

Recommendation Summary (CB Detail)

Agency: 048 Court of Appeals
Version: S1 2016 Supplemental Budget Request

9:41:18AM
 11/20/2015

Dollars in Thousands

Annual Average FTEs	General Fund State	Other Funds	Total Funds
------------------------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------

2015-17 Current Biennium Total

Total Carry Forward Level

Percent Change from Current Biennium

Carry Forward plus Workload Changes

Percent Change from Current Biennium

M2 AB Reinstatement of Merit Increments	319	319
M2 AF Retirement Buyout	94	94
M2 AG Employment Security	75	75
M2 AH Office of Attorney Office	20	20
M2 AI Benefits for Judges Salary	12	12
M2 AJ Capital Project Request	103	103

Total Maintenance Level

Percent Change from Current Biennium

623 623

Subtotal - Performance Level Changes

0.0

2015-17 Total Proposed Budget

Percent Change from Current Biennium

623 623

M2 AB Reinstatement of Merit Increments

The Court of Appeals requests funding to reinstate salary step increases for eligible employees. Staff salaries were frozen in 2009 as part of the austerity measures necessitated by severe budget reductions. Since 2009, employees have not advanced to the next salary step within their salary ranges, as is customary for state employees.

M2 AF Retirement Buyout

Fund is requested to meet the leave buyout obligation for employees who have been with the Court for many years.

M2 AG Employment Security

Pursuant to RCW 50.44.020, the Court of Appeals requests funding for payment of unemployment compensation invoices from the Department of Employment Security remaining unpaid through June 30, 2015 and funds for anticipated invoices in FY 2016 and FY 2017.

M2 AH Office of Attorney Office

Recommendation Summary (CB Detail)

Agency: 048 Court of Appeals
Version: S1 2016 Supplemental Budget Request

9:41:18AM

11/20/2015

Dollars in Thousands

Annual	General		
Average FTEs	Fund State	Other Funds	Total Funds

The central services appropriation for the Office of the Attorney General was insufficient for the 2013-2015 biennium. Funding is requested to reimburse the Attorney General's Office (AGO) for services provided in FY 2014 and 2015 and to ensure that anticipated Attorney General costs can be paid in FY 2016.

M2 AI Benefits for Judges Salary

Funding is requested for the increased benefit costs resulting from the judges' salary adjustment approved by the Washington Citizens' Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials.

M2 AJ Capital Project Request

Division III court facility located in Spokane is owned by the court. The court was constructed in 1978 with an extensive remodel and enlargement occurring in 1998. Consequently, the flooring, the wall paint and HVAC controls will be 18 years old by the year of 2016. While leased facilities get incremental funding through lease increase, building ownership did not that incremental funding. This project will upgrade the facility. Use the RSMEANS facility maintenance and repair frequency for reference.

Washington State Judicial Branch 2016 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

Decision Package

Agency Court of Appeals

Decision Package Title Reinstatement of Merit Increments

Budget Period 2016 Supplemental Budget

Budget Level: Maintenance Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

The Court of Appeals requests funding to reinstate salary step increases for eligible employees. Staff salaries were frozen in 2009 as part of the austerity measures necessitated by severe budget reductions. Since 2009, employees have not advanced to the next salary step within their salary ranges, as is customary for state employees.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Funding Source 001-1 GF-S	\$0	\$319,000	\$319,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

In order to achieve and maintain reductions over the past seven years, the Court of Appeals implemented austerity measures which included elimination of salary step increases for current employees.

There are approximately 140 employees in the three divisions of the Court of Appeals, including staff attorneys, judicial assistants, and court clerks. Employees who are at the top of their salary ranges are not eligible for further step increases. An agreement has been reached whereby OFM has recognized that the Court of Appeals functions as three autonomous courts each with fewer than 100 FTEs and can therefore include the cost of salary increments in the maintenance level request. This request seeks to provide step

increases for those employees who are not yet at the top of their salary ranges and who are eligible for step increases, but who did not receive increases due to the budget reductions.

Allowing each of these eligible employees to receive a step increase on their next Periodic Increment Date (PID) would begin the process of bringing them to the salary they should be receiving based on their tenure in the job class.

Restoring step increases would assist greatly in the retention of these skilled employees.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Contribution to the Judicial Branch Principle Policy Objectives

Appropriate Staffing and Support.

Court of Appeals staff salaries were frozen in 2009 to enable the Court to operate on a severely reduced budget. The affected employees have continued to carry out their duties despite the fact that they did not receive step increases as they were earned. Restoring the Court's ability to provide step increases to eligible employees will ensure that court personnel are effectively supported.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

None

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Court of Appeals staff cannot be expected to serve indefinitely without receiving the merit increments they have earned.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

These are ongoing costs.

Effects of non-funding

It will be difficult to recruit and retain qualified employees if merit increments cannot be

provided.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$0	\$319,000	\$319,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Objects	\$0	\$319,000	\$319,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2016 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

Decision Package

Agency Court of Appeals

Decision Package Title Retirement Buyout

Budget Period 2016 Supplemental

Budget Level: Maintenance

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested to meet the leave buyout obligation for employees who have been with the Court for many years.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Funding Source 001-1 GF-S	\$94,000	\$0	\$94,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

The Court of Appeals (COA) has sustained substantial reductions to its operating budget the past few years. In order to achieve those reductions the Court of Appeals has made significant reductions in discretionary spending. Leave buyout however is not a discretionary expenditure. Employees of the court earn leave and they must receive the entire value of the leave when they retire. There are several long term COA employees who are eligible for retirement in FY 2016. If any of them retire, the cost of their leave buyout will have a significant impact on the budget.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

None

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Not applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

The costs are one-time.

Effects of non-funding

Other obligations would not be paid.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

The request is based on five long-term employees nearing retirement.

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$94,000	\$0	\$94,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Objects	\$94,000	\$0	\$94,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2016 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

Decision Package

Agency Court of Appeals

Decision Package Title Employment Security

Budget Period 2016 Supplemental

Budget Level: Maintenance

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Pursuant to RCW 50.44.020, the Court of Appeals requests funding for payment of unemployment compensation invoices from the Department of Employment Security remaining unpaid through June 30, 2015 and funds for anticipated invoices in FY 2016 and FY 2017.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Funding Source 001-1 GF-S	\$45,000	\$30,000	\$75,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

Pursuant to RCW 50.44.020, the Court of Appeals requests funding for payment of unemployment compensation invoices from the Department of Employment Security remaining unpaid through June 30, 2015 and funds for anticipated invoices in FY 2016 and FY 2017. The amount currently due is \$15,000. The amount due to Employment Security averages approximately \$30,000 per year. Therefore, an additional \$30,000 is requested for FY 2016 and \$30,000 is requested for FY 2017.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

None.

Impact on other state services

None.

Relationship to Capital Budget

None.

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

None.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

These costs are one-time in nature; however, budget requests will be made in the future as ESD invoices are received.

Effects of non-funding

The Court of Appeals will not pay invoices from the Department of Employment Security.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Projected invoices for 2016 and 2017 are \$30,000 each year.

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-Staff Costs	\$45,000	\$30,000	\$75,000
Total Objects	\$45,000	\$30,000	\$75,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2016 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

Decision Package

Agency Court of Appeals

Decision Package Title Office of the Attorney General

Budget Period 2016 Supplemental Budget

Budget Level: Maintenance Level

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

The central services appropriation for the Office of the Attorney General was insufficient for the 2013-2015 biennium. Funding is requested to reimburse the Attorney General's Office (AGO) for services provided in FY 2014 and 2015 and to ensure that anticipated Attorney General costs can be paid in FY 2016.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Funding Source 001-1 GF-S	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

The Court of Appeals (COA) has received invoices from the Office of the Attorney General (AGO) totaling \$14,000 more than the amount appropriated for FY 2015. It is anticipated that the level of service provided by the AGO during FY 2016 will be similar to the level provided in FY 2015. Therefore, an additional \$6,000 is requested for FY 2016 for a total request of \$20,000.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service
None

Impact on other state services

None

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

Not applicable

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

These costs are one-time in nature; however, budget requests will be made in the future as AGO invoices are received.

Effects of non-funding

The Court of Appeals will be unable to pay invoices from the Office of the Attorney General.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-Staff Costs	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000
Total Objects	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000

Washington State Judicial Branch 2016 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

Decision Package

Agency Court of Appeals

Decision Package Title Benefits Associated with Judges' Salary Increase

Budget Period 2016 Supplemental

Budget Level: Maintenance

Agency Recommendation Summary Text

Funding is requested for the increased benefit costs resulting from the judges' salary adjustment approved by the Washington Citizens' Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Funding Source 001-1 GF-S	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$12,000
Staffing	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
FTEs (number of staff requested)	0	0	0

Package Description

The Washington Citizens' Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials approved a salary increase for judges of the Washington State Court of Appeals. The correct amount of funding was provided for the increase in salary costs; however, an inadequate level of funding was provided for the associated increase in benefit costs. Funding is requested for the shortfall.

Measure Detail

Impact on clients and service

None.

Impact on other state services

None.

Relationship to Capital Budget

None

Required changes to existing Court Rule, Court Order, RCW, WAC, contract, or plan

None

Alternatives explored

None.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs and budget impacts in future biennia

On-going costs.

Effects of non-funding

The Washington Court of Appeals would not have sufficient funding for judges' benefits.

Expenditure calculations and assumptions and FTE assumptions

Object Detail	FY 2016	FY 2017	Total
Staff Costs	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$12,000
Non-Staff Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Objects	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$12,000

01-1 General Fund-
State
Total

103,000				103,000
103,000	0	0	0	103,000