



## State of Michigan 14A District Court



1

Office: 734-484-6690

Court Administrative Offices  
415 W. Michigan Avenue  
Ypsilanti, MI 48197

Hon. Kirk W. Tabbey  
Chief Judge

Fax: 734-484-6697  
www.14ADistrictCourt.org

Robert Ciolek  
Court Administrator

### 2012-2013 Business Plan

This Business Plan contains:

- Strategic Summary of the District Court's focus for the next (2) years- 2012-13.
- Summary of Base Budget impacts.
- Summary of Companion Issues to the 14A Budget that may impact the safe, efficient and effective operation of the District Court.
- Executive Summary

#### **STRATEGIC SUMMARY for 2012-13-Service, Public Safety and Stewardship**

- Provide Mandated Services
  - Ability to operate efficiently and effectively, i.e., function with adequate staffing, technology and resources, impacts:
    - Service: Timely access to justice and court services.
    - Clean, efficient community based facilities.
    - Efficient and effective internal processes, inclusive of depth and redundancy in operational capacity.
- Public Safety:
  - Safe, secure facilities that meet Michigan court facility and security standards as required by State Court Administrative Office (SCAO), State law, and County Board of Commissioner Policy Priorities.
  - Safe, efficient and effective use of pretrial and post adjudicative resources.
- Stewardship:
  - Efficient collection and disbursement of court ordered financial obligations.
  - Reasonable expenditures.
- **General Strategy-Service, Public Safety and Stewardship**
  - Service
    - Provide timely access to justice and court services. Operate in accordance with our case flow management plan.

- o Require and provide clean and safe facilities in the communities we serve and in accordance with state law and County Board of Commissioner Policy Priorities.
  - Comply with SCAO standards for facilities.
    - o Improve the Court services “one process at a time”.
      - Use of technology to improve court systems and processes.
      - Build redundancy, i.e., cross-train staff in all court operational functions.
      - Reduce or remove unnecessary processes.
- o Public Safety:
  - Provide a safe and secure environment for all customers and staff in accordance with state law and County Board of Commissioner Policy Priorities.
    - o Comply with SCAO standards for facilities and security.
    - o Encourage Washtenaw County Sheriff to provide mandated court security in compliance with state law and Board of Commissioner Policy Priorities.
  - Optimize the use of the jail and sentencing program resources.
    - o Efficient and effective use of existing jail and alternative sentencing program resources.
    - o Development, use and/or coordination of new, additional appropriate “gap filling” *alternative* sentencing program resources.
- o Stewardship:
  - Budget: Operate on a reasonable budget developed in partnership with *our funding* unit.
  - Performance: Meet SCAO requirements and standards in all facets of operation.
  - Process Improvement: Reduce cost of doing business through process review and improvement through the application of appropriate technology (e.g., web-based traffic citation payment, new Case Management System, Courtroom presentation and video technology, etc.).
    - o Efficiently process all financial transactions in compliance with audit requirements [assure the timely and accurate flow of collected court ordered financial obligations to State, County and local jurisdictions].
    - o Efficiently collect and disburse revenue that passes through the court or is generated by services provided by the court.
    - o Maintain accurate court records; assure business continuity.
- Technology: Acquire and use the best available “appropriate” technology to assure the efficient and effective delivery of services.
- **Specific Strategic Initiatives for the 2012-13 Budget Cycle**
  - o Facilities:
    - Operate Phase 1 of the 14A-4 Court Facility in Saline on a full-time basis (currently it is now open only 4.5 days per week).
    - Operate the 14A-1 court facility at maximum efficiency (including scheduled use of courtrooms, jury assembly, and other rooms).

- Create needed development at (or alternative site plan for) existing facilities:
      - Eastern Washtenaw County (14A-2 in Ypsilanti)
      - Western Washtenaw County (14A-3 in Chelsea)
- Operations and services:
  - Mediation: Maintain Small Claims and General Civil Mediation (even with reduced services).
  - Sentencing Alternatives: Expand Pre-Trial/Probation Services to reduce jail overcrowding.
    - Expand use of 14A educational classes:
      - Domestic Violence
      - Driving on Suspended License
      - Minor in Possession of Alcohol
      - Retail Fraud
      - Possession/Use of Drugs
      - How to Effectively Interact with Law Enforcement
    - Expand use of 14A Alcohol and GPS tether program
    - Continue ticket mediation program
  - Case Management/Financials: Participate in the implementation of a New Case Management System in cooperation with the SCAO.
    - Note: This is listed under both operations and technology as the impact of such a large project will significantly affect resources in both areas.
  - Financial Management:
    - Continue to improve the efficient collection, processing and distribution of court ordered financial obligations.
- Appropriate Technology in Support of Operations, Services and Financial Management:
  - Case Management: The District Court anticipates that the County will **continue its agreed** participation as a “beta-site” for the implementation of the State’s new case management/financials system, i.e., “Next” Generation JIS (Judicial Information System), which is scheduled to begin in 2012.
  - Upgrade, update and improve 14A District Court website.
  - Use new courtroom presentation, interactive video, and “tele-interpreter” technology.
- Process Improvement:
  - Collections & Cash Handling:
    - Expand on-line payment system to encompass all areas of court ordered financial obligations (expected to be available with new case management system).
  - Pretrial/Probation:
    - Standardize the processing of pre-trial and probation referrals, case processing and reporting as a part of a larger initiative to expand these services to help limit jail overcrowding.

- Reorganize the Probation Department to provide more effective services for problem solving court dockets, i.e., in Domestic Violence and Sobriety/Drug courts.
- Records Management:
  - Develop electronic record storage in partnership with the County for the efficient and effective storage of records in accordance with state law and records retention guidelines; and, to assure business continuity.
  - Develop access to electronic court records to better improve business continuity, and customer service.
  - Revise and consolidate civil case filing locations to streamline process, reduce errors, and improve customer service.
- **Base Budget Impacts:**
  - Human Resource Changes:
    - Judicial Officer Operations:
      - Plan to part time a Magistrate position based upon Judicial Resource need.
    - Clerk of the Court Operations:
      - Hold vacant one Court Reporter position.
    - Probation Operations:
      - Not fill one full-time Probation Agent position for as long as possible, and/or add a part-time position.
  - Base Budget:
    - Continue “hold-harmless” agreement for funding of statutory line items:
      - Jury Fees (Court has implemented new efficiencies reducing this line item)
      - Interpreter & Witness Fees (Court is proposing to use tele interpreters reducing this line item)
      - Court Appointed Attorney Fees
    - Increase to other line items, i.e., funding to under-budgeted and selected line items.
    - Decrease to other line items, i.e., funding removed from over-budgeted and selected line items
    - To better track expenses/receipt of court ordered financial obligations, the accounting correction has been made to the public safety fund line items although differences remain unresolved on accounting methodology which effects projected revenue and expenditure budget targets. The County agrees to recognize the court’s indirect contribution to the county general fund through its transmittal of cost recovery to both the Washtenaw County Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney.
  - Operation and Services Impact:
    - Mediation

- Continue to fund (although at reduced rate) small claims and general civil mediation, a cost effective alternative to adjudication, with the goal of improving timely case resolution, service efficiency and quality. The Court notes that if further budget cuts are made to meet the requested budget target this line item funding will likely be eliminated, seriously impacting the delivery of court services in this area.
- Sentencing Alternatives
  - Increase revenue from “In-House Programming” classes by expanding and promoting their use within the Court and to other courts.
- Technology
  - Participation as a beta-site for the State’s new “Next Generation” JIS case management system may require additional temporary staffing and other resources, as the court must operate two case management systems for a period of time and provide staff training.
  - Process Improvement
    - Expansion of on-line payment system will require systems updates and improvements.

### **BASE BUDGET IMPACT-SUMMARY**

Our budget requests are presented below as follows:

- Human Resources
  - Judicial Officer Operations
  - Clerk of the Court Operations
  - Probation Operations
- Base Budget Line Item Review

**The Court agrees with the County’s 2012-2013 line item expenditures.**

**We agree to a total baseline item budget reduction of \$28,346.00**

<b>Employee Development-</b>	<b>82750</b>	<b>\$ 5,000.00</b>
<b>Transcripts-</b>	<b>80100</b>	<b>\$ 1,500.00</b>
<b>Judicial Services</b>	<b>80420</b>	<b>\$1,490.00</b>
<b>Consultants/Contracts (DRC)</b>	<b>80800</b>	<b>\$5,000.00</b>
<b>Interpreter/witness</b>	<b>80380</b>	<b>\$10,356.00</b>
<b>Jury Fees</b>	<b>80340</b>	<b>\$5,000.00</b>

## Human Resources

Personnel changes include:

<b>Hold vacant Court Reporter position</b>	<b>\$ 70,152.00</b>
Total Annual Cost Savings of:	\$98,498.00

Judicial Officer Operations:

Reducing one Judicial Officer (Magistrate) position to part-time has been under review since the previous budget cycle and is supported by the Judicial Resource Report (JRR). Its implementation will add to an increase in docket size and reduce service to litigants.

Clerk of the Court Operations:

**The hold vacant of one Court Reporter position will significantly impact court operations by requiring back up Certified Electronic Operators to cover dockets, removing them from needed Deputy Clerk duties and will require position upgrade costs slightly increasing FTE expense.**

Probation Operations:

**Not filling one Probation Agent position will require increase in contract teaching costs to teach classes currently taught through this position. The caseload will be spread among remaining agents all ready carrying caseloads well above state averages, and may not be sustainable without an additional part time Probation Agent expense to avoid an increase in jail bed usage.**

## Base Budget Review

The Court understands the current extreme economic difficulties within its jurisdiction. In the spirit of cooperation and partnership, the Court realizes no significant increases to its base budget can be expected. The Court will strive to provide reasonable and necessary, mandated services within our established operational budget.

Historically, the County has agreed to hold the court harmless for statutory line items, and for that, the Court is grateful. While it is understood that increases to the line items for jury fees, interpreters, and appointed attorney fees are not feasible, the County should be advised that increased expenditures are likely, even though the Court's efforts to reduce Jury fees and interpreter costs through rescheduling the use of our new 14A-1 facility and expected use of new technology will allow the Court to realize some cost savings in this budget cycle.

## Summary of Requests:

The Court and County do not entirely agree on our baseline expenditure and revenue amounts, due to a difference in accounting procedures. Through the human resource reductions as well as the line item expenditure reductions, the Court will strive to make 2012-13 savings to Washtenaw County toward the targeted amount. With our increased focus and more efficient processes in collections of court ordered financial obligations, we expect the receipt of these revenues to remain unchanged or go down slightly due to a continued trend of reduced case filings that usually generate the most financial orders per case.

## **COMPANION ISSUES TO THE 14A BUDGET-SUMMARY**

### Facilities & Security

Although not a part of the Court's budget, safe and secure facilities are a key variable in the ability of the Court to provide its *mandated* services. All sites should be safe, clean, provide easy public and professional access, make use of the best appropriate technology available and be adequate for both current and anticipated future services. The strategic thrust of the Court is to assure that all of our existing facilities, to the extent possible, comply with SCAO standards for facilities and security ; and, that all our new facilities fully comply with the standards. In partnership, we've made progress at each facility and in planning for replacement facilities should state law and local political requirements continue unchanged.

Closely linked to the facilities issues, security is a shared responsibility. The judges have policy authority (but no budget for security) in the building and on the curtilage, the Sheriff has the mandated statutory budget responsibility to provide security to the court. The County has also designated Facilities Management with responsibility for the physical security of all its buildings which is in keeping the current policy priorities of Board of Commissioners. The safety of the public and its staff is a primary concern to the Court. Although we have made progress in physical security in general and security is assigned on a full time basis to the 14A-1 site; full weapons screening security is only available 4.5 days a week in Saline (14A-4); no weapons screening and occasional roving security in Chelsea (14A-3) and Ypsilanti (14A-2). This is in spite of a probation agent being assaulted in Chelsea and numerous serious security incidents occurring regularly in Chelsea and Ypsilanti. One security incident in 14A-2 last year has resulted in a lawsuit against the Bailiff and Sheriff Department which could have been prevented had full weapons screening been in place as the plaintiff would have been prevented from bringing her cell phone into the Court. We also routinely recover weapons and contraband from the public after they have entered our facilities.

### Present Status:

#### 14A-1 (Justice Campus):

Opened July 17, 2010. This new facility has 3 jury courtrooms and include lockups directly linked into jail operations, a unique combination of District Court Jail Facilities in the county and state. Here 14A District Court continues to host all felony preliminary examinations in the county and conduct all 14A Court misdemeanor jail arraignments, saving the County expensive prisoner

transport costs, and reducing security risks. Additionally the court has been able to reduce jury fees and travel costs by using the new jury assembly room and all three courts simultaneously to select juries for all 3 judges on one morning. Following state and national court facility standards, separate areas and offices have been created for witnesses and defendants, prosecutors and defense attorneys, providing safer surroundings that promote efficiencies and justice to all those involved in the court system. The Court expects that by early 2012 it will schedule a dedicated courtroom every afternoon for the video arraignment docket, (including the weekends) and will effectively double scheduled courtroom usage.

14A-2 (Ypsilanti):

The 14A-2 site is a renovated supermarket. The addition of electronic card access has improved security and safety, **however with the exception of roving coverage for half day mediation hearings**, there is **no** designated security staffing in the building. A significant limitation to the site is the considerable absence of parking adjacent to the court building. The County finished a review of the facility by an architect experienced with court construction and renovation. The purpose of the review was to establish a Facility Improvement Plan (FIP) that can be implemented over time. The recommendation basically promotes full weapons screening security be implemented within the existing lobby, with additional facility/security improvements to the second floor level. The complete renovation cost needed to achieve the current National and SCAO safety and security standards for this facility would not be a fiscally responsible investment of public funds. The addition of weapons screening and a second floor employee security zone would be the only recommended renovation to achieve maximum security and safety with the least cost. It would also allow for the County to rent out the remaining space to an appropriate user. Due to grant funding supplied from the SCAO – Judicial Technology Information Fund and Michigan State Police, the Court is installing courtroom technology upgrades for courtroom presentation and interactive video conferencing. The Magistrate courtroom is a major security risk and really should not be used.

14A-3 (Chelsea):

**Built in 1901**, the 14A-3 site is a renovated bank and historical site. The addition of electronic card access has improved security somewhat. This site still needs improved physical security at the clerk's counter, full weapons screening and a second lock up. **The recent physical assault of the probation officer resulted in limited roving security personnel on specific occasions.** The County completed a review of the facility by an architect experienced with court construction and renovation. The purpose of the review was to establish a Facility Improvement Plan (FIP) that can be implemented over time. The recommendations do not promote any significant expenditure as most needed security recommendations would not get historical commission approval, and there is insufficient space to renovate for compliance with current court facility standards.

#### 14A-4 (Saline):

Phase I of the Saline Court opened on August 17, 2009. This was the first court facility constructed in Washtenaw County that is specifically designed to be a court. This location is staffed on a less than full time basis. Security was incorporated in the construction of the facility, and security officers are present during all operating hours. The facility lacks sufficient administrative office space, multipurpose room, storage and file retention space, an enclosed prisoner transport area, and has limited clerk work stations. The County has agreed to fund Phase II of the plan, which would complete the space required to meet current court facility standards. The funding is currently set to come from an agreement from the County to set aside any amounts of money saved from better than expected reduction in expenses or increased in collections of court ordered financial obligations. As outlined in the Executive Summary, however, the County's accounting process keeps changing the budget expenditure and revenue lines making it impossible to effectuate this agreement. The Court is agreeing, therefore, to put this agreement on hold for the 2012-2013 budget while the public safety fund continues to pay off the Phase I capital costs, expected to be completed by 2013. The Court is suggesting that said fund should be redesignated for use in completing Phase II of project, and if the Chelsea (14A-3) site is closed pursuant to the FIP (with agreement from the City of Chelsea) the completion of Phase II, expanded to replace the Chelsea courtroom, would become an immediate facilities priority.

#### Human Resources

The District Court experienced the retirement of several senior employees over the past budget cycle. Although these events reduced the salary line item, they increased the costs associated with selection, promotion and training of new staff. The challenge presented to Court Administration is to accomplish this training and development with another reduction in the Employee Training & Development line item.

The hold/vacant of the court reporter position will impact the court negatively by requiring clerk CEO's to be temporarily reassigned to these duties, thus reducing their services to the general public. The vacancy in probation will increase remaining case loads for other agents, and may still need a part time hire. The reduction of a full time Magistrate to part time will increase docket size and reduce service to litigants.

#### Technology Investment-Case Management Information System

**Case Management:** Our case management information system, eNACT, is managed by the Washtenaw County Trial Court. An upgrade of eNACT was partially installed in 2006 after which the vendor went out of business. The 14A District Court is a "beta site" for implementing the "Next Gen" JIS case management system in 2012. In exchange for what amounts to seed funding, the court will be among the first to implement this new system after which the State

will reimburse the County by not charging user fees commensurate with the initial financial support provided by the County.

**Probation Management:** The Court is reorganizing the Probation Department after receiving an additional Federal Grant for Domestic Violence cases. This will provide a partial direct salary reimbursement for an existing Probation Agent FTE. The Court is currently operating 6 educational classes and a tether program which brings in revenue (\$60,000 approximately in 2010), reduces jail bed usage, and promotes behavioral compliance. With the retirement of our most senior Probation Agent this year, the Court expects to save additional salary and benefit costs and has agreed to not fill the position for the remainder of 2011. The savings, however, will be somewhat offset by the expense of hiring a part time person to teach the classes, and to potentially handle some caseload, both on a part time basis.

**Electronic Citation Entry:** The project was identified as a priority project by the Criminal Justice Collaborative Council's (CJCC) Information Sharing and Integration Committee (ISIC). The District Court is working with police agencies throughout the county and state to integrate the CLEMIS electronic citation and eCommerce systems with that of Next Generation JIS.

**Telephone Systems at 14A-2 (Ypsilanti) and 14A-3 (Chelsea):** Although the voice mail system was recently replaced at the Service Center, benefiting the 14A-1 District Court, we operate out of two (2) other systems at our sites in Ypsilanti and Chelsea. We encourage the upgrades of these telephone systems as well so that the District Court may operate with a single consistent telephone system across all sites. This will help us implement a new interactive voice answering system to improve customer service and allow for tele-interpreter use at all sites, further reducing interpreter costs. The 14A-2 is also leasing new courtroom presentation and video conferencing technology pursuant to state grant funding, which will promote justice and further reduce witness travel expense.

## Development

Ongoing development which may increase population throughout the areas of the County served by the 14A District Court will continue to have an impact on the workload of the Court, i.e., an increase in filings may occur as the economy recovers and additional law enforcement officers are added.

## Changes in Policing Structure and Patterns

A reduction or elimination of the Sheriff's Road Patrol and/or changes in policing structure or patterns in the County, i.e., creation of regional policing blocks within the County during the 2012-13 budget cycle will most likely have the impact of reducing revenue generated through the Court, at least temporarily if not for the longer term, unless it results in the hiring of a higher number of officers and/or allows more specific traffic enforcement operations which tend to increase the filings of higher court financial assessment cases (OWI, moving violations). This also would also increase the "cost recovery" transmittal collected at the Court's discretion for the County Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney, and the Public Safety fund which is generated from a civil interaction surcharge.

## 14A District Court 2012-2013 Executive Summary

Since the beginning of the 2010-2011 budget cycle the 14A District Court has continued to see the effects of the recession. Case filings, which comprise the primary source of court ordered financial obligations, have declined to now their lowest level in well over twenty years. This trend is expected to continue for the 2012-2013 budget cycle. Despite the reduced case load, however, the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) released the Judicial Resources Report which shows that the 14A District Court is significantly underjudged, as compared to other courts in the state based on current caseload averages. Even though our caseload has dropped significantly, the judicial and staff resources are still at a level below what is reasonable and necessary to provide mandated judicial services. The challenge the Court faces to constantly improve justice through the swift, thorough and cost effective array of services provided to Washtenaw citizens, while daunting, we believe is achievable.

### Expenditure Review

The Court recognizes that despite the fact that we are already not able to provide the level of serviceability we could provide if we had sufficient judicial resources, the need for sharing in the pain of cuts to the County budget is important and we will continue to partner with the County to reduce costs and increase the collection of court ordered financial obligations. In 2010-2011 the Court agreed to reduce the need for county general fund dollars by \$375,000 (plus additional costs for medical coverage, approximately \$14,000) for each year, a total approximately of \$779,000 for that budget cycle. This was to be achieved by reducing/saving on expenditures and trying to reverse the trend in falling collections of court ordered financial obligations. While the County encouraged cost reductions to be more "structural", that is continuing forward for new budget cycles, not all cuts or increases in collections could be in that category.

Nevertheless, the Court made structural cuts in personnel, held/vacant two FTE's, while placing another FTE on layoff status. Due to the changes in the Administration of both the Court and the County, however, both held different assumptions in how these savings were to be accounted for in the budget. The Court counted the public safety fund (approximately \$140,000 yearly) as part of the revenue stream into the general fund when it calculated its revenue side of the cost reduction. The County failed to include these dollars initially as a contribution to the general fund and has since made an accounting adjustment, but now adds it to the expenditure line as well. Had this accounting adjustment been made at the time the Court calculated its budget cut it would not have included the Public Safety Fund in its revenue calculation and would have adjusted the cut downward by said amount. The Court also assumed the 2 FTE positions that the Court agreed not to fill, would also be counted as savings for the budget cycle, at \$122,000 per year. As the County did not credit the expenditures into the budget cycle, the Court also would not have counted these cuts in its initial calculations.

Thus, the targeted reduction for 2010-2011 would have been approximately \$127,000 ( $375,000 + 14,000 - 140,000 - 122,000$ ) for each year. After reviewing these misunderstandings with the accounting procedure, the County agreed that our cuts should have been \$127,000 each year for a total of \$254,000 over the 2010-2011 cycle. By year end the Court projects to be close to that revised target number in expenditures. The County, however, carries over all cuts we made as if they were all structural, which is not the case. The Court made some savings in expenditures that are not structural to meet the target for that budget cycle and does not accept a process that counts these cuts again going into the next budget.

Due to similar accounting misunderstandings when both the County Administration and Court replaced top key staff, the County did not adopt the Court's requested revenue target for 2010. The County used \$3,457,000 an amount that failed to recognize the drop in case filings. The County then appropriately reconsidered the Court's projections and changed the revenue target for 2011 to \$3,047,000. Assuming the target should have been the same for both years the Court projects that actual revenue will exceed the two year projected total by approximately \$30,000 or around 1%. The Court expects to meet the \$3,047,000 target. The County, however, has further revised the revenue target upward for 2012-2013 to account for the Public Safety fund, which the Court has already counted in its projections this year and for 2012-2013. The Court does not accept this increased target because it fails to reflect actual numbers, and the Court will continue to use its own projection until these accounting differences can be resolved.

The Court expects to reduce expenses structurally again for 2012-2013 along with non-structural costs to move forward toward the requested target reduction of \$293,000. The Court also anticipates some FTE expense savings from potential retirements of some long time employees. Again the Court has agreed on a combination of structural and non structural cuts to try and meet these targeted reductions.

### **Collection of Court Ordered Financial Obligations (Revenue) Review**

The Court created a collections office and has been reworking collections policy on civil infractions, and misdemeanors. In spite of the bad economy the Court has been able to collect significantly more of its court ordered financial obligations through the extensive use of payment plans. This is a structural change in enforcement and we expect this trend to continue until it levels off in the next budget cycle. This policy also directly reduces jail bed usage.

The Court also started a civil infraction prehearing conference (traffic ticket mediation) program with the law enforcement agencies and started accepting the payment of tickets online which has greatly improved collection rates on civil infractions despite fewer cases being filed.

The Court also created six probation educational programs and reinstated a tether program which has also increased the revenue stream, while reducing jail bed usage.

The Court reorganized its judicial case assignments, moving one judge into a complete civil caseload for all of 14A, allowing for a reorganization of civil filing and dockets and for the other two judges to split the criminal cases. Both the case disposition ratio and the collection rates will become part of a new Dashboard to measure performance. The Court also thanks the County for recognizing the Court's non-mandated collection of cost recovery to the budgets of the Sheriff and Prosecuting Attorney (approximately \$20,000 to \$25,000) each year even though it is not counted directly as court revenue.

As we move forward into 2012-2013 we expect the trends for case filings to be down and the revenue from collections based on this loss of case filings to go down accordingly. This will be offset by marked progress in the collection of the court ordered financial obligations. While it is extremely difficult to project these offsets, we are cautiously optimistic the revenue side will stabilize as the economy improved and project it to be approximately \$3,047,000 (and not the inflated number now presented in the budget).

In summation, the Court estimates that it achieved most of its adjusted targeted reductions in 2010-2011. Partnering with the County in the budget process, the Court will strive to achieve targeted reductions for 2012-2013, but cannot agree that the projected targets in expenditure and revenue by the County will match the amounts projected by the Court. We will continue to work with the County budget process to resolve our differences, but we cannot reasonably rely on the J.D. Edwards budget process that makes projected budget numbers moving targets. We will continue to use actual numbers to form the court's budget projections and hope to find common ground with the County's budget going forward.