COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE



SUPPLEMENTAL REQUESTS FOR FY 2011-12 JUDICIAL BRANCH

JBC Working Document - Subject to Change Staff Recommendation Does Not Represent Committee Decision

> Prepared By: Carolyn Kampman, JBC Staff January 12, 2012

For Further Information Contact:

Joint Budget Committee Staff 200 E. 14th Avenue, 3rd Floor Denver, Colorado 80203 Telephone: (303) 866-2061 TDD: (303) 866-3472

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Narrative Page	Numbers Page
Prioritized Supplementals in Department-Assigned Order		
Courts, Administration, and Probation:		
Supplemental #1 - IT Cash Fund Spending Authority	1	12
Supplemental #2 - Ralph L. Carr Justice Center Parking Garage	3	12
Supplemental #3 - Conservation Easement One-time Surplus	5	12
Supplemental #4 - Federal Grant Indirect Cost Recovery True-up	6	14
Office of the State Public Defender:		
Supplemental #1 - Mandated Costs	8	14
Non-prioritized Supplementals		
JBC Staff-initiated Supplemental - Leased Space for the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel	10	15
Statewide Common Policy Supplemental Requests	11	15
Totals for All Supplementals	N.A.	16

Prioritized Supplementals in Department-Assigned Order

Supplemental Request, Department Priority #1 IT Cash Fund Spending Authority

	Request Recommendation	
Total	\$800,000	\$800,000
Cash Funds (Judicial Department Information Technology Cash Fund)	800,000	800,000

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]	YES
JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of data that was not available when the appropriation was made.	original

Department Request: The Department requests \$800,000 cash funds from the Judicial Department Information Technology (IT) Cash Fund for FY 2011-12 to purchase IT equipment that is necessary to maintain the reliability and efficiency of the Department's IT infrastructure and to accommodate the time line for implementing the new in-house e-filing system¹. The Department has submitted a companion request for \$860,000 cash funds for FY 2012-13 to complete the purchase and deployment of the new hardware prior to December 2012. Revenues to the Judicial Department IT Cash Fund include fees paid by users of the Department's web-based public access system and cost recovery fees collected by the vendor that operates the existing e-filing system.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approving the Department's request.

Staff Analysis:

Request. The Department requests a total of \$1,660,000 cash funds from the Judicial Department Information Technology (IT) Cash Fund to purchase IT equipment that is necessary to maintain the reliability and efficiency of the Department's IT infrastructure. The Department intends to purchase and deploy the new hardware over the course of 2012, and is requesting to spend \$800,000 in FY 2011-12 and \$860,000 in FY 2012-13. The timing of this request is based on: (1) the flow of revenues into the Judicial Department IT Cash Fund; (2) the planned statewide implementation of

¹ This in-house e-filing system is called the Integrated Colorado Courts E-filing System, or ICCES. For more information about the development of an in-house e-filing system, see the staff issue brief that begins on page 45 of the JBC Staff Budget Briefing for the Judicial Branch, dated November 30, 2011.

the in-house e-filing system by January 2013; and (3) the anticipated move to the Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center as early as December 2012.

Source of Funding. The Judicial Department IT Cash Fund, established through a Joint Budget Committee-sponsored bill in 2008, allows the Department to retain fees and cost recoveries related to information technology services, including providing public access to court records and e-filing services. Pursuant to Section 13-32-114 (2), C.R.S., moneys in the Fund may be appropriated to the Department "for any expenses related to the department's information technology needs". The intent was to allow the Department to use fees and cost recoveries to support a portion of the Department's costs of maintaining the underlying IT systems and network, thereby mitigating the need for the Department to request periodic General Fund appropriations for such purpose.

Department IT Systems. The Department's IT systems connect 104 court, probation, and administrative locations throughout the state, and ensure the proper and secure storage and exchange of information between judicial employees, state agencies, and the public. The network infrastructure includes hardware, statewide data circuits, cabling, routers, switches, hubs, wireless access points, fire walls, and video-conferencing units, as well as the associated operational software. The Department's servers which house all of the Department's production databases and its case management system (ICON/Eclipse) form the backbone of this infrastructure. In addition, the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (CICJIS), Public Access, inter-agency data exchanges, the court-appointed counsel payment system, and the Department's administrative systems are housed on these servers.

Use of Requested Funds. The requested funds would be used to purchase two new iSeries servers, and two new storage controller units and related software and equipment.

First, the Department currently has four mid-range iSeries servers; two are large-scale production servers, one is a development server, and one is a disaster recovery/ back-up server located at E-fort. Due to advancements in mid-range server technology, the Department plans to replace the four existing servers with the two new servers. The Department indicates that the industry standard for replacement of server equipment is three to four years. The current servers have been in use for five years and it is essential that they be replaced soon to ensure continuity. The Department would like to upgrade its development server now so that the e-filing system can be developed directly on the most up-to-date technology, thereby avoiding the need to replace the aging server during critical programming stages or within months after the new system is implemented.

Second, the Department's request would fund new document storage hardware to accommodate the large number of electronic documents that will be stored through the e-filing system. The Department currently has three Net App controller units that store existing data; two are located at the primary data center, and one is located at the State's disaster recovery center. The current

controller units only have a single network connection, which puts the Department at risk of losing data and documents in the event of an equipment failure. The existing units are also under-sized for the volume of data and usage that will be required for the e-filing system. The Department is thus requesting funding to replace the three existing units with two storage controller units which each have two network connections for increased redundancy. The new storage controller units will also have greater capacity to accommodate the documents related to the e-filing project and are generally more appropriate for an organization the size of Judicial.

Staff Recommendation. Staff recommends approving the request in order to maintain a reliable and functional IT infrastructure, and to avoid the risk and complexity of migrating the new e-filing system from an aging server to a new server during a critical programming and quality control stage of the project. The requested funds are from fees paid by users who rely on the Department's IT infrastructure to obtain access to court records and e-filing services.

Supplemental Request, Department Priority #2 Ralph L. Carr Justice Center Parking Garage

appropriation was made.

for the request is parking fees.

	Request	Recommendation	
Total	<u>\$120,105</u>	<u>\$120,105</u>	
Cash Funds (Justice Center Cash Fund)	120,105	120,105	

	Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria?	YES
	[An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was	
	not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]	
JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of data that was not available when the origin		original

Department Request: The Department requests an appropriation of \$120,105 cash funds from the Justice Center Cash Fund for FY 2011-12 to pay Standard Parking to manage and maintain the parking garage structure associated with the Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center. The garage will offer public parking until the Judicial Center opens in the Spring of 2013. The source of revenue

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approving the request. Please note, however, that throughout the Department's FY 2012-13 budget request and the FY 2011-12 supplemental request the new proposed section of the Long Bill is referred to as "Ralph L. Carr Justice Center". Staff recommends that the new Long Bill section be titled, "Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center", consistent with the official name of the facility.

Staff Analysis:

Background Information. The Department has submitted a FY 2012-13 budget request that is intended to establish the appropriate Long Bill structure and spending authority to support operations of the Judicial Center upon construction completion in FY 2012-13. As proposed, this section of the Long Bill would provide cash funds spending authority from the Justice Center Cash Fund to cover five types of expenditures:

- Contract services;
- Controlled maintenance;
- Colorado State Patrol services:
- Utilities; and
- Facility staff.

With respect to contract services, the Department anticipates entering into several contracts with outside vendors related to building operations. The largest contract is for Cushman Wakefield to act as the management company, providing contract engineering staff, first floor reception services in the office tower, and related administrative costs. The Department also anticipates contract services for various services, including custodial, maintenance contracts and supplies, grounds maintenance, and the copy center. Finally, the Department anticipates using contract services to operate and maintain the parking garage (located between the ING building and the Colorado History Museum).

Reason for the Request. The Department has entered into a contract with Standard Parking to manage and maintain the parking structure. The garage has 327 available parking spaces that will be used as general public spaces until the Judicial Center opens in the Spring of 2013. The Department has requested spending authority from the Justice Center Cash Fund for FY 2011-12 to use parking garage revenue to pay the vendor to operate the garage.

The Department projects that parking fee revenues totaling \$157,992 will be collected for the seven months that the garage will be operational in FY 2011-12. The Department projects that the associated contract expenses will total \$120,105 for the same time period. Excess revenues will remain in the Justice Center Cash Fund and will be combined with other revenue sources to help cover project debt service payments as required by S.B. 08-206.

Staff Recommendation. Staff recommends providing the cash funds spending authority, as requested.

Supplemental Request, Department Priority #3 Conservation Easement One-time Surplus

	Request	Recommendation
Total	(\$502,529)	(\$502,529)
FTE	<u>(4.0)</u>	<u>(4.0)</u>
General Fund	(502,529)	(502,529)

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria?	YES
[An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was	
not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]	
JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of an unforseen contingency.	

Department Request: The Department requests a one-time <u>reduction</u> in General Fund appropriations (for FY 2011-12 only) for conservation easement tax credit cases that proceed through state district courts pursuant to H.B. 11-1300.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approving the request.

Staff Analysis:

Background Information. House Bill 11-1300 created an expedited process for resolving disputed claims for conservation easement tax credits. Pursuant to H.B. 11-1300, some of these cases will be litigated in district courts in three regions of the state, and others will be litigated through an administrative hearing. The taxpayers were required to elect one of several procedural tracks by September 30, 2011. The act appropriated \$1,351,933 and 9.1 FTE to the Department of Law for FY 2011-12 to provide legal services related to these cases to the Department of Revenue and the Department of Regulatory Agencies. The act also appropriated \$653,000 and 6.0 FTE to the Judicial Branch for FY 2011-12 to hear cases that proceed through the district courts.

Reason for the Request. The H.B. 11-1300 appropriation to the Judicial Branch for FY 2011-12 was intended to allow the Department to hire 3.0 FTE Magistrates and 3.0 FTE Court Judicial Assistants to process conservation easement tax credit cases. This resource allocation was based on the assumption that the act would result in 72 additional district court civil cases.

The Department of Law has indicated that the representatives of 455 donations elected to proceed in state district court and, after consolidation, a total of 188 district court cases were filed. Thus, the

number of district court cases resulting from H.B. 11-1300 is more than twice the number anticipated.

Despite the larger than anticipated number of district court cases, the Judicial Department has indicated that the court workload impact is less than anticipated in FY 2011-12. As this is the first time cases of this nature have been filed in district court, the courts are determining for the first time the proper parties to the actions and the appropriate manner of notice or service. At least one case is set to appeal the court's decision, and this appellate decision is crucial to the future of many conservation easement cases. Thus, most cases are waiting for resolution of this appeal before proceeding to the factual phase of the trial.

The Department thus anticipates reverting a significant portion of the appropriation provided through H.B. 11-1300 for FY 2011-12. Specifically, the Department's request includes a \$450,000 (76 percent) reduction in funding for personal services and operating expenses, and a \$52,529 (84 percent) reduction in funding for capital outlay. At this point the Department's budget request for FY 2012-13 is consistent with the Legislative Council Staff fiscal note for H.B. 11-1300. Once the appellate decision is final and the cases proceed, the Department will reassess its needs for FY 2012-13 and will submit a budget amendment or a supplemental request as appropriate.

Staff Recommendation. Staff recommends approving the request. The Department's request appears to be a reasonable estimate of resources that will not be needed in the current fiscal year.

Supplemental Request, Department Priority #4 Federal Grant Indirect Cost Recovery True-up

	Request	Recommendation
Total	(\$158,000)	\$142,000
FTE	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
General Fund	(158,000)	(158,000)
Reappropriated Funds	0	300,000

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria?	
[An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was	
not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]	

JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of data that was not available when the original appropriation was made.

YES

Department Request: The Department requests an adjustment to the FY 2011-12 appropriation for General Courts Administration based on updated estimates of indirect cost recoveries related to federal grants. Specifically, the Department requests a \$158,000 reduction in the General Fund portion of this appropriation, based on higher than anticipated indirect cost recoveries related to federal grants.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approving the request. In addition, staff recommends increasing the reappropriated funds portion of the General Courts Administration appropriation by \$300,000 to reflect the full amount of indirect cost recoveries related to federal grants that the Department anticipates using to offset administrative expenses. This duplicative appropriation is consistent with the treatment of the Department's other indirect cost recoveries, and provides a more transparent reflection of the department's annual administrative costs.

Staff Analysis:

Background Information. In FY 2010-11, appropriations for the Judicial Department's administrative and information technology staff were reduced by \$941,519 and 9.0 FTE (10.5 percent). In order to mitigate this reduction, the Department applied for and received federal approval to utilize a portion of federal grant funding to cover certain department indirect costs. To properly account for grant expenditures related to the department's indirect costs, the Department books the expenditure of federal funds for indirect costs to the relevant grant line item. The Department's existing appropriation of state funds for the General Courts and Administration line item assumes that \$142,000 will be available from various federal grants to cover a portion of the Department's administrative costs; thus, the General Fund share of this appropriation is understated by \$142,000.

Reason for the Request. For the current fiscal year, the Department has been approved for a federal grant indirect cost recovery rate of 13.8 percent. Based on this indirect cost rate and an unusually large number of federal grants awarded in the current fiscal year, the Department expects these federal indirect cost recoveries to total \$300,000 – \$158,000 more than initially anticipated. The Department is thus requesting a \$158,000 reduction in the General Fund portion of its administrative appropriation. The Department indicates that the existing FY 2011-12 appropriations for federal grants in the Trial Courts and the Probation and Related Services sections of the Long Bill provide sufficient spending authority, and thus no adjustments are needed for these line items.

Staff Recommendation. Staff recommends approving the request. In addition, staff recommends increasing the reappropriated funds portion of the General Courts Administration appropriation by \$300,000 to reflect the full amount of indirect cost recoveries related to federal grants that the Department anticipates using to offset administrative expenses. This duplicative appropriation is

consistent with the treatment of the Department's other indirect cost recoveries, and provides a more transparent reflection of the department's annual administrative costs.

Supplemental Request, Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD) Priority #1 Mandated Costs

	Request	Recommendation	
Total	\$234,719	\$234,719	
General Fund	234,719	234,719	

	Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]	YES
JBC staff and the OSPD agree that this request is the result of <i>data that was not available when the original appropriation was made</i> .		nal

OSPD Request: The Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD) requests an increase of \$234,719 (6.4 percent) for FY 2011-12 for mandated costs.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approving the request.

Staff Analysis:

Background Information. Mandated costs are associated with activities, events, and services that accompany court cases that are required in statute and/or the U.S. and Colorado Constitutions to ensure a fair and speedy trial, and to ensure the right to legal representation. For the OSPD, these costs primarily include obtaining transcripts and reimbursing district attorney offices for duplicating discoverable materials. The OSPD also incurs costs for expert witnesses, interpreter services (for activities outside the courtroom), and travel (both for witnesses and for public defender staff to conduct out-of-state investigations).

Reason for Request. The OSPD requests an increase of \$234,719 General Fund for this line item for FY 2011-12. The OSPD also requests continuation of this increase for FY 2012-13. As detailed in Table 1 on the next page, the existing appropriation for FY 2011-12 represents a \$133,347 (3.8 percent) increase in funding compared to actual mandated cost expenditures incurred in FY 2010-11. The existing appropriation anticipated continued increases in reimbursements to district attorney offices, assumed that expert witness and travel expenditures would remain at the relatively low levels of recent years, and assumed relatively stable expenditures for transcripts and interpreters.

The supplemental request is primarily related to unanticipated increases in transcript expenses (requested increase of \$168,124) and expert witness and travel expenses (requested increase of \$69,037). The request is based on expenditures through December 28, 2011, as well as expenditures anticipated to be required in support of an active case that is expected to be declared as a death penalty case in the 18th judicial district (Arapahoe/Douglas/Elbert/Lincoln). Table 1 provides a breakdown of mandated cost expenditures in the last four fiscal years, as well as the OSPD's initial and revised projections for FY 2011-12. Table 2 compares annual mandated costs to the OSPD's caseload.

OSPD Table 1: Mandated Costs Breakdown						
Description	FY 07-08 (actual)	FY 08-09 (actual)	FY 09-10 (actual)	FY 10-11 (actual)	FY 11-12 (approp)	FY 11-12 (request)
Transcripts	\$1,186,376	\$1,238,740	\$1,267,820	\$1,343,846	\$1,343,032	\$1,511,156
annual percent change		4.4%	2.3%	6.0%	-0.1%	12.5%
Discovery (paid to DAs)	886,112	969,306	1,125,966	1,514,957	1,598,730	1,600,302
annual percent change		9.4%	16.2%	34.5%	5.5%	5.6%
Expert witnesses	817,186	504,530	516,403	474,661	516,403	561,168
annual percent change		-38.3%	2.4%	-8.1%	8.8%	18.2%
Travel	150,005	109,567	58,254	74,700	61,421	85,693
Interpreters	85,301	109,563	106,661	93,239	110,927	107,802
Other	18,279	22,461	17,497	14,976	19,213	18,062
Total	3,143,259	2,954,167	3,092,601	3,516,379	3,649,726	3,884,183
annual percent change		-6.0%	4.7%	13.7%	3.8%	10.5%

OSPD Table 2: Mandated Costs Per Case									
Description	FY 07-08 (actual)	FY 08-09 (actual)	FY 09-10 (actual)	FY 10-11 (actual)	FY 11-12 (approp)	FY 11-12 (request)			
Total Cases Closed	90,969	94,421	95,580	94,219	98,317	98,317			
annual percent change	0.0%	3.8%	1.2%	-1.4%	4.3%	4.3%			
Average Mandated Costs Per Case	\$35	\$31	\$32	\$37	\$37	\$40			
annual percent change	23.2%	-9.5%	3.4%	15.3%	-0.5%	5.9%			
Total Mandated Costs	3,143,259	2,954,166	3,092,601	3,516,379	3,649,464	3,884,183			

Recommendation. Staff recommends approving the request. The supplemental request is primarily based on increases in the costs of obtaining transcripts, which can be voluminous in a death penalty case. The per page rate for transcripts is established by the Judicial Department. Further, while the anticipated FY 2011-12 expenditures for expert witnesses and travel are higher than those incurred in the last two fiscal years, they are still well below the expenses incurred from FY 2006-07 through FY 2008-09. The FY 2010-11 appropriation for mandated costs fell short of expenditures

by \$49,587, requiring the OSPD to transfer moneys from personal services to cover necessary expenditures. Transfers from personal services simple exacerbate an existing staffing deficit.

Non-prioritized Supplementals

JBC Staff-initiated Supplemental Leased Space for the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel

	Request	Recommendation		
Total	<u> </u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$4,664)</u>	
General Fund		0	(4,664)	

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria?					
[An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was					
not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]					
This supplemental is the result of data that was not available when the original appropriation was made					

OADC Request: The Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC) did not request this supplemental. However, the OADC is aware of and comfortable with staff's recommendation.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends reducing the appropriation to the OADC for leased space for FY 2011-12 by \$4,664 General Fund.

Staff Analysis: The leased space appropriation to the OADC currently funds a lease for 1,993 square feet at 1580 Logan Street. Last Spring, the OADC's lease agreement was scheduled to expire on June 30, 2011. The FY 2011-12 Long Bill appropriation was based on an estimated lease rate of \$19.44 per square foot. Subsequently, the OADC was able to renegotiate and extend their lease through the Spring of 2013 for a rate of \$16.50 per square foot (for a total of \$32,880). Assuming that an additional \$3,000 will be sufficient to cover the operating expense portion of the lease, the FY 2011-12 appropriation can be reduced to \$35,880. This reduced appropriation is consistent with the OADC's leased space request for FY 2012-13. Staff thus recommends reducing the FY 2011-12 appropriation by \$4,664.

Statewide Common Policy Supplemental Requests

These requests are not prioritized and are not analyzed in this packet. The JBC will act on these items later when it makes decisions regarding common policies.

Department's Portion of Statewide Supplemental Request	Total	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reapprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
Annual Fleet True-up - Probation and trial court staff	(\$2,098)	(\$2,098)	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0
Annual Fleet True-up - State Public Defender staff	221	221	0	0	0	0.0
Department's Total Statewide Supplemental Requests	(1,877)	(1,877)	0	0	0	0.0

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommendation for these requests is pending Committee approval of common policy supplementals. **Staff asks permission to include the corresponding appropriations in the Judicial Branch's supplemental bill when the Committee approves this common policy supplemental. If staff believes there is reason to deviate from the common policy, staff will appear before the Committee later to present the relevant analysis.**

	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Fiscal Year 2011-12 Supplemental		mental
		-	Requested	Recommended	New Total with
	Actual	Appropriation	Change	Change	Recommendation
HIDIOIAL BRANCH Court IR I I		1			
JUDICIAL BRANCH - Courts and Probation Michael L. Bender, Chief Justice					
michael L. Denaci, Chief sustice		_			
Supplemental #1 - IT Cash Fund Spending Auth	ority				
(2) Courts Administration					
(A) Administration and Technology					
Information Technology Infrastructure	4,395,921	4,642,845	<u>800,000</u>	800,000	<u>5,442,845</u>
General Fund	529,869	853,094	0	0	853,094
Cash Funds	3,866,052	3,789,751	800,000	800,000	4,589,751
Complemental #A D L L X C X Y L C X	D 1.1. C				
Supplemental #2 - Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center	r Parking Gara	ge			
(2) Courts Administration (D) Palph L. Carr Colorado Indiaial Canter (NE)	W CHDCECTION	11			
(D) Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center [NE			120 105	100 105	100 107
Operating Expenses [NEW LINE ITEM] - CF	n/a	ı 0	120,105	120,105	120,105
Supplemental #3 - Conservation Easement One-	time Surplus				
(2) Courts Administration					
(C) Centrally Administered Programs					
Courthouse Capital/ Infrastructure Maintenance	<u>2,432,067</u>	<u>536,055</u>	<u>(52,529)</u>	(52,529)	<u>483,526</u>
General Fund	80,791	62,529	(52,529)	(52,529)	10,000
Cash Funds	2,351,276	473,526	0	0	473,526

	FY 2010-11	FY 2010-11 FY 2011-12		ear 2011-12 Supple	emental
			Requested	Recommended	New Total with
	Actual	Appropriation	Change	Change	Recommendation
(3) Trial Courts					
Trial Court Programs	114,677,763	118,970,878	(450,000)	(450,000)	118,520,878
FTE	<u>1,615.2</u>	<u>1,754.6</u>	(4.0)	<u>(4.0)</u>	<u>1,750.6</u>
General Fund	90,070,969	90,369,520	(450,000)	(450,000)	89,919,520
FTE	1,345.3	1,435.8	(4.0)	(4.0)	1,431.8
Cash Funds	23,572,951	27,501,358	0	0	27,501,358
FTE	269.9	318.8	0.0	0.0	318.8
Reappropriated Funds	1,033,843	1,100,000	0	0	1,100,000
Total for Supplemental #3	117,109,830	119,506,933	(502,529)	(502,529)	119,004,404
FTE	1,615.2	* *	(4.0)	$\frac{(4.0)}{}$	•
General Fund	90,151,760	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(502,529)	(502,529)	<u></u>
FTE	1,345.3	* *	(4.0)	(4.0)	
Cash Funds	25,924,227	,	0	0	27,974,884
FTE	269.9	* *	0.0	0.0	318.8
Reappropriated Funds	1,033,843		0	0	1,100,000

	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Fiscal Y	Year 2011-12 Supplemental	
		•	Requested	Recommended	New Total with
	Actual	Appropriation	Change	Change	Recommendation
Supplemental #4 - Federal Grant Indirect	Cost Recovery True-	up			
(2) Courts Administration					
(A) Administration and Technology					
General Courts Administration	15,485,771	15,694,751	(158,000)	142,000	15,836,751
FTE	<u>178.3</u>	<u>190.4</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>190.4</u>
General Fund	12,292,978	11,761,843	(158,000)	(158,000)	11,603,843
FTE	159.3	168.4	0.0	0.0	168.4
Cash Funds	1,825,845	1,882,296	0	0	1,882,296
FTE	19.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Reappropriated Funds	1,366,948	2,050,612	0	300,000	2,350,612
FTE	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
JUDICIAL BRANCH - Office of the State Doug Wilson, State Public Defender	Public Defender				
Supplemental #1 - Mandated Costs (5) Public Defender					
Mandated Costs - GF	3,516,379	3,649,464	234,719 6.4%	234,719	3,884,183

	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Fiscal Year 2011-12 Supplemental		
		·	Requested	Recommended	New Total with
	Actual	Appropriation	Change	Change	Recommendation
		_			
JUDICIAL BRANCH - Office of the Alterna	<mark>ite Defense Counse</mark> l				
Lindy Frolich, Alternate Defense Counsel					
JBC Staff Initiated Supplemental - Leased S	pace for the OADC				
(6) Alternate Defense Counsel					
Leased Spaces - GF	36,577	40,544	0	(4,664)	35,880
Totals Excluding Pending Items					
JUDICIAL BRANCH					
Totals for ALL Branch line items	438,619,024	473,715,022	494,295	789,631	474,504,653
FTE	<u>3,841.5</u>	<u>4,178.7</u>	(4.0)	(4.0)	<u>4,174.7</u>
General Fund	324,696,803	340,243,578	(425,810)	(430,474)	339,813,104
Cash Funds	102,063,138	113,517,658	920,105	920,105	114,437,763
Reappropriated Funds	6,929,916	, ,	0	300,000	15,043,488
Federal Funds	4,929,167	5,210,298	0	0	5,210,298
Statewide Common Policy Supplemental Rec	_				
(see narrative for more detail)	<u>N.A.</u>	<u>N.A.</u>	(1,877)	<u>Pending</u>	<u>N.A.</u>
General Fund			(1,877)		
Cash Funds			0		
Reappropriated Funds			0		
Federal Funds			0		

	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Fiscal Year 2011-12 Supplemental		
		_	Requested	Recommended	New Total with
	Actual	Appropriation	Change	Change	Recommendation
Totals Including Pending Items					
JUDICIAL BRANCH					
Totals for ALL Branch line items	438,619,024	473,715,022	492,418	789,631	474,504,653
FTE	<u>3,841.5</u>	<u>4,178.7</u>	<u>(4.0)</u>	<u>(4.0)</u>	<u>4,174.7</u>
General Fund	324,696,803	340,243,578	(427,687)	(430,474)	339,813,104
Cash Funds	102,063,138	113,517,658	920,105	920,105	114,437,763
Reappropriated Funds	6,929,916	14,743,488	0	300,000	15,043,488
Federal Funds	4,929,167	5,210,298	0	0	5,210,298

Key:

N.A. = Not Applicable or Not Available