


**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Summary of Recommendations - House**

Page IV-23  
 David Slayton, Administrative Director  
 George Dziuk, LBB Analyst


Method of Financing	2016-17 Base	2018-19 Recommended	Biennial Change (\$)	Biennial Change (%)
General Revenue Funds	\$40,266,441	\$36,715,294	(\$3,551,147)	(8.8%)
GR Dedicated Funds	\$109,739,454	\$103,711,352	(\$6,028,102)	(5.5%)
<i>Total GR-Related Funds</i>	<i>\$150,005,895</i>	<i>\$140,426,646</i>	<i>(\$9,579,249)</i>	<i>(6.4%)</i>
Federal Funds	\$63,836	\$0	(\$63,836)	(100.0%)
Other	\$12,120,771	\$11,853,910	(\$266,861)	(2.2%)
<b>All Funds</b>	<b>\$162,190,502</b>	<b>\$152,280,556</b>	<b>(\$9,909,946)</b>	<b>(6.1%)</b>

	FY 2017 Budgeted	FY 2019 Recommended	Biennial Change	Percent Change
FTEs	239.6	232.6	(7.0)	(2.9%)

**Historical Funding Levels (Millions)**



**Historical Full-Time-Equivalent Employees (FTEs)**



The bill pattern for this agency (2018-19 Recommended) represents an estimated 100% of the agency's estimated total available funds for the 2018-19 biennium.

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Summary of Funding Changes and Recommendations - House**

Funding Changes and Recommendations for the 2018-19 Biennium compared to the 2016-17 Base Spending Level (in millions)		General Revenue	GR-Dedicated	Federal Funds	Other Funds	All Funds	Strategy in Appendix A
<b>SIGNIFICANT Funding Changes and Recommendations (each issue is explained in Section 3 and additional details are provided in Appendix A):</b>							
A)	Decrease funding for grants to counties for indigent defense costs due to anticipated reductions in court cost revenue and available balances in the General Revenue-Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073. The agency submitted a \$2.8 million reduction in available balances in its 4 percent reduction in addition to including an anticipated \$2.4 million revenue reduction in its 2018-19 baseline request.	\$0.0	(\$5.2)	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$5.2)	D.1.1.
B)	Decrease in General Revenue-Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 funding submitted in the agency's 4 percent reduction.	\$0.0	(\$0.8)	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.8)	A.1.2.
C)	Decrease in funding for Centralized Accounting and Payroll/Personnel System (CAPPS) deployments with authority for 2.0 FTEs which the agency submitted \$0.4 million in its 4 percent reduction.	(\$0.8)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.8)	A.1.2.
D)	Decrease in one-time funding for the Guardianship Compliance Pilot Project.	(\$0.6)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.6)	A.1.1, A.1.2.
E)	Decrease in one-time funding for the Timothy Cole Exoneration Review Commission.	(\$0.2)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.2)	A.1.1.
<b>OTHER Funding Changes and Recommendations (these issues are not addressed in Section 3 but details are provided in Appendix A):</b>							
F)	One-time funding to replace aging security technology and a legacy data analysis system used to monitor the 4 judicial professions regulated by the Judicial Branch Certification Commission.	(\$1.6)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$1.6)	A.1.2.
G)	Decrease in funding for reimbursements to counties to provide administrative assistants to the presiding judges of the administrative judicial regions submitted in the agency's 4 percent reduction.	(\$0.3)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.3)	A.1.4.
H)	Decrease of \$23,750 in General Revenue funding for travel expenses for Appellate Justices and staff for transferred cases that was submitted in the agency's 4 percent reduction	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	A.1.3.
I)	Decreases and increases in appropriated receipts and interagency contracts that combined result in a net decrease.	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.3)	(\$0.3)	A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.4, B.1.1, B.1.2, C.1.1, D.1.1
<b>TOTAL SIGNIFICANT &amp; OTHER Funding Changes and Recommendations (in millions)</b>		<b>(\$3.5)</b>	<b>(\$6.0)</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$0.3)</b>	<b>(\$9.8)</b>	As Listed
SIGNIFICANT & OTHER Funding Increases		\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	As Listed
SIGNIFICANT & OTHER Funding Decreases		(\$3.5)	(\$6.0)	\$0.0	(\$0.3)	(\$9.8)	As Listed

Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

**Office of Court Administrative, Texas Judicial Council  
Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House**

1. The Legislative Appropriations Request submitted reflects the appropriations requests of both the Office of Court Administration (OCA), Texas Judicial Council (OCA and TJC respectively), and the Texas Indigent Defense Commission (TIDC). TIDC is a standing committee of the Texas Judicial Council, and is administratively attached to the Office of Court Administration.
2. **Electronic Case Filing Funding.** Recommendations provide \$22.4 million each year for management of the e-filing system and remove the estimated appropriation authority for these funds. This includes a decrease of \$788,018 in General Revenue-Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 funding from 2016–17 levels submitted in the agency's 4 percent reduction. OCA uses these funds to pay a vendor, Tyler Technologies, to manage the e-filing system and to assist courts in implementing mandated electronic filing. The agency has reported that this reduction will not impact the contracts with the vendor. The Comptroller's Biennial Revenue Estimate (BRE) anticipates revenue collections of \$44.5 million for the 2018–19 biennium in addition to remaining available balances of \$5.2 million at the end of fiscal year 2017. This will result in a \$5.0 million balance being available for appropriation.


The enactment of Senate Bill 1139, Eighty-fourth Legislature, Regular Session, increased the filing fee for civil cases in county-level, district, and appellate courts from \$20 to \$30 to compensate for reductions in e-filing revenues during the 2014–15 biennium (See also, Rider Highlights – House #15 and Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA – House #6).

3. **Timothy Cole Exoneration Review Commission:** Recommendations do not include \$245,304 in General Revenue funding with 2.0 FTEs for the Timothy Cole Exoneration Review Commission to examine cases in Texas in which an innocent defendant was convicted and subsequently exonerated after January 1, 2010. The Commission, which was established with the enactment of HB 48, Eighty-fourth Legislature, Regular Session, is required to submit a report by December 1, 2016 on its work and will be abolished upon the earlier of either the date the Commission submits its report, or December 1, 2016.
4. **CAPPS Deployment:** Recommendations do not include \$803,438 in General Revenue with 2.0 FTEs each year for Centralized Accounting and Payroll/Personnel System (CAPPS) deployment for OCA to assist courts and judicial agencies in the transition. 2016–17 funding provided for a project manager and a management analyst to oversee the support, which began in fiscal year 2016. The agency submitted \$431,624 from this funding in its 4 percent reduction and requested to retain the remaining amount of \$371,814 in 2018-19 to complete the full deployment among the courts and judicial agencies, which the recommendations remove.
5. **Guardianship Compliance Project:** Recommendations remove one-time funding of \$590,881 in General Revenue with 3.0 FTEs each year for the Guardianship Compliance Pilot Project to review adult guardianship cases to identify reporting deficiencies by the guardian, audit annual accountings and report findings back to the judge, and work with courts to develop best practices in managing guardianship cases. Funding provided for the 2016–17 biennium pilot project was used to review 10,325 guardianship files from 18 courts in 11 counties. Project findings include a recommendation to close 76 percent of the reviewed cases that were not active and a determination that 43 percent of filings were out of compliance with at least one element of statutorily required reporting. OCA submitted a performance report on the pilot project in December, 2016 (See Also, Rider Highlights – House #20 and Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA – House #2).
6. **Children's Courts:** Recommendations include \$5.4 million in General Revenue funding and \$10.5 million in Interagency Contracts for 43 Child Support Courts and \$8.8 million in General Revenue funding for 24 Child Protection Courts. OCA has identified a potential conflict of interest between these courts and the Office of Attorney General (OAG) due to the OAG providing information technology support to these courts while, at the same time, being a party to the cases heard in these courts (See also, Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA – House #3 and Rider Highlights – House #17).
7. **Executive Director Salary** Section 8, Schedule of Exempt Positions, Special Provisions – Judiciary, provides the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Texas with the authority to set the rate of compensation for the Administrative Director in an amount not to exceed the maximum salary of the salary group listed for this position in OCA's bill pattern. The Chief Justice last increased the salary for the Administrative Director to \$167,040 effective September 1, 2015. The State Auditor's Classification Office recommended in August, 2016, that the Group for the Administrative Director position be increased from Group 4 to Group 5 (See also, Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA – House #4).

8. **Fair Defense Account:** Appropriations from the General Revenue-Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 fund the operations of both the Office of Capital and Forensic Writs (OCFW) and the Texas Indigent Defense Commission (TIDC) in addition to the grants provided to the counties discussed in Item 9 below. Anticipated costs from this account total \$62.8 million, which includes recommended appropriations of \$61.7 million (\$31.4 million in fiscal year 2018 and \$30.3 million in fiscal year 2019) to OCFW and TIDC for these purposes and benefit costs of \$1.1 million. Anticipated revenues and available fund balances of \$68.5 million exceed total costs by \$5.7 million, which are also available for appropriation. Revenues deposited to this account are primarily generated from 8.0143 percent of the total collections received through the Consolidated Court Cost that is paid by defendants convicted under certain sections of the Penal Code.

Recommendations for TIDC include \$59.0 million in General Revenue–Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 funding which is \$5.2 million below 2016–17 spending levels. This decrease includes \$2.8 million for amounts that TIDC submitted in its 4 percent reduction and \$2.4 due to an agency-anticipated 2.0 percent decrease in Court Cost revenue each year of the 2018–19 biennium. Recommendations also remove estimated appropriation authority from these funds. Recommendations continue the Commission’s administrative allocation at 2016–17 levels (See also, Items Not Included in Recommendations for TIDC – House #1 and #4, and Rider Highlights – House #8).

9. **County and State Share of Indigent Defense Costs:** The costs to provide indigent defense services are met through a combination of state and local funding, with counties absorbing a majority of these costs. Recommendations include \$66.5 million from General Revenue and General Revenue–Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 funding, but do not include a TIDC request for estimated appropriation authority to the account nor a request for \$103.6 million in fiscal year 2018 and \$108.6 million in fiscal year 2019 in General Revenue to defray county court costs of providing mandatory indigent defense services. The chart below shows a breakdown of indigent defense expended and budgeted spending from fiscal years 2011 through 2017 with projections for each year of the 2018–19 biennium. TIDC’s request for the 2018–19 biennium would result in an approximately 50 percent state/county split in the share of indigent defense costs with the state absorbing \$134 million in fiscal year 2018 and \$138 million in fiscal year 2019 (See also, Rider Highlights – House #8 and Items Not Included in Recommendations for TIDC – House #4).



Note: Estimates assume an annual increase of \$10.0 million in total costs to provide indigent defense.  
Source: Texas Indigent Defense Commission

10. **Regional Public Defender Office for Capital Cases:** Recommendations continue \$3.1 million in General Revenue for the Regional Public Defender Office for Capital Cases (RPDO) that covers approximately 24 percent of program costs. The RPDO includes 179 participating counties that pay membership dues in exchange for the RPDO to have a qualified defense team provided by the program at no additional cost when a member county has a capital murder case (See also, Items Not Included in Recommendations for TIDC – House #2 and Rider Highlights – House #18).

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council  
Rider Highlights - House**

**Modification of Existing Riders**

8. **Texas Indigent Defense Commission:** Recommendations update the rider to require appropriations to be for all uses authorized by TIDC's enabling statute, Government Code, Chapter 79, and remove estimated appropriation authority for the General Revenue—Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073. Amounts provided from General Revenue—Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 are sum-certain in Strategy D.1.1, Texas Indigent Defense Commission (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #8 and #9, and Items Not Included in Recommendations for TIDC – House #1 and #4)
11. **Innocence Projects:** Recommendations update the rider to correctly identify the total amount allocated to the six law schools following the addition of two universities by the 84<sup>th</sup> Legislature, an increase from \$400,000 to \$600,000, and require higher education institutions receiving grant funds from TIDC for innocence projects to use these funds to provide direct assistance to investigate and pursue relief for defendants with claims of actual innocence.
16. **Mileage Reimbursement for Children's Court Staff:** Recommendations update the rider to reference the new title for the agency's Child Support and Child Protection Courts that has replaced the agency's previous title, Specialty Courts.
18. **Regional Public Defender Office for Capital Cases:** Recommendations update the rider to reflect a program title change (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #10 and Items Not Included in Recommendations for TIDC – House #2)

**Deleted Riders**

12. **Lump Sum Payments for Child Support Courts Program:** Recommendations delete the rider. Recommendations continue funding for this purpose in Strategy B.1.1, Child Support Courts Program. The agency reports making payments for this purpose consistently above amounts included in the rider
14. **Contingency: Study of School Attendance Related Cases:** Recommendations delete the rider because enactment of House Bill 2398, Eighty-fourth Legislature, Regular Session repealed the law making failure to attend school a criminal offense and eliminated the need for the study.
15. **Statewide Efiling System Fund:** Recommendations delete the rider. Amounts provided from General Revenue—Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 are sum-certain in Strategy B.1.2, Information Technology (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues – House #2 and Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA – House #6).
17. **Additional Child Protection Courts:** Recommendations delete the rider. Recommendations continue funding for this purpose in Strategy B.1.2, Child Protection Courts Program.
19. **Contingency for SB 1970:** Recommendations delete the rider. Recommendations continue General Revenue—Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 funding in Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology, pursuant to enactment of Senate Bill 1139, Eighty-fourth Legislature, Regular Session that increased certain filing fees collected to support operations of the Statewide Electronic Filing System (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues – House #2)
20. **Performance Reporting for the Guardianship Compliance Project:** Recommendations delete the rider because the required study will be completed by December, 2016 (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues – House #5 and Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA – House #2).

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Items Not Included in Recommendations - House**

**Section 5**

	2018-19 Biennial Total			Information Technology Involved?	Contracting Involved?	Estimated Continued Cost 2020-21
	GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			

**Agency Exceptional Items - In Agency Priority Order**

<b>Office of Court Administration (OCA) - Exceptional Items Not Included</b>							
1)	<b>Support Core Services for the Judicial Branch</b> General Revenue funding for merit salary increases to provide salaries comparable to similar positions in other state agencies, and compensation changes resulting from an internal review of staff job classifications.	\$633,896	\$633,896	1.0	No	No	\$836,465
2)	<b>Guardianship Program Compliance</b> General Revenue funding for a statewide Guardianship Compliance Project to assist courts with compliance in guardianship cases with authority for 39.0 FTEs for 28 guardianship compliance specialists, 2 managers, and 9 operational staff (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #5 and Rider Highlights - House #20).	\$6,613,678	\$6,613,678	39.0	Yes	No	\$6,493,260
3)	<b>Children's Courts</b> a) \$1,451,968 in General Revenue funding with authority for 8.0 FTEs for 4 additional child protection courts to meet increasing caseload demands. The request includes one associate judge and one court coordinator for each of the 4 additional courts.  b) \$1,667,797 in All Funds (1,345,897 in General Revenue funding and \$321,900 in Interagency Contracts) with authority for 6.0 FTEs for regional technology support staff and one project manager (1.0 FTE) to provide direct technology support to the agency's child support and child protection courts and a project manager to oversee additional technology projects that would include these courts. This request is to address a potential conflict of interest identified by the agency between the courts and the Office of Attorney General (OAG). The OAG currently provides information technology support to these courts while, at the same time, being a party to the cases heard in these courts. (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - Senate #6 and Rider Highlights - Senate #17)	\$2,797,865	\$3,119,765	15.0	Yes	No	\$2,900,766

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Items Not Included in Recommendations - House**

**Section 5**

		2018-19 Biennial Total			Information Technology Involved?	Contracting Involved?	Estimated Continued Cost 2020-21
		GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
4)	<b>Administrative Director's Exempt Salary Adjustment</b> a) Request to increase the Administrative Director position classification from a Group 4 to a Group 5 position (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #7).  b) Request to update the salary of the Administrative Director to reflect the 2.5 percent salary increase provided by the Eighty-4th Legislature. This would increase this position's salary as listed in the bill pattern from \$167,040 to \$171,216 each year.	\$0	\$0	0.0	No	No	\$0
5)	<b>Grant Funded Software Development Projects</b> a) \$499,984 in Federal Funds with Capital Budget Authority for a grant awarded to OCA in September 2016 from the Department of Justice for to develop a web-based, data driven ability-to-pay determination tool and a web-based tool and related applications to link suitable alternatives to fines, fees, and costs to defendants that lack an ability to pay.  b) \$2,753,659 in Interagency Contracts with Capital Budget Authority for a Statewide eCitation System Grant through the Texas Department of Transportation.	\$0	\$3,253,643	0.0	Yes	Yes	\$3,253,643
6)	<b>General Revenue-Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157</b> Request to continue estimated appropriation authority for General Revenue–Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 appropriations through an updated version of Rider 15, Statewide eFiling System Fund, from the 2016-17 biennium (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #2 and Rider Highlights #15).	\$5,033,310	\$5,033,310	0.0	Yes	Yes	\$5,033,310



**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Items Not Included in Recommendations - House**

		2018-19 Biennial Total			Information Technology Involved?	Contracting Involved?	Estimated Continued Cost 2020-21
		GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
Texas Indigent Defense Commission (TIDC) - Exceptional Items Not Included							
1)	<b>Funding for Indigent Defense included in TIDC's 4 percent Reduction and Estimated Appropriation Authority</b> a) General Revenue-Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 funding for indigent defense that the agency included in its 4 percent baseline reduction (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #8)  b) Amend Rider 8, Texas Indigent Defense Commission, to provide estimated appropriation authority to General Revenue—Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 that was previously provided to TIDC for the 2016-17 biennium.	\$5,665,154	\$5,665,154	0.0	No	No	\$5,665,154
2)	<b>Regional Public Defense Office for Capital Cases</b> a) General Revenue funding to cover 50 percent of operating costs for the Regional Public Defense Office for Capital Cases (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #10 and Rider Highlights - House #18).  b) Request to remove Rider 14, Regional Public Defender Office for Capital Cases, due to lack of county participation in the counties designated by the rider.	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	0.0	No	No	\$2,900,000
3)	<b>Representing the Mentally Ill</b> General Revenue funding with authority for 1.0 FTE to provide grants to counties to establish specialized public defenders to represent defendants with mental illness and to enhance existing programs.	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	1.0	No	No	\$10,000,000

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Items Not Included in Recommendations - House**

		2018-19 Biennial Total			Information Technology Involved?	Contracting Involved?	Estimated Continued Cost 2020-21
		GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
4)	<b>State Funding of Criminal Indigent Defense</b> General Revenue funding with authority for 4.0 FTEs to defray costs of providing mandatory indigent defense services by counties. The amount would provide 50 percent of the estimated cost to fund indigent defense in 2018-19 which counties currently fund. Out year costs increase in the 2020-21 biennium to \$222.2 million each year for state funding to cover approximately 75 percent of total indigent defense expenditures and to \$308 million for fiscal year 2022 and \$318 million in fiscal year 2023 for state funding to cover 100 percent of total indigent defense expenditures. Items Not Included in Recommendations for TIDC #1, #2, and #3 would be included in this item if it were approved (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #9).	\$212,200,000	\$212,200,000	4.0	No	Yes	\$444,400,000
5)	<b>Administrative Allocation</b> Amend Rider 8, Texas Indigent Defense Commission, to increase TIDC's administration allocation from \$1,064,988 to \$1,164,988 (a \$100,000 increase) each year for a total of \$200,000 for the 2018-19 biennium (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #8).	\$0	\$0	0.0	No	No	\$0
<b>TOTAL Items Not Included in Recommendations</b>		<b>\$245,843,903</b>	<b>\$249,419,446</b>	<b>60.0</b>			<b>\$481,482,598</b>

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Appendices - House**

<b>Table of Contents</b>		
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>Appendix Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>A</b>	Funding Changes and Recommendations by Strategy	12
<b>B</b>	Summary of Federal Funds	*
<b>C</b>	FTE Highlights	16
<b>D</b>	Performance Measure Highlights	17
<b>E</b>	Summary of Ten Percent Biennial Base Reduction Options	18

\* Appendix is not included - no significant information to report

\*\* Information is included in the presentation section of the packet

Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council  
Funding Changes and Recommendations - House, by Strategy -- ALL FUNDS

Strategy/Goal	2016-17 Base	2018-19 Recommended	Biennial Change	% Change	Comments
COURT ADMINISTRATION A.1.1	\$7,655,146	\$6,764,098	(\$891,048)	(11.6%)	Recommendations reflect:  1. a \$32,559 increase in General Revenue funding due to agency-requested redistribution of General Revenue within its baseline request  2. a \$515,881 decrease in General Revenue funding due to removal of one-time funding for the Guardianship Compliance Project pilot (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #5, Rider Highlights - House #20, and Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA - House #2).  3. a \$245,304 decrease in General Revenue funding due to removal of one-time funding for the Timothy Cole Exoneration Review Commission.  4. a \$63,836 decrease in Federal Funds due to a Department of Justice Family Violence Grant expiring.  5. a \$81,955 decrease in Criminal Justice Grant Funding (Other Funds) due to grant funds expiring.  6. a \$9,942 decrease in Appropriated Receipts due to anticipated decreases in travel reimbursements.  7. a \$6,689 decrease in Interagency Contracts with the Office of Attorney General and Office of the State Prosecuting Attorney due to anticipated contract expense decreases.

Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council  
Funding Changes and Recommendations - House, by Strategy -- ALL FUNDS

Strategy/Gol	2016-17 Base	2018-19 Recommended	Biennial Change	% Change	Comments
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY A.1.2	\$56,317,958	\$52,872,319	(\$3,445,639)	(6.1%)	Recommendations reflect:  1. a \$1,600,000 decrease in General Revenue funding due to removal of funding for a one-time Legacy Technology Capital Project.  2. a \$803,438 decrease in General Revenue funding due to removal of funding for one-time CAPPs Deployment (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #4).  3. a \$75,000 decrease in General Revenue funding due to removal of funding for a one-time Guardianship Compliance Project pilot (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #5, Rider Highlights - House #20, and Items Not Included in Recommendations for OCA - House #2).  4. a \$788,018 decrease in General Revenue-Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 due to required reductions.  5. a \$288,503 decrease in Interagency Contracts due to elimination of funding for the eCitation project.  6. a \$27,930 increase in Interagency Contracts due to increases in reimbursements from the Board of Law Examiners for Information Technology services.  7. a \$183,130 increase in Interagency Contracts due to increases in Collection Improvement Program technology project funding.  8. a \$101,740 decrease in Appropriated Receipts.

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Funding Changes and Recommendations - House, by Strategy -- ALL FUNDS**

Strategy/Goal	2016-17 Base	2018-19 Recommended	Biennial Change	% Change	Comments
DOCKET EQUALIZATION A.1.3	\$33,750	\$10,000	(\$23,750)	(70.4%)	Recommendations reflect General Revenue funding decreases due to required reductions for travel expenses incurred by appellate justices and their staff that travel to hear cases transferred to them for disposition.
ASSIST ADMIN JUDICIAL REGIONS A.1.4	\$563,781	\$330,372	(\$233,409)	(41.4%)	Recommendations reflect the following:  1. a \$319,084 decrease in General Revenue included in the agency's 4 percent reduction.  2. a \$85,675 increase in Appropriated Receipts due to reimbursement increases from counties for agency costs to provide administrative assistants to two regional presiding judges
<b>Total, Goal A, PROCESSES AND INFORMATION</b>	<b>\$64,570,635</b>	<b>\$59,976,789</b>	<b>(\$4,593,846)</b>	<b>(7.1%)</b>	
CHILD SUPPORT COURTS PROGRAM B.1.1	\$15,883,960	\$15,903,184	\$19,224	0.1%	Recommendations reflect increases in Interagency Contracts due to increased reimbursement by the Office of Attorney General for visiting associate judges.
CHILD PROTECTION COURTS PROGRAM B.1.2	\$8,786,862	\$8,784,974	(\$1,888)	(0.0%)	Recommendations reflect decreases in Appropriated Receipts due to anticipated decreases in third party reimbursements.
<b>Total, Goal B, ADMINISTER CHILDREN'S COURTS</b>	<b>\$24,670,822</b>	<b>\$24,688,158</b>	<b>\$17,336</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	
JUDICIAL BRANCH CERTIFICATION COMM C.1.1	\$1,098,228	\$1,106,086	\$7,858	0.7%	Recommendations reflect increases in Appropriated Receipts due to anticipated increases in third party reimbursements for background checks.
TEXAS.GOV C.1.2	\$24,111	\$22,861	(\$1,250)	(5.2%)	Recommendations reflect decreases in General Revenue funding due to revenues received in fiscal year 2016 in excess of appropriated amounts.
<b>Total, Goal C, CERTIFICATION AND COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>\$1,122,339</b>	<b>\$1,128,947</b>	<b>\$6,608</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	

Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council  
Funding Changes and Recommendations - House, by Strategy -- ALL FUNDS

Strategy/Goal	2016-17 Base	2018-19 Recommended	Biennial Change	% Change	Comments
TX INDIGENT DEFENSE COMM D.1.1	\$71,826,706	\$66,486,662	(\$5,340,044)	(7.4%)	Recommendations reflect:  1. a \$2,869,070 decrease in General Revenue-Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 funding due to the agency including this amount in its 4 percent reduction.  2. a \$2,371,014 decrease in General Revenue-Dedicated Fair Defense Account No. 5073 funding due to anticipated declines in court cost revenue in the 2018-19 biennium from 2016-17 levels.  (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues - House #8 and Items Not Included in Recommendations for TIDC - House #1 and #4)  3. a \$99,960 decrease in Interagency Contracts due to decreases in Criminal Justice Grants due to grant funds expiring.
Total, Goal D, INDIGENT DEFENSE	\$71,826,706	\$66,486,662	(\$5,340,044)	(7.4%)	
Grand Total, All Strategies	\$162,190,502	\$152,280,556	(\$9,909,946)	(6.1%)	

Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council  
FTE Highlights - House

Full-Time-Equivalent Positions	Expended 2015	Estimated 2016	Budgeted 2017	Recommended 2018	Recommended 2019
Cap	223.6	239.6	239.6	232.6	232.6
Actual/Budgeted	213.9	227.2	239.6	NA	NA

Schedule of Exempt Positions (Cap)					
Administrative Director	\$157,920	\$167,040	\$167,040	\$167,040	\$167,040

Notes:

Sec 8, Schedule of Exempt Positions, in the Special Provisions - Judiciary, authorizes the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Texas to set the salary for the Director of the Office of Court Administration in an amount within the salary group for that position. The Chief Justice increased the salary of the Administrative Director of the Office of Court Administration to \$167,040 effective September 1, 2015 (See also, Selected Fiscal and Policy Issues for OCA - House #7



**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Performance Measure Highlights - House**

**Appendix D**

	<b>Expended 2015</b>	<b>Estimated 2016</b>	<b>Budgeted 2017</b>	<b>Recommended 2018</b>	<b>Recommended 2019</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Electronic Filing System Service Availability</i></li> </ul>	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Measure Explanation:</i> This measure shows the percentage of time that the Electronic Filing service is capable of receiving, processing, transferring, and accessing electronic documents. This key performance measure is new for the 2018-19 biennium.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Total Number of E-filed Documents</i></li> </ul>	4,824,357	8,588,210	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
<i>Measure Explanation:</i> This measure provides the total number of documents filed annually through the e-filing system. This non-key measure is new for the 2018-19 biennium.					

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Summary of Ten Percent Biennial Base Reduction Options - House**

**Appendix E**

Priority	Item	Description/Impact	Biennial Reduction Amounts			Potential Revenue Loss	Reduction as % of Program GR/GR-D Total	Included in Introduced Bill?
			GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
1)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE for CAPPS Deployment (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE in Information Technology for services provided for CAPPS implementation amongst the appellate courts and judicial service agencies. This would decrease the level of support to one and a half years from two years.	\$94,366	\$94,366	1.0	\$0	2%	Yes
2)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE Project Manager Within Information Services (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE in Information Technology that would decrease project completion time and increase workloads among other project managers.	\$79,348	\$79,348	0.5	\$0	0%	No
3)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE in Research and Court Services Department (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE in Research and Court Services. This resulting impact would be a decrease in the Judicial Information Department's ability to provide research and best practice information to the courts and would hamper data quality.	\$122,652	\$122,652	1.0	\$0	2%	No
4)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE for the Language Access Program (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE for the Language Access Program. The resulting impact would cut program services by 50 percent.	\$135,594	\$135,594	1.0	\$0	2%	No
5)	Reduction in Funding to Counties to Provide Indigent Defense Services (Strategy D.1.1, Texas Indigent Defense Commission)	Reduction in funding to counties to support Constitutionally required indigent defense programs. The reduction's impact would be a transfer of programmatic costs to county governments for representation of approximately 5,500 non-capital felony cases or 17,500 misdemeanor cases.	\$3,414,574	\$3,414,574	0.0	\$0	5%	No
6)	Reduction in Funding for Information Technology Capital Projects (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Reduction in funding would decrease half of OCA's Capital Projects: Computer Equipment and Software and Replacement of Computers and Laptops. The resulting impact would be a delay in hardware and software replacement schedules.	\$970,918	\$970,918	0.0	\$0	2%	No

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Summary of Ten Percent Biennial Base Reduction Options - House**

**Appendix E**

Priority	Item	Description/Impact	Biennial Reduction Amounts			Potential Revenue Loss	Reduction as % of Program GR/GR-D Total	Included in Introduced Bill?
			GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
7)	Elimination of 2.5 Child Support Courts & 5.0 FTEs (Strategy B.1.1. Child Support Courts)	Elimination of 2.5 child support courts and 5.0 FTEs. The reduction's impact depends on which courts are closed, but could result in child support cases not being resolved within statutorily mandated, expedited timeframes. General Revenue for this program is used to match federal funding, therefore funding cuts to this program also results in a corresponding reduction in federal funds. The 0.5 court reduction means the agency would operate the court for half a year before closing the court.	\$269,990	\$269,990	5.0	\$539,978	5%	No
8)	Elimination of One Child Protection Court & 2.0 FTEs (Strategy B.1.2. Child Protection Courts)	Elimination of one child protection court and 2.0 FTEs. The reductions impact would reduce the number of child protection court hearings by 1,550 per year impacting 275 children.	\$426,358	\$426,358	2.0	\$0	5%	No
9)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE from the Collection Improvement Program (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE from the Collection Improvement Program and 0.5 FTE from the Collection Improvement Program Audit Program. The reduction's impact would result in less support to assist counties and cities in implementing the program and fewer audits and visits conducted.	\$157,950	\$157,950	1.0	\$0	3%	No
10)	Reduction in Guardianship Compliance Project (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Reduction in 50 percent funding for this program and 1.5 FTEs. Resulting impact would be fewer Guardianship Compliance Specialists placed around the state to review guardianship filings to determine if guardians are following statutorily-required procedures, to review annual reports filed by the guardians, and to ensure that exploitation and/or neglect of persons under guardianship is not occurring.	\$257,940	\$257,940	1.5	\$0	4%	Yes
11)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE in Judicial Branch Certification Commission (Strategy C.1.1, Judicial Branch Certification Commission)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE within the Judicial Branch Certification Commission. The reductions impact would produce delays in processing applications for licensing, renewal or registration and complaint resolution.	\$54,804	\$54,804	0.5	\$0	5%	No
12)	Reduction in Electronic Filing funding (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Reduction of General Revenue-Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 funding. The resulting impact could potentially impact OCA's contractual terms with the vendor.	\$1,149,606	\$1,149,606	0.0	\$0	2%	No

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Summary of Ten Percent Biennial Base Reduction Options - House**

Priority	Item	Description/Impact	Biennial Reduction Amounts			Potential Revenue Loss	Reduction as % of Program GR/GR-D Total	Included in Introduced Bill?
			GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
13)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE in Legal Staff (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Elimination of 0.5 FTEs in the Legal department. The resulting impact would be a decrease in access to legal counsel.	\$66,188	\$66,188	0.5	\$0	1%	No
14)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE for CAPPS Deployment (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE in Information Technology for services provided for CAPPS implementation amongst the appellate courts and judicial service agencies. This would decrease the level of support to one year from two years.	\$94,366	\$94,366	1.0	\$0	0%	Yes
15)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE Project Manager Within Information Services (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE in Information Technology that would decrease project completion time and increase workloads among other project managers.	\$79,348	\$79,348	0.5	\$0	0%	No
16)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE in Research and Court Services Department (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE in Research and Court Services. This resulting impact would be a decrease in the Judicial Information Department's ability to provide research and best practice information to the courts and would hamper data quality.	\$122,652	\$122,652	1.0	\$0	2%	No
18)	Eliminate Language Access Program (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Reduction of 1.0 FTE for the Language Access Program. The resulting impact would cut program services by 100 percent.	\$135,594	\$135,594	1.0	\$0	2%	No
19)	Reduction in Funding to Counties to Provide Indigent Defense Services (Strategy D.1.1, Texas Indigent Defense Commission)	Reduction in funding to counties to support Constitutionally required indigent defense programs. The reduction's impact would be a transfer of programmatic costs to county governments for representation of approximately 5,500 non-capital felony cases or 17,500 misdemeanor cases.	\$3,414,574	\$3,414,574	0.0	\$0	5%	No
20)	Reduction in Funding for Information Technology Capital Projects (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Reduction in funding would decrease half of OCA's Capital Projects: Computer Equipment and Software and Replacement of Computers and Laptops. The resulting impact would be a delay in hardware and software replacement schedules.	\$970,918	\$970,918	0.0	\$0	2%	No

**Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council**  
**Summary of Ten Percent Biennial Base Reduction Options - House**

**Appendix E**

Priority	Item	Description/Impact	Biennial Reduction Amounts			Potential Revenue Loss	Reduction as % of Program GR/GR-D Total	Included in Introduced Bill?
			GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
21)	Elimination of 2.5 Child Support Courts & 5.0 FTEs (Strategy B.1.1. Child Support Courts)	Elimination of 2.5 child support courts and 5.0 FTEs. The reduction's impact depends on which courts are closed, but could result in child support cases not being resolved within statutorily mandated, expedited timeframes. General Revenue for this program is used to match federal funding, therefore funding cuts to this program also results in a corresponding reduction in federal funds. The 0.5 court reduction means the agency would operate the court for half a year before closing the court.	\$269,990	\$269,990	5.0	\$539,978	5%	No
22)	Elimination of One Child Protection Court & 2.0 FTEs (Strategy B.1.2. Child Protection Courts)	Elimination of one child protection court and 2.0 FTEs. The reductions impact would reduce the number of child protection court hearings by 1,550 per year impacting 275 children.	\$426,358	\$426,358	2.0	\$0	5%	No
23)	Elimination of 1.0 FTE from the Collection Improvement Program (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE from the Collection Improvement Program and 0.5 FTE from the Collection Improvement Program Audit Program. The reduction's impact would result in less support to assist counties and cities in implementing the program and fewer audits and visits conducted.	\$157,950	\$157,950	1.0	\$0	3%	No
24)	Reduction in Guardianship Compliance Project (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Reduction in 50 percent funding for this program and 1.5 FTEs. Resulting impact would be fewer Guardianship Compliance Specialists placed around the state to review guardianship filings to determine if guardians are following statutorily-required procedures, to review annual reports filed by the guardians, and to ensure that exploitation and/or neglect of persons under guardianship is not occurring.	\$257,940	\$257,940	1.5	\$0	4%	Yes
25)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE in Judicial Branch Certification Commission (Strategy C.1.1, Judicial Branch Certification Commission)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE within the Judicial Branch Certification Commission. The reductions impact would produce delays in processing applications for licensing, renewal or registration and complaint resolution.	\$54,804	\$54,804	0.5	\$0	5%	No
26)	Reduction in Electronic Filing funding (Strategy A.1.2, Information Technology)	Reduction of General Revenue-Dedicated Statewide Electronic Filing System Account No. 5157 funding. The resulting impact could potentially impact OCA's contractual terms with the vendor.	\$1,149,606	\$1,149,606	0.0	\$0	2%	No

Office of Court Administration, Texas Judicial Council  
Summary of Ten Percent Biennial Base Reduction Options - House

			Biennial Reduction Amounts			Potential Revenue Loss	Reduction as % of Program GR/GR-D Total	Included in Introduced Bill?
Priority	Item	Description/Impact	GR & GR-D	All Funds	FTEs			
27)	Elimination of 0.5 FTE in Legal Staff (Strategy A.1.1, Court Administration)	Elimination of 0.5 FTEs in the Legal department. The resulting impact would be a decrease in access to legal counsel.	\$66,178	\$66,178	0.5	\$0	1%	No
TOTAL, 10% Reduction Options			\$14,400,566	\$14,400,566	28.0	\$1,079,956		