## **Workers' Compensation Court of Existing Claims**

### L. Brad Taylor, Presiding Judge

Michael J. Harkey, Court Administrator

FY'16 Projected Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
General Court	\$3,326,386		\$429,323			\$3,755,709
ISD Data Processing	\$393,116					\$393,116
						\$0
						\$0
						\$0
						\$0
Total	\$3,719,502	\$0	\$429,323	\$0	\$0	\$4,148,825

<sup>\*</sup>In FY16 the legislature put in place a method of step-down funding for the Court through June 30, 2020. Funding for general Court operations and data

processing comes directly from assessments on insurors and not general revenue. In addition, in FY16 the legislature created the Workers'

Ap	propriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
FY'15 Carryover	\$0		\$619,753			\$619,753

### What Changes did the Agency Make between FY'15 and FY'16?

1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts?

No

#### 2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user?

Despite the obstacles of reduced funding and severely limited workforce, we have managed to provide the public with the same quaility of service as before by heavy multi-tasking. frequent overtime, and consolidation of functions. The pace is stepped-up but workable for now.

# 3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate?

Our staff is exceptional but heavy demands are being made of them. When the Court and the Commission divided, most of our staff was taken. The salaries of our remaining small staff were dangerously non-competitive. We were in danger of losing many key employees. However, last year's budget included a slight increase in pay to base employees to reflect a major increase in their duties. Without such an increase we would have been required to hire additional staff at an even greater cost. All of this has insured that the pace and quality of our services will be sustainable.

4.) Did the agency provide any pay raises that were not legislatively/statutorily required? If so, please provide a detailed description in a separate document.

No, see #3, above.

FY'17 Requested Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other	Total	% Change
General Court	\$3,326,386		\$429,323		\$3,755,709	0.00%
ISD Data Processing	\$393,116				\$393,116	0.00%
-						
Total	\$3,719,502	\$0	\$429,323	\$0	\$4,148,825	0.00%
*Source of "Other" and %	of "Other" total for each	•			•	

\*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each

FY'17 Top Five A	Appropriation Funding Requests	
		\$ Amount
Request 1: Description		
Request 2: Description		
Request 3: Description		
Request 4: Description		
Request 5: Description		

**Total Increase above FY-17 Request** 

U

Our revolving fund is diminishing due to winding down of claims and will eventually be minimized. We already will be taking a 12.5% reduction from FY 2016, per HB 2238.

## How would the agency handle a 7.5% appropriation reduction in FY'17?

We are at absolute minimum needs. Services would be cut. The Court would be in danger of having to furlough and suspend dockets. Our revolving fund is diminishing due to winding down of claims and will eventually be minimized.

We already will be taking a 12.5% reduction from FY 2016, per HB 2238.

### How would the agency handle a 10% appropriation reduction in FY'17?

We are at absolute minimum needs. Services would be cut. Court would be in danger of having to furlough and suspend dockets.

Our revolving fund is diminishing due to winding down of claims and will eventually be minimized.

We already will be taking a 12.5% reduction from FY 2016, per HB 2238.

		Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY'16?	
			\$ Amount
Increase 1	N/A		\$0
Increase 2	N/A		\$0
Increase 3	N/A		\$0

## What are the agency's top 2-3 capital or technology (one-time) requests, if applicable?

#### **Federal Government Impact**

1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government?

N/A

2.) Are any of those funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate?

N/A

3.) What would the consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency?

N/A

4.) How will your agency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year?

N/A

5.) Has the agency requested any additional federal earmarks or increases?

N/A

#### **Division and Program Descriptions**

# **Administrative Services**

The Office of the Court Administrator operates the day to day business and functions of the Court System to handle the claims for the thousands of outstanding cases remaining to be resolved. This office is responsible for budgeting, hiring, purchasing, and employee supervision.

Docketing Division - Responsible for scheduling case settings, notifying parties of trials and hearings and setting and docketing appeals.

Order Division - Writers and processes all Judgements and Orders.

**Court Clerk** - Maintains all records, receives and accounts for all fees, accepts and processes all fillings, and mails all legal Ordes and Judgments to parties.

Office of Management and Enterprise Services - The Court has consolidated all of its budgetary, accounting, business services, and payroll with OMES for a savings of over 200K per year.

FY'17 Budgeted FTE						
	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
Administration						
Division Name						
Division Name						
Division Name						
Division Name						
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE History					
	2016 Budgeted	2015	2012	2009	2005
Administration					
Division Name					
Division Name					
Division Name					
Division Name					
Total	0	0	0	0	0

Performance Measure Review						
Measure I	FY'15	FY'14	FY'13	FY'12	FY'11	
Measure II						
Measure III						

Revolving Funds (200 Series Funds)							
	FY'13-15 Avg. Revenues	FY'13-15 Avg. Expenditures	June '15 Balance				
Revolving Fund I							
Brief Description	\$1,823,184	\$1,530,698	\$619,753				
Revolving Fund II							
Brief Description	N/A						