

| FY16 Judiciary - Possible Budget Savings Options - March 10, 2015 |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Issue #1: \$600K Pay Act Cut</b>                               |   |  | <b>Solutions:</b>                                |   |
| <b>Factors/Variables:</b>   |   | <b>Response:</b>   |  | <b>Obtacles/Issues:</b>   |
|   | If Judiciary Pay Act is cut by \$600K with no change to obligations   | Filing fees - average 20% increase - additional GF revenue                     | \$ 630,093                                       | (Before rounding to nearest \$5) - overlap with Tech Fund proposal (below) - Each average 1% raises \$31,505 est        |
| <b>Issue #2: \$500K "Justice System Restructuring"</b>            |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Factors/Variables:</b>   |   | <b>Response:</b>   |  | <b>Obtacles/Issues:</b>   |
|   | Gov Big Bill language proposes base reduction                         | 1) Lightening the Load: Family Division parties handle service:                |  | Also significant efficiency gain for JUD; Other operational efficiency issues in LTL bill proposal.                     |
|   | But language references justice system                                | - postage  | \$ 50,000  | Assumes \$50K savings of total \$65K Fam Division postage   |
|   | Not specific to Judiciary   | - service of process   | \$ 37,000  | Assumes 100% savings on Fam Div service of process  |
|   |   | 2) Video arraignments (Not JUD approp)   | \$ 500,000                                       | \$500K IS POSSIBLE LONG-TERM SAVINGS (1st year only fraction); requires process agreement from all participants         |
|   |   | - offset by \$350K ERF (DOC & JUD) over 5 years                                | \$ (70,000)                                      | One-time equipment acquisition costs (excludes DOC infrastructure and staffing issues)                                  |
|   |   | <b>Subtotal</b>  | <b>\$ 517,000</b>                                |   |
| <b>Issue #3: Existing pressures = ~\$900K</b>                     |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Factors/Variables:</b>   |   | <b>Response:</b>   |  | <b>Obtacles/Issues:</b>   |
|   | Includes pressures and shortfalls: sheriffs; security; staffing; etc. | Continue to utilize "extraordinary" vacancy savings                            |  | Continues structural challenge  |
| <b>Total GF pressures: approx. \$2,000,000</b>                    |   |  | <b>Total GF possible solutions: \$ 2,047,093</b> |   |
| <b>Issue #4: Funding for Case Mgmt System</b>                     |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Factors/Variables:</b>   |   | <b>Response:</b>   |  | <b>Obtacles/Issues:</b>   |
|   |   | 415151 Fail to Answer Fee (From \$20 to \$30)                                  | \$ 165,645                                       | Increases nonpayment %?   |
|   |   | 415152 Fail to Pay Fee (from \$30 to \$40)                                     | \$ 169,946                                       | Increases nonpayment %?   |
|   |   | Filing fee surcharge equivalent to average 25% increase - revenue to Tech Fund | \$ 787,616                                       | (Before rounding to nearest \$5) - See above - NOTE this would be in addition to the GF filing fee average 20% increase |
|   |   | <b>Subtotal</b>  | <b>\$ 1,123,207</b>                              | <b>To Court Technology Fund</b>   |
| Vermont Judiciary - 3/10/15                                       |   |  |  |   |