

Court of Appeals of Maryland
Robert C. Murphy Courts of Appeal Building
361 Rowe Boulevard
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1699



MARY ELLEN BARBERA
CHIEF JUDGE

BUDGET ALLOWANCE
FISCAL YEAR 2016
JUDICIAL BUDGET OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

The Judiciary's Fiscal Year 2016 allowance is \$549 million, which represents 1.3 percent of the State's operating budget. The major components of the budget are as follows: salaries and benefits 69 percent, contractual services 14 percent, grants 9 percent and fixed costs 3 percent. The general fund request includes funding for personnel related items including health insurance, employee pension, new judgeships, contractual conversions, merits, new regular positions, positions for temporary employees, and a full year of COLA that was initiated on December 31, 2014. Turnover is being requested at a historical rate of 4 percent.

BUDGET ISSUES

Issue Number 1

Returning to Richmond: Following the lift of the injunction, the ruling of *DeWolfe v. Richmond* went into effect on July 1, 2014. During the 2014 legislative session, the General Assembly restricted \$10 million within the Judiciary's budget for the provision of counsel at initial appearances for indigent defendants. The Appointed Attorney Program began in July 2014, and has provided representation during 25,052 appearances in the first six months of the program.

The Department of Legislative Services (DLS) recommends that the Judiciary comment on how the implementation of Richmond has been progressing and the fiscal impact of the program. The Judiciary should provide an accounting on the exact expenditures of the program to date and whether the program will remain within budget for fiscal 2015 and 2016.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The implementation of the *Richmond* decision began on July 1, 2014, with staffing of the Appointed Attorney Program (the "Program"). The Program assures that attorneys are available for any indigent defendant that requests representation at initial appearances before District Court Commissioners. In developing the scheduling for this Program, District Court headquarters compiled a master list of attorneys with the assistance of the administrative judges in each of the districts, as well as cooperation from the local and state bar associations.

Attorney staffing is centralized in the commissioners' headquarters and is determined from data derived from historical flows of arrests, as well as real time monitoring of arrest conditions. One full-time deputy commissioner, one full-time staff from commissioner headquarters and approximately three temporary employees are required to manage staffing of the Program. In addition, two temporary employees are necessary to process invoices. The authorizing language for expenditures limits the ten million dollars (\$10 million), segregated from the Judiciary's budget, solely for payment of the appointed attorneys in the Program. As a result, the Judiciary has absorbed, within its own budget, the cost of approximately seven employees needed to administer the Program.

The projected costs for Fiscal Year 2015 are estimated to be less than nine million dollars (\$9 million). Exhibit 1 contains a breakdown of expenditures from July 2014 through January 31, 2015. If pending legislation does not remove control of the Program from the Judiciary, the Program is expected to remain within budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

This issue is related to Recommendation Nos. 5 and 7.

Issue Number 2

Land Records Improvement Fund Balance and Activity: The Land Records Improvement Fund (LRIF) continues to maintain a structural imbalance that could potentially lead to the fund being insolvent in fiscal 2017. The Judiciary has introduced legislation to eliminate the sunset on the increased land records fee to address the fund balance. The largest driver of costs in the LRIF is the increasing costs of the Maryland Electronic Courts (MDEC) initiative. The Judiciary has reintroduced legislation to impose new filing fees for the LRIF in order to cover the cost of MDEC.

DLS recommends that both SB 64 and HB 54 be amended to credit any new revenues generated from these filing fees to a new special fund for that purpose. DLS further recommends that committee narrative be adopted instructing the Judiciary to migrate major information technology development costs, including MDEC, to the general fund in order to maintain the viability of the LRIF.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary opposes the Department's recommendation at this time.

In 1991, the General Assembly enacted legislation creating the Circuit Court Real Property Records Improvement Fund (the Fund) in response to the deteriorating conditions and operations within the land records offices in clerks of the circuit court

offices throughout the State. The Fund was, and continues to be, funded through a surcharge on recordable instruments. In 2005, the General Assembly mandated that all general fund expenditures related to land records operations and support (including salaries) were to be appropriated from the Fund. In 2007, the General Assembly again expanded the scope of the Fund to include all of the Judiciary's major information technology development projects. In 2010, the General Assembly made the appropriation permanent. It should be noted that the Judiciary opposed each expansion of the scope of the Fund, but the Judiciary was sympathetic to the fiscal realities. Despite the misgivings, the Judiciary made its information technology plans in accordance with the funding mechanism the General Assembly mandated.

Given the current fiscal condition of the State, returning major information technology to the general fund would put an untenable strain on the State's finances. If any migration were to occur, it should start with the transfer of 256 employees in the circuit courts land records offices back to the general fund, which is equally unrealistic at this time.

The revenues generated from the increase in filing fees associated with SB 64 and HB 54 are intended to be used to cover the costs of e-filing hosting services provided by Tyler Technologies, system modifications to enhance electronic filing capabilities, and other expenses specific to the jurisdictional rollout of the electronic capabilities of MDEC statewide. These revenues can be effectively administered through the Fund and, as such, there is no need to create a new special fund.

This issue is related to Recommendation No. 11.

Issue Number 3.

Maryland Electronic Court Initiative: Committee narrative in the 2014 *Joint Chairmen's Report* (JCR) requested that the Judiciary provide a report summarizing the efficiencies and savings expected once the MDEC project is complete. The Judiciary offered a number of benefits of the system but did not identify any cost savings that would be achieved upon full implementation.

DLS recommends that there should be savings associated with the MDEC initiative for personnel, postage, and supplies, including printing and paper. Narrative is recommended to direct the Judiciary to provide a report of the itemized savings, and the savings should be reflected in the 2017 budget request.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

As stated in reports delivered to the budget committees on November 1, 2014, it is not possible at this early juncture in the rollout of the system to accurately estimate potential cost savings that may result from the MDEC system, especially in the area of personnel. While savings may accrue in the areas of postage, printing, and paper, these costs are directly dependent on the adoption of electronic document service as opposed to the printing and mailing of notices to parties. In November 2015, when the report is requested, only Anne Arundel County will have been fully implemented for more than five months, with Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's, Talbot, and Caroline counties joining the

rollout in 2015. Until the MDEC system is fully implemented, the Judiciary will have insufficient data to project these savings across these and the remaining jurisdictions.

This issue is related to Recommendation No. 10.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Recommendation No. 1.

Add the following language:

Provided that \$5,800,520 in general funds and \$29,275 in federal funds are eliminated and 110 new regular positions shall be reduced from the Judiciary's budget.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs, in part, with the Department's recommendation.

The Judiciary recognizes the fiscal challenges faced by the State and concurs with the elimination of 33 of the requested positions; however, the Judiciary strongly opposes the elimination of the remaining 77 requested positions. In the past, in order to meet operational needs, the Judiciary has supplemented staff with temporary positions. In some cases, these employees have been in these positions for many years. In 2014, the Judiciary conducted a thorough review of the functions performed by temporary employees. As a result, the number of temporary positions has been reduced by 47 percent. The remaining 77 positions are determined to be mission critical and vital to effective and efficient operations throughout the Judiciary.

Recommendation No. 2.

Add the following language:

Further provided that general funds are reduced by \$5,000,000 from operating expenditures. The Chief Judge shall allocate this reduction across the Judicial Branch and cancel prior year encumbrances to support fiscal 2016 operating spending.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary strongly opposes the Department's recommendation.

As a branch of government, the Judiciary believes it is essential that it be a trustworthy and reliable partner in the Maryland business community. The Judiciary entered into contracts with various business entities to address specific operational needs and those

needs have not changed. These contracts address a variety of essential operational areas including court security, technology-related needs, equipment, and support for legal services. We currently have a \$13 million open balance on all prior year general fund encumbrances; however, this number is continually being reduced, as vendors are performing work and submitting invoices. To cancel these contracts would be disruptive to Judicial operations and would negatively impact relationships with the business community. In addition, the Judiciary is concerned with the systemic structural impact this reduction would have on Fiscal Year 2017 and beyond. The Judiciary will, as it always has at the end of each fiscal year, revert any unspent funds that remain after the contractual agreements have been fulfilled.

Recommendation No. 3.

Add the following language:

Further provided that 19 positions and \$2,049,490 in general funds are contingent upon the enactment of HB 111 or SB 332.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs with the Department's recommendation.

Recommendation No. 4.

Add the following language:

Further provided that a \$7,587,000 general fund reduction is made for operating expenditures. This reduction shall be allocated among the divisions according to the following Comptroller objects:

<u>Comptroller Sub-object</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<u>0301 – Postage</u>	<u>\$285,000</u>
<u>0302 – Telephone</u>	<u>\$230,000</u>
<u>0401 – In-State/Routine Operations</u>	<u>\$395,000</u>
<u>0802 – Maryland Reports</u>	<u>\$108,000</u>
<u>0817 – Legal Services</u>	<u>\$1,245,000</u>
<u>0819 – Education/Training Contracts</u>	<u>\$325,000</u>
<u>0854 – Computer Maintenance Contracts</u>	<u>\$2,900,000</u>
<u>0902 – Office Supplies</u>	<u>\$299,000</u>
<u>0915 – Library Supplies</u>	<u>\$115,000</u>
<u>1006 – Duplicating Equipment</u>	<u>\$245,000</u>
<u>1115 – Office Equipment</u>	<u>\$300,000</u>
<u>1206 – Grants to Other St. Gov't. Prog./Agen.</u>	<u>\$975,000</u>
<u>1304 – Subscriptions</u>	<u>\$165,000</u>

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs, in part, with the Department's recommendation, but strongly opposes specific reductions and requests the restoration of \$4,145,000 in Legal Services and Computer Maintenance Contracts, which are critically important to the Judiciary's operations.

The Judiciary disagrees with the approach used by the Department to calculate the reductions, because in all but three of the sub-objects cited, the recommended cuts would result in the Fiscal Year 2016 appropriation being lower than the Fiscal Year 2015 base appropriation. This methodology only provides for a 2 percent increase over the Fiscal Year 2014 expenditures, which is not necessarily representative of what the funding needs will be in the Fiscal Year 2016 budget. Although the Judiciary believes the funds requested are reflective of our operational needs, we are cognizant of the fiscal challenges confronting the State. As such, the Judiciary will concur with a reduction of \$3,442,000, but respectfully requests the restoration of funding for Legal Services of \$1,245,000 and Computer Maintenance Contracts of \$2,900,000, which have been recommended to be reduced by 38 percent and 27 percent respectively.

As you have provided for in prior years, the Judiciary requests the flexibility to allocate the reduction across its budget.

Legal Services/Self-Help Centers

The first critical operating program is funding for legal services that are part of an ongoing effort to re-engineer the manner in which the public interacts with the courts. It will build upon the work accomplished through the Self-Help Center in the District Court in Glen Burnie, as well as in Family Law self-help centers in the circuit courts around the State. With your support, the Judiciary has been able to build a successful access to justice initiative utilizing self-help centers that provide essential legal services to those most in need. The Department's recommendation would result in a reduction of 38 percent, which is \$633,000 below the Fiscal Year 2015 base appropriation. The failure to restore the \$1,245,000 reduction will severely reduce services and impact an important access to justice initiative by preventing the expansion to include both trial courts, and all case types.

This initiative was implemented to respond to the growing need for legal services in civil cases. Civil matters often have important life consequences for citizens, yet there are a significant number of Marylanders who cannot afford an attorney for these cases. In the District Court, 95 percent of non-criminal cases have at least one party who is self-represented. As the number of self-represented litigants has increased, due in part to the recession and to the number of returning veterans, the gap in justice between represented citizens and the poor also has grown. When the legal needs of these individuals are not met, other State resources are strained to deal with potentially preventable homelessness, difficulty finding another residence, loss of employment, changes in schools and adjustments to custody arrangements.

The Glen Burnie Self-Help Center has proved to be a cost-effective way to increase access to justice, support more efficient and effective courtrooms, and increase public

trust and confidence in the Judiciary. With only six full-time staff attorneys, the Self-Help Center served 23,632 clients statewide through walk-in, phone, on-line chat, and email. There is compelling evidence for the continued support of the Self-Help Center, a second location in Prince George's County, and the development of a centralized telephone service.

A study conducted in April 2012 on the effectiveness of the Glen Burnie Self-Help Center demonstrated that there is an equally encompassing need in neighboring Prince George's County for the services provided. Over 4,029 residents of Prince George's County used the Self-Help Center in 2014. Such need justified the opening later this month of the Self-Help Center located in the Upper Marlboro Courthouse. This Center will service the needs not just of Prince George's County, but Charles, Calvert and St. Mary's counties. In addition to the physical locations for walk-in participants, the Court is expanding the telephone and live on-line chat services to these underserved citizens. The enhanced Center is coupled with the development of a pilot program to incorporate pro-bono attorneys providing call-in and on-line assistance throughout the State. The goal of this expanded Self-Help Center component is that a caller from Cambridge seeking advice can be paired with an attorney located in Cumberland.

Computer Maintenance Contracts

The second critical operating program is Computer Maintenance Contracts. The Department's recommendation would result in a reduction of 27 percent, which is \$2.3 million below the Fiscal Year 2015 appropriation. Funding in this category is used to pay for maintenance contracts for critically important IT infrastructure and computer systems. With your support over the years, the Judiciary has been able to maintain the IT systems necessary to provide justice to the citizens of Maryland. A reduction of this magnitude would have a significant negative impact upon court operations and the judicial system.

Several significant items have been added to this category in Fiscal Year 2015, or are anticipated to be added in Fiscal Year 2016. Chief among these is the assumption of \$1.6 million for annual Tyler Technology (MDEC) software maintenance. With the partial implementation of MDEC into production in October 2014, the payment of annual maintenance has been assumed within the operating budget. The remaining increase requested in the Fiscal Year 2016 budget includes incremental increases for software and hardware maintenance for expanded use of the new cash register system, jury software, and hardware deployments in support of the Infrastructure Redundancy Major IT project.

The efficient performance of computer software and hardware that is currently operational is critical to the Judiciary, as well as to public safety. For example, law enforcement utilizes the Domestic Violence Central Repository (DVCR) to ascertain the existence and status of protective and peace orders. They also use the warrant database to determine if there are outstanding warrants. In addition, Secure CaseSearch permits law enforcement to obtain expanded case information to assist them in fulfilling their responsibilities.

Once again, as you have allowed in prior years, the Judiciary respectfully requests the flexibility to allocate any reduction as the Judiciary deems appropriate.

Recommendation No. 5.

Add the following language:

Further provided that \$100,000 in general funds of this appropriation may not be expended until the Judiciary submits a report to the budget committees detailing the monthly and total expenditures of the Appointed Attorney Program for fiscal 2015, including expenditures for the reimbursement of tolls and mileage. The report shall be submitted by October 1, 2015, and the budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment. Funds restricted pending the receipt of a report may not be transferred by budget amendment or otherwise to any other purpose and shall revert to the General Fund if the report is not submitted to the budget committees.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs with the Department's recommendation.

This recommendation is related to Issue No. 1.

Recommendation No. 6.

Add the following language:

Further provided that \$4,754,859 in general funds is eliminated and that turnover for employees is increased to 6 percent.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary strongly opposes the Department's recommendation.

The Department's recommendation to increase the turnover rate from 4 percent to 6 percent would represent a dramatic increase of 50 percent over the prior year. The Department's analysis was based on a January 7, 2015, vacancy report. The data contained within that report, and upon which the analysis was conducted, represents a one-day snapshot in time. The turnover rate fluctuates throughout the year and can be impacted by a number of factors, such as the recruitment process, judicial appointments, time of the year, and the point in time at which the calculation is made. The Judiciary seeks the Committees' favorable consideration to retain the Judiciary's current historical turnover rate at 4 percent.

Recommendation No. 7.

Add the following language:

Provided that \$10,000,000 of the General Fund appropriation may only be expended for the purpose of providing attorneys for required representation at initial appearances before District Court commissioners consistent with the holding of the Court of Appeals in DeWolfe v. Richmond. Any funds not expended for this purpose shall revert to the General Fund. Further provided that any State funds to provide attorneys for required representation at initial appearances before District Court Commissioners shall be done so on the basis of the calendar 2014 distribution of initial appearances within each county. If the allotment for a specific county is expended before the end of the fiscal year, then any further costs shall be addressed first by reallocating any unspent amounts remaining from other county allotments at the end of the fiscal year, and any final unresolved amounts to be paid by that county. Further provided that the Chief Judge is authorized to process a budget amendment to transfer up to \$10,000,000 in general funds to the appropriate unit of State government upon the enactment of legislation designating that unit of government to assume responsibility for providing attorney for required representation at initial appearances before District Court Commissioners.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs, in part, with the Department's recommendation. As noted in the Judiciary's response to Issue No. 1, the operation of the Appointed Attorney Program by the District Court has resulted in additional expenses. New and existing staff resources have been assigned to facilitate its development and implementation, and to administer ongoing scheduling of appointed attorneys. If pending legislation does not remove control of the Program from the Judiciary, it is requested that the authorizing language permit the Judiciary to utilize funds for the payment of staff to operate the Program.

This recommendation is related to Issue No. 1.

Recommendation No. 8.

Eliminate the salary reclassification for the Administrative Office of the Courts related to the Judiciary-commissioned salary study. This increase is being denied due to the fiscal condition of the State.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs with the Department's recommendation; however, we note that the \$10.1 million request for salary reclassifications was the result of a compensation study that showed disparity with regard to employee salaries. While the Judiciary recognizes this is not the optimal time to begin to address this matter, it is a necessary discussion to revisit in the future.

Recommendation No. 9.

Eliminate the salary reclassification for the Clerks of the Court division related to the Judiciary-commissioned salary study. This increase is being denied due to the fiscal condition of the State.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs with the Department's recommendation. Please see the Judiciary's response to Recommendation No. 8.

Recommendation No. 10.

Adopt the following narrative:

Information on Savings from the Maryland Electronic Court Project. The budget committees are concerned about the ever increasing costs associated with the Maryland Electronic Court (MDEC) major information technology development project. The committees expect that because the project is supposed to make the Judiciary more efficient by reducing the support costs necessary in the current system, that there will be fiscal savings and a return on investment, especially in personnel. A report detailing the potential savings should be submitted to the budget committees by November 1, 2015.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs, in part, with the Department's recommendation. Please see the Judiciary's response to Issue No. 3.

Recommendation No. 11.

Adopt the following narrative:

Migrating Major Information Technology Development Costs to General Fund. Given the structural imbalance that exists in the Circuit Court Real Property Records Improvement Fund, it is the intent of the budget committees that the Judiciary plan for the costs for major information technology development to be funded from the general fund beginning in fiscal 2017.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary strongly opposes the Department's recommendation. Please see the Judiciary's response to Issue No. 2.

Recommendation No. 12.

Adopt the following narrative:

Use of Land Records Improvement Fund: The committees direct that the Judiciary report on the Maryland State Archives' expenditures of the money granted to them from the Land Records Improvement Fund (LRIF) and the agreement between the two organizations. The report shall be provided by September 1, 2015, and then every two years thereafter.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Judiciary concurs with the Department's recommendation.

OTHER COMMENTS

The Department of Legislative Services (DLS) recommends that the Judiciary comment on its plans to address the longer case times for District Court cases.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The District Court strives to reach the aspirational goal of 98 percent compliance in all case types within the established case time standards. Each year, the District Court analyzes the data to both determine any areas which require further investigation and to implement any changes to improve timeliness of cases in the Court. While the Department's analysis indicates that average case processing time in Fiscal Year 2013 rose in comparison to Fiscal Year 2012 in several categories, a closer review of the data indicate several anomalies which skew the recent reporting and the Department's conclusion.

A review of the average case processing time for criminal cases indicates that three substantially "over standard" cases from Baltimore City account for the increase in processing time for the entire court system for all of Fiscal Year 2013. These three cases were from 1984, 1988, and 1990 -- before cases were even assessed for timeliness. All three of the cases involved errors in the service of a warrant or summons that resulted in "over standard" dispositions by 10,349 days, 9,003 days, and 8,124 days, respectively.

In 2012, the Court, in conjunction with the State's Attorney, began a systematic review of all outstanding criminal cases and, in particular, outstanding warrants in Baltimore City. As a result, these three cases appeared in the caseload assessment application as a representation of some of the cases that were terminated in Fiscal Year 2013. If the three cases are removed from the assessment, the average time to disposition for "over standard" cases drops from 1,342 days to 225 days for Baltimore City. When this information is then applied to the statewide average, the average time to disposition declines from 527 days to 236 days -- a reduction, rather than an increase, from Fiscal Year 2012.

A similar analysis of the data with respect to the percentage of cases within standard for Traffic Driving under the Influence (Traffic – DUI) indicated the need for new business processes to improve performance. In District 6, the Court found that notices of the scheduling for preliminary inquiries could no longer be undertaken by the county police as the result of a union agreement. The preliminary inquiry process reduces the number of postponements, and results in more cases being terminated within the time standard. As of January 2015, the Court implemented an automated notice system regarding the

requirement to appear for a preliminary inquiry and expects to see improvement in this area for Fiscal Year 2015 as the result of these business process improvements.

The Court also has reviewed the findings with respect to the performance standards for Small Claims actions noted in the assessment as “Civil-Small.” Civil – Small encompasses claims for damages under \$5,000. In these cases (and in all civil cases in District Court), a case is not “terminated” for purposes of the case time standards until each and every defendant in the case has been served and adjudicated. In cases where there are multiple defendants, when one defendant is served but another defendant cannot be located, the cases cannot be “terminated” until the latter is served and the case adjudicated. The second defendant may not be served for quite some time, and be adjudicated in an entirely different year. As long as the plaintiff in the case is complying with attempting to serve the second defendant, the complaint cannot be dismissed.

The following table demonstrates this in more detail:

Example of a case that is over standard when reviewed as a whole:

Case Number	Case Start	Case Stop	Total Days to Disposition
080400159942011	05/31/2011	01/28/2013	608

Example of the same case when reviewed based on the individual complaints:

Case Number and Complaint Number	Case Start	Case Stop	Total Days to Disposition
080400159942011 – 001	05/31/2011	07/18/2011	49
080400159942011 – 002	12/23/2012	01/28/2013	37

When evaluating a case based on individual complaints, the case can be viewed as being extremely “over standard” as a whole case, or “within standard” when reviewed individually. The current practice is to review the case as a whole. Civil cases rely heavily on the plaintiff to serve the defendant in order to proceed to trial. The rules are set up to allow for time to accomplish this task, but put no limit on achieving service on all parties in order to proceed. Since much of what the District Court processes in terms of small claim civil cases are contractual debts, the cases are not generally dependent upon service on all parties to proceed. There were 141 out of 597 cases that contained multiple defendants and were over standard in Fiscal Year 2013. These multi-defendant cases contribute to the higher average number of days for cases terminated beyond the standard. This issue has been reviewed over the past several years, and continues to be an important issue to address.

DLS recommends that the Judiciary comment on its plans to address the timely disposition of child access cases.

JUDICIARY RESPONSE:

The Court of Special Appeals has established two time standards in child access cases: Standard One – Holding argument (or submitting) on the case within 120 days of the filing of the record; and Standard 2 – Filing a decision in the case within 60 days of argument or submission of the case. The second standard has largely been met with the significant outlier being a non-child access case (that is nonetheless expedited). The standard applies to guardianship, adoption, child in need of assistance, and child access cases.

Following is the plan the Court has put in place to address the timely disposition of cases as it relates to Standard One:

1. Immediately review cases on filing in the Court to schedule cases for argument within the 120 day limit. This has already been implemented.
2. Closely scrutinize requests to modify briefing schedule or reschedule arguments for merit.
3. Conference with the Office of the Public Defender/Department of Health and Human Services (single largest cohort of counsel involved in child access cases) to discuss the need to significantly limit the number of postponements or extensions.
4. If cases have significant issues delaying consideration, the case should be stayed pending resolution of the issues. This has already been implemented.

In an effort to address the challenges associated with timely resolution of child access cases in the circuit courts, the Judiciary has implemented a number of innovative case management initiatives, including a Parent Locator program in Baltimore City that works to locate parents early in the process to avoid multiple postponements. In addition, special child in need of assistance (CINA) dockets and have been adopted, as well as the one judge/one family model that permits all cases related to a single family to be handled by one judicial officer. That model ensures that the court is aware of all issues impacting the child. Baltimore City, Prince George’s County and Charles County were participants in the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Model Courts Program. These courts agree to work systemically on programs to improve outcomes for families and children in child welfare. The Judiciary is working to share lessons learned with other courts. Other initiatives underway to address concerns include regular meetings with stakeholders, including the Department of Social Services, the Department of Juvenile Services, Court Appointed Special Advocates, and the local boards of education. The Judiciary also provides training opportunities for judges, masters, and stakeholders.

The measures underway in the circuit courts will have a positive impact on child access cases in the appellate court as well.

EXHIBIT #1

DISTRICT COURT OF MARYLAND
Appointed Attorney Program
Fiscal Year 2015 - Through January 2015

	County	Original Appropriation	Net Expenditure	Available Balance	Net Invoices
51	Allegany	\$118,326.21	\$23,564.03	\$94,762.18	182
52	Anne Arundel	\$868,138.68	\$269,683.89	\$598,454.79	628
53	Baltimore County	\$1,035,517.43	\$379,171.32	\$656,346.11	983
54	Calvert	\$113,107.86	\$45,874.50	\$67,233.36	171
55	Caroline	\$49,509.15	\$20,888.46	\$28,620.69	166
56	Carroll	\$117,543.46	\$20,719.11	\$96,824.35	164
57	Cecil	\$184,403.64	\$82,531.53	\$101,872.11	186
58	Charles	\$262,418.06	\$101,233.77	\$161,184.29	312
59	Dorchester	\$70,643.49	\$14,987.80	\$55,655.69	70
60	Frederick	\$177,293.63	\$78,285.30	\$99,008.33	187
61	Garrett	\$45,138.78	\$20,053.04	\$25,085.74	148
62	Harford	\$196,601.55	\$66,704.70	\$129,896.85	191
63	Howard	\$203,646.33	\$75,321.76	\$128,324.57	184
64	Kent	\$25,374.25	\$19,727.76	\$5,646.49	162
65	Montgomery	\$837,219.92	\$274,431.69	\$562,788.23	663
66	Prince George's	\$1,865,692.57	\$968,802.70	\$896,889.87	2,320
67	Queen Anne's	\$73,317.90	\$22,366.16	\$50,951.74	177
68	St. Mary's	\$149,832.03	\$50,462.98	\$99,369.05	175
69	Somerset	\$31,179.67	\$16,577.98	\$14,601.69	61
70	Talbot	\$54,270.90	\$19,574.52	\$34,696.38	159
71	Washington	\$186,621.44	\$75,401.92	\$111,219.52	184
72	Wicomico	\$236,391.51	\$68,612.56	\$167,778.95	85
73	Worcester	\$226,280.94	\$93,983.96	\$132,296.98	172
74	Baltimore City	\$2,871,530.61	\$1,095,789.68	\$1,775,740.93	2,663
		\$10,000,000.00	\$3,904,751.12	\$6,095,248.88	10,393