policy recommendations of the Court Reporting Technology Workgroup. The amount includes refresh dollars from fiscal year 2009/10 through fiscal year 2012/13 based on the hardware replacement schedule (recommended by the Workgroup), less refresh expenditures for fiscal year 2008/09 and 2009/10.

² Circuit 11 request includes standard refresh with upgrade to centralized recording.

**Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission
FY 2012-2013 Legislative Budget Request**

Issue: Courthouse Furnishings

At the June 23, 2011 meeting, the Trial Court Budget Commission approved, as part of the FY 2012-13 Trial Court Legislative Budget Request strategies, circuits to submit requests for non-recurring issues. All items were reviewed for compliance with provisions in Florida Statutes, Chapter 29.008-County Funding of Court-Related Functions, and with the Department of Financial Services and the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget guidelines.

A. 4th Circuit Request – \$507,252

The 4th Circuit reports that the new Duval County Courthouse is scheduled for occupancy in May 2012, and there will be 51 courtrooms, 47 chambers, 62 judicial offices, magistrates, and many other personnel in the seven story, 800,000 square foot building. The circuit indicates that current furnishings have been inventoried and are inadequate to meet the needs of the new courthouse. Information received from the circuit state that: the new courthouse is over twice as large as the current building and will need over twice the furnishings; many of the current furnishings are in poor condition and some are not of sufficient stability that they could survive being moved; and some furnishings have mold and mildew issues and will violate all Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) building warranties.

The 4th Circuit requests \$507,252 in non-recurring funding within the OCO category to furnish the various non-public spaces of the new courthouse.

Options:

1. File issue as requested.
2. Do not file issue.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File issue as requested.

Trial Court Budget Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File issue as requested.

B. 5th Circuit Request – \$63,530

The 5th Circuit reports that new courthouse facilities in Hernando and Sumter Counties are projected for total completion by May 2013; however, some areas may be occupied at an earlier date. These projects will increase the number of courtrooms by five and the number of judicial chambers by five. The five judicial chambers are private areas which

include: five judge's offices, five judicial conference rooms, and five judicial assistant's areas.

The 5th Circuit requests \$63,530 (\$53,030 Expense and \$10,500 OCO) in non-recurring funding to furnish the private areas within the judicial chambers.

Options:

1. File issue as requested.
2. Do not file issue.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File the issue as requested

Trial Court Budget Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File issue as requested.

**Recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Commission
FY 2012-13 Legislative Budget Request**

Issue: Other Non-Recurring Requests

At the June 23, 2011 meeting, the Trial Court Budget Commission approved, as part of the FY 2012-13 Trial Court Legislative Budget Request strategies, circuits to submit requests for non-recurring issues. All items were reviewed for compliance with provisions in Florida Statutes, Chapter 29.008-County Funding of Court-Related Functions, and with the Department of Financial Services and the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget guidelines.

A. 2nd Circuit Request – \$23,438

The 2nd Circuit requests funding to purchase six new stand-alone copy machines to replace current machines that are between eleven and fourteen years old. The circuit estimates a savings of \$1,185 to \$1,250 in maintenance costs annually if the copiers are replaced. Other intangible savings would include a reduction in machine down time currently experienced when copiers require complicated servicing and parts replacement. Additionally, the current maintenance costs are higher as replacement parts are harder to locate.

The 2nd Circuit requests \$23,438 (\$3,906.32 per copier x 6) in non-recurring funding within the OCO category for the equipment replacement.

Options:

1. File issue as requested.
2. Do not file issue.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File issue as requested

Trial Court Budget Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File issue as requested.

B. 4th Circuit Request – \$23,700

The 4th Circuit requests funding to purchase five complete mobile presentation display units for trials and other administrative purposes. The circuit indicates that the court currently has five mobile display units which are paired with a data projector and mounted on a cart for mobility. These units have been heavily used over the years and are at the end of their useful life cycle. The cost of these presentation devices are

relatively inexpensive as compared to the larger, more sophisticated evidence carts, so it permits the court to purchase additional units which can be wheeled into a room and set up with a minimum setup time. The circuit states that the objects and information being presented can be displayed in a much larger and more legible format.

The 4th Circuit requests \$23,700 in non-recurring funding within the OCO category for the mobile equipment.

Options:

1. File issue as requested.
2. Do not file issue.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File issue as requested

Trial Court Budget Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File issue as requested.

C. 9th Circuit Request – \$30,000

The 9th Circuit requests funding to replace furniture and cubicles for the Office of Court Reporter Services, which staffs 44 court reporters and digital court reporters. The circuit has indicated that current furnishings are 16 years or older, and in disrepair. The 9th Circuit requests \$30,000 in non-recurring funding within the Expense category for the furnishings replacement.

Options:

1. File issue as requested.
2. Do not file issue.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Option 2: Do not file issue

Trial Court Budget Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: Do not file issue.

D. 18th Circuit Request – \$70,665

The 18th Circuit requests funding to purchase fifteen stand-alone copy machines to replace current machines that are between eight and ten years old. The circuit reports that

copiers have had a multitude of service calls. The vendor has stated it is becoming impossible to get parts and that maintenance will no longer be provided on some of the older machines.

The 18th Circuit requests \$70,665 (\$4,711 per copier x 15) in non-recurring funding within the OCO category for the equipment replacement.

Option: Do not file issue. After staff review of the quote, it has been determined that this expenditure is not consistent with provisions in Florida Statutes, Chapter 29.008. The quote includes a facsimile component and therefore the machine would not be considered a stand-alone copier and is not a State-funded responsibility.

Funding Methodology Committee Recommendation:

Option: Do not file issue. However, the committee also recommended that staff contact the 18th Circuit to determine if they wished to amend the request for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Commission.

18th Circuit Amended Request - \$75,000

The 18th Circuit has amended the request and provided a revised quote without the facsimile component. The 18th Circuit amended request is for \$75,000 (\$5,000 per copier x 15) in non-recurring funding within the OCO category for the equipment replacement.

Note: The date of the original quote is March 26, 2010, and the new quote is dated July 26, 2011.

Options:

1. File issue as requested.
2. Do not file issue.

Trial Court Budget Committee Recommendation:

Option 1: File amended issue as requested. However, direct OSCA staff to provide further statutory research on the issue.