

**2015 Legislature - Operating Budget  
Transaction Compare - Governor Amend Structure  
Between 16Adj Base and 16GovEndorsed**

<b>Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: Judiciary</b>
---

**Agency: Judiciary**

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
<b>Alaska Court System</b>													
<b>Appellate Courts</b>													
Life-Cycle Replacement of Computer Systems	16GovEndorsed	Inc	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>Automation of its case management system requires the court system to regularly update its operating systems to be compatible with updated software versions and licensing requirements. Rapid advancements in computer technology requires the court system to continually evaluate and improve its base of technological equipment. In the past, the court system has received sporadic grant and capital funding to replace equipment and operating systems. To ensure a planned, life-cycle approach to replacement of these systems, a sustained source of funding must be incorporated into the court system's base operating budget. Experts recommend replacement cycles of three years for personal computers (PCs) and servers, and four years for printers. The court system currently keeps equipment in place for an additional year beyond the recommended guidelines, but requires a sustained funding source to facilitate this cycled approach. In its funding base, the court system has received \$500,000. Last year the court system requested an additional \$175,000 for equipment replacement and received an appropriation of \$75,000. The additional \$100,000 will secure a base funding of \$600,000 to facilitate a planned life-cycle approach for replacement of these critical systems. Funding for this increment will be requested as follows: \$25,000 in Appellate; \$25,000 in Administration; and \$50,000 in the Trial Courts.</i>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			25.0										
AMD: Reverse Request for Life-Cycle Replacement of Computer Systems	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-25.0										
AMD: Reduction Attributable to Unpaid Days Off (Court Closures)	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-107.2	-107.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-107.2										
AMD: Reduction in Travel and Supply Costs	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-75.0	0.0	-25.0	0.0	-50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-75.0										
<b>* Allocation Difference *</b>			<b>-182.2</b>	<b>-107.2</b>	<b>-25.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-50.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Trial Courts</b>													
Security Screening Services	16GovEndorsed	Inc	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>The court system currently has full-time security screening at seven superior court locations (Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, Palmer, Kenai, and Bethel). We are requesting funding to contract for one full-time security guard to be hired for each superior court location at which there is currently no security service. Because a minimum of two guards is required to operate security screening equipment consisting of an x-ray machine and a walk-through metal detector, the court system plans to use the single guard to perform hand searches of patrons' bags and use a hand-held metal detector to screen for prohibited items at domestic violence hearings, criminal sentencing, and other high risk proceedings.</i>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			320.0										
Funding for Increased Trials	16GovEndorsed	Inc	275.0	0.0	0.0	275.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>In FY13, the court system conducted 418 criminal trials. In FY14, the court system held 485 criminal trials, a 16% increase over FY13. There were 230 more trial days in FY14 than in FY13. As a result of the increase in trial days, jury costs in FY14 exceeded FY13 costs by approximately \$210,000. The increase in the number of jury trials has also affected interpreter costs. So far, during the first three months of FY15, the court system has incurred interpreter costs totaling \$55,000. The court system currently has \$85,000 in its base budget for language interpreter services. We are recommending an increase of \$50,000 for this expense.</i>													
<i>The remaining \$15.0 of this increment is requested for increased juror parking costs in Homer.</i>													

**2015 Legislature - Operating Budget  
Transaction Compare - Governor Amend Structure  
Between 16Adj Base and 16GovEndorsed**

<b>Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: Judiciary</b>
---

**Agency: Judiciary**

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
<b>Alaska Court System (continued)</b>													
<b>Trial Courts (continued)</b>													
Funding for Increased Trials (continued)													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			275.0										
Facility Operations and Maintenance	16GovEndorsed	Inc	217.0	0.0	0.0	217.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>The court system leases court facilities from private landlords throughout the state. For FY16, \$95,200 is required to fund increased lease expenses in Nome, Dillingham, Barrow, Homer, and Wrangell. The court system is also requesting an additional \$29,000 for utility increases in Anchorage and Palmer and \$161,700 for increased cost associated with snowplowing and janitorial contracts in Anchorage, Kenai, and Palmer.</i>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			179.2										
1007 I/A Rcpts (Other)			37.8										
Data Exchanges with the Department of Corrections	16GovEndorsed	Inc	150.0	0.0	0.0	150.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>The court system seeks funding to develop two electronic data exchange with the Department of Corrections. The first exchange would provide real-time access to a defendant's custody status and would allow the Department of Corrections to determine when a defendant is scheduled to appear in court. Having this information readily available to the court system and to DOC will contribute to improved efficiency by eliminating the time spent by multiple employees to find defendants in DOC custody and to schedule medical appointments, transports, etc. within DOC.</i>													
<i>The second data exchange would allow the court system to determine whether individuals called for jury service are disqualified from serving as jurors because of their criminal history. Under the juror qualification statute, individuals who are on felony probation cannot serve as jurors. Disqualifying these individuals prior to sending out questionnaires, reminder notices, and subsequent follow-up, would improve the efficiency of juror qualification processes as well as reduce the court system's juror costs, particularly in areas where jurors are flown in only to be disqualified and flown home. The funding requested is for the cost of programming the data exchanges to enable the two systems to communicate and disseminate custody and probationary status information needed by the two agencies.</i>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			150.0										
Life-Cycle Replacement of Computer Systems	16GovEndorsed	Inc	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>Automation of its case management system requires the court system to regularly update its operating systems to be compatible with updated software versions and licensing requirements. Rapid advancements in computer technology requires the court system to continually evaluate and improve its base of technological equipment. In the past, the court system has received sporadic grant and capital funding to replace equipment and operating systems. To ensure a planned, life-cycle approach to replacement of these systems, a sustained source of funding must be incorporated into the court system's base operating budget. Experts recommend replacement cycles of three years for personal computers (PCs) and servers, and four years for printers. The court system currently keeps equipment in place for an additional year beyond the recommended guidelines, but requires a sustained funding source to facilitate this cycled approach. In its funding base, the court system has received \$500,000. Last year the court system requested an additional \$175,000 for equipment replacement and received an appropriation of \$75,000. The additional \$100,000 will secure a base funding of \$600,000 to facilitate a planned life-cycle approach for replacement of these critical systems. Funding for this increment will be requested as follows: \$25,000 in Appellate; \$25,000 in Administration; and \$50,000 in the Trial Courts.</i>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			50.0										
AMD: Reverse UGF Increment Requests Submitted 12/15/14	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-924.2	0.0	0.0	-924.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-924.2										

**2015 Legislature - Operating Budget  
Transaction Compare - Governor Amend Structure  
Between 16Adj Base and 16GovEndorsed**

<b>Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: Judiciary</b>
---

**Agency: Judiciary**

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
<b>Alaska Court System (continued)</b>													
<b>Trial Courts (continued)</b>													
AMD: Reduction Attributable to Unpaid Days Off (Court Closures)	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-1,373.8	-1,373.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-1,373.8										
AMD: Reduction in Travel, Contractual, and Supply Costs	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-630.0	0.0	-100.0	-130.0	-400.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-630.0										
<b>* Allocation Difference *</b>			<b>-1,916.0</b>	<b>-1,373.8</b>	<b>-100.0</b>	<b>-92.2</b>	<b>-350.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Administration and Support</b>													
Life-Cycle Replacement of Computer Systems	16GovEndorsed	Inc	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>Automation of its case management system requires the court system to regularly update its operating systems to be compatible with updated software versions and licensing requirements. Rapid advancements in computer technology requires the court system to continually evaluate and improve its base of technological equipment. In the past, the court system has received sporadic grant and capital funding to replace equipment and operating systems. To ensure a planned, life-cycle approach to replacement of these systems, a sustained source of funding must be incorporated into the court system's base operating budget. Experts recommend replacement cycles of three years for personal computers (PCs) and servers, and four years for printers. The court system currently keeps equipment in place for an additional year beyond the recommended guidelines, but requires a sustained funding source to facilitate this cycled approach. In its funding base, the court system has received \$500,000. Last year the court system requested an additional \$175,000 for equipment replacement and received an appropriation of \$75,000. The additional \$100,000 will secure a base funding of \$600,000 to facilitate a planned life-cycle approach for replacement of these critical systems. Funding for this increment will be requested as follows: \$25,000 in Appellate; \$25,000 in Administration; and \$50,000 in the Trial Courts.</i>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			25.0										
AMD: Reverse Request for Life-Cycle Replacement of Computer Systems	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-25.0										
AMD: Reduction Attributable to Unpaid Days Off (Court Closures)	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-201.0	-201.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-201.0										
AMD: Reduction in Travel and Supply Costs	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-75.0	0.0	-25.0	0.0	-50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-75.0										
<b>* Allocation Difference *</b>			<b>-276.0</b>	<b>-201.0</b>	<b>-25.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-50.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>** Appropriation Difference **</b>			<b>-2,374.2</b>	<b>-1,682.0</b>	<b>-150.0</b>	<b>-92.2</b>	<b>-450.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Therapeutic Courts</b>													
<b>Therapeutic Courts</b>													
MH Trust: Dis Justice - Grant 569 Criminal Justice Diversion Project	16GovEndorsed	IncOTI	150.0	0.0	0.0	150.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>This increment will be used to develop and implement a pilot program in a targeted community for diverting adult and/or juvenile Trust beneficiaries from the criminal justice system. The project and its funding will be managed by the Alaska Court System staff. This project is a critical component of the Disability Justice Focus Area aimed at addressing the underlying reasons for an individual's contact with the criminal justice system, maintaining public</i>													

**2015 Legislature - Operating Budget  
Transaction Compare - Governor Amend Structure  
Between 16Adj Base and 16GovEndorsed**

<b>Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: Judiciary</b>
---

**Agency: Judiciary**

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
<b>Therapeutic Courts (continued)</b>													
<b>Therapeutic Courts (continued)</b>													
MH Trust: Dis Justice - Grant 569 Criminal Justice Diversion Project (continued)													
<i>safety, and ultimately reducing criminal recidivism and the associated costs. Individual recidivism outcome data as well as any associated cost savings will be collected.</i>													
			150.0										
	1092 MHTAAR (Other)												
	AMD: Reduction Attributable to Unpaid Days Off (Court Closures)	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-13.6	-13.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
	1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-13.6									
	AMD: Reduction in Treatment Services	16GovEndorsed	Dec	-75.0	0.0	0.0	-75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
	1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			-75.0									
	<b>* Allocation Difference *</b>			<b>61.4</b>	-13.6	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
	<b>** Appropriation Difference **</b>			<b>61.4</b>	-13.6	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0

**Judicial Council**

**Judicial Council**

	Advertising for Public Feedback on Performance of Judges and Applicant Qualifications	16GovEndorsed	Inc	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
--	---	---------------	-----	------	-----	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---

*The Alaska Judicial Council depends on public involvement to perform its constitutional and statutory duties related to the selection and retention of judges. Until recent years, the Council had relied on a mixture of paid and non-paid advertising to involve and inform the public about these important governmental functions. Since advertising was removed from the Council's budget, it has relied solely on non-paid outreach. While the non-paid methods successfully reach some individuals, the absence of paid advertising has coincided with a dramatic drop off in involvement by members of the general public. Council members thus are deprived of information that could help them in their duties, and members of the public who might have wished to be involved are not heard. The effect that the requested increment would have in each of the Council's areas of responsibility is described below.*

*Soliciting public input on judicial applicants: The Alaska Judicial Council's longstanding procedures for evaluating applicants for judgeships include participation by members of the public. The most important tool for involving the public is an in-person hearing conducted in the town where the vacancy has occurred. At these hearings, members of the public comment on the qualifications of the applicants, and tell the Council members what qualities or characteristics are important to them for their local judge and what specific problems are facing their local justice system. Although the Council has continued to use non-paid methods of soliciting public input (such as posting notices on the state's on-line system and the Council's web site, issuing press releases, and asking local court staff to post notices in the courthouse and around town), the Council's inability to use paid advertising has depressed public participation in these hearings over the past two years. A portion of the requested increment would be used to publicize the hearing dates and times in local communities.*

*Soliciting public input on evaluation of judges standing for retention: Public comment is also integral to the Council's retention evaluation process, and it has been the Council's practice to conduct a statewide public hearing for the purpose of receiving public testimony on the performance of judges standing for retention. In 2014, the Council attempted to involve the public in its evaluation of judges standing for retention without paid advertising. Consistent with intent language in HB266, Council staff worked closely with the Legislative Information Office to publicize the statewide retention election hearing held on June 5, 2014. However, for the first time in*

**2015 Legislature - Operating Budget  
Transaction Compare - Governor Amend Structure  
Between 16Adj Base and 16GovEndorsed**

<b>Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: Judiciary</b>
---

**Agency: Judiciary**

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
<b>Judicial Council (continued)</b>													
<b>Judicial Council (continued)</b>													
Advertising for Public Feedback on Performance of Judges and Applicant Qualifications (continued)													
<p><i>memory, no members of the public testified on any of the fourteen judges standing for retention. The Council thus was deprived of important information that members of the public could have provided about the qualifications of the judges standing for retention, and members of the public who might have wished to comment were not heard. A portion of the requested increment would be used to solicit public input throughout the judicial performance evaluation process, and to publicize the date/time/purpose of the statewide public hearing on judges who will stand for retention in 2016.</i></p> <p><i>Advertising of judicial performance evaluation and retention recommendations to the public: To enable voters to make informed decisions about whether judges should be retained in office, the legislature requires the Council to publicize its evaluations of judges and its recommendations to the voters. It is important for voters to understand the exhaustive process the Judicial Council uses to evaluate judges standing for retention. Voters who understand the Council's evaluation process will understand that they can access the detailed evaluation materials for themselves to make an informed vote. Alternatively, voters will understand that they can access the Judicial Council's recommendations if they do not wish to review the voluminous evaluation materials themselves. The increment would be used to publicize the availability of the Judicial Council's evaluation materials for all judges, and the Judicial Council's recommendations to voters on all judges standing for retention. Consistent with a commitment made by the Council's executive director during a prior legislative session, the Judicial Council will not use the increment to respond to opposition to a judge or justice. Rather, the Council will use advertising funds to publicize its recommendations and the information upon which it relied in making its recommendations, and to inform the public about the evaluation process.</i></p> <p><i>Summary: The Alaska Judicial Council requests that the legislature approve an increment of 20.0 to restore advertising funding so the Council can effectively obtain public input when it evaluates judicial applicants and judges, and to insure that Alaskans are aware of the information they need to vote on the retention of judges. he information they need to vote on the retention of judges.</i></p>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			20.0										
* Allocation Difference *			20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
** Appropriation Difference **			20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
*** Agency Difference ***			-2,292.8	-1,695.6	-150.0	2.8	-450.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
**** All Agencies Difference ****			-2,292.8	-1,695.6	-150.0	2.8	-450.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0

## Column Definitions

**16Adj Base (FY16 Adjusted Base)** - FY2015 Management Plan less one-time items, plus FY2016 adjustments for position counts, funding transfers, line item transfers, temporary increments (IncT) from prior years, and additions for statewide items (risk management and most salary and benefit increases). The Adjusted Base is the "first cut" of the FY2016 budget; it is the base to which the Governor's and the Legislature's increments, decrements, and fund changes are added.

**16GovEndorsed (16Governor's Endorsed Bdgt 2/5)** - The Governor's endorsed budget as of February 5, 2015. Includes the December 15th budget submission and 2/5/15 budget Governor's budget submission,