# **Agency Name: District Court**

### Lead Administrator: Michael D. Evans

### Lead Financial Officer: Tammy Reaves

FY'13 Budgeted FTE								
	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$		
Administrative	0	0	654	193	220	241		
Total	0	0	654	193	220	241		

FTE History								
	2013 Budgeted	2012	2009	2008	2003			
Administrative	654	654	654	654	0			
Total	654	654	654	654	0			

FY'13 Projected Division/Program Funding By Source								
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total		
Administrative	\$8,600,000	\$0	\$51,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$59,600,000		
Total	\$8,600,000	\$0	\$51,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$59,600,000		
*Source of "Other" and %	of "Other" total for e	each.						

FY'12 Carryover by Funding Source								
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total		
FY'12 Carryover	\$600,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,600,000		
*Source of "Other" and %	of "Other" total for ea	ach.						

### What Changes did the Agency Make between FY'12 and FY'13

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

2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user? N/A

3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate? N/A

FY'14 Requested Division/Program Funding By Source							
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other	Total		
Administrative	\$14,884,381	\$0	\$49,000,000	\$0	\$63,884,381		
Administrative	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000		
Total	\$14,884,381	\$0	\$50,000,000	\$0	\$64,884,381		

The legislature has provided adequate funding to our district courts over the last several years; however, the percentage of general revenue has decreased dramatically from \$21,450,117 in FY2008 to \$8,600,000 in FY2013. Collections in the district courts have increased significantly to make up the budget shortages; however, the collection of fines, fees and costs appears to have peaked last year and is declining. Note that we have lowered our certification estimate from \$51,000,000 to \$49,000,000. We anticipate the figures may need to be adjusted lower in February, 2014.

FY'14 Top Five Appropriation Funding Requests	
	\$ Amount
Increase in benefits and salaries	\$6,284,381
	\$0
	\$0
	\$0
	\$0

### How would the agency handle a 3% appropriation reduction in FY'14?

Operational costs vary and we have little control over costs due to legislative mandates and directives. Further reductions in staff cannot be absorbed without a loss of essential basic court services.

# How would the agency handle a 5% appropriation reduction in FY'14?

Operational costs vary and we have little control over costs due to legislative mandates and directives. Further reductions in staff cannot be absorbed without a loss of essential basic court services.

Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY'14?					
		\$ Amount			
None		\$0			
		\$0			
		\$0			

	Federal Government Impact
1.) How much feder \$0.00	ral money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government?
2.) Are any of those <i>N/A</i>	funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate?
The C	consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency? Courts would be unable to provide the education for Judges and lawyers in deprived child cases as directed by homa Statutes.
4.) How will your as <i>N/A</i>	gency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year?
5.) Has the agency 1 <i>No</i> .	requested any additional federal earmarks or increases?

# **Division and Program Descriptions**

Administrative

Performance Measure Review								
		FY12	FY'11	FY'10	FY'09	FY'08		
Administrative	ſ							
	None	0	0	0	0	0		