

II. FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

A. Five Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:

Fiscal Years	20 <u>10</u>	20 <u>11</u>	20 <u>12</u>	20 <u>13</u>	20 <u>14</u>
Capital Expenditures	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Parasocial Costs	_____	<71,300>	_____	_____	_____
External Revenues	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Program Income (County)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
In-Kind Match (County)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
NET FISCAL IMPACT	_____	<71,300>	_____	_____	_____
No. ADDITIONAL FTE POSITIONS (Cumulative)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Is Item Included In Current Budget? Yes _____ No _____
 Budget Account No.: Fund _____ Department _____ Unit _____
 Object _____ Reporting Category _____

B. Recommended Sources of Funds/Summary of Fiscal Impact:

C. Departmental Fiscal Review:

III. REVIEW COMMENTS

A. OFMB Fiscal and/or Contract Dev. and Control Comments:

Deleting this position will save \$71,300

[Signature]
 OFMB
 4/15/10
 MEB
 4/15/10
 4/15/10

[Signature] 4/15/10
 Contract Dev. and Control

B. Legal Sufficiency:

[Signature] 4/15/10
 Assistant County Attorney

C. Other Department Review:

 Department Director



THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
OF FLORIDA

CHAMBERS OF
PETER D. BLANC
CIRCUIT JUDGE

COUNTY COURTHOUSE
WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA 33401
561/355-1721

April 13, 2010

Robert Weisman, County Administrator
Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners
301 North Olive Avenue
West Palm Beach, FL 33401

Re: Court Technology Position #5675

Dear Mr. Weisman:

I am writing this letter in support of our request that the County permit us to reclassify and fill a vacant position in our Court Technology office. The position became vacant as the result of an internal promotion into a State funded position in late 2009. We are seeking to reclassify the position because the duties required by the job more properly align with those of a Systems II Administrator than they do with a Desktop Administrator.

Despite the reclassification, no adverse fiscal impact will be created for the upcoming budget. In fact, the cost is approximately 18% less than if we had not created the vacancy by a promotion.

This position is extremely critical for the following reasons:

- When Banner is decommissioned this fall and Showcase, the Clerk's new system, is introduced, ISS will no longer serve as database administrator. Instead, that responsibility will fall directly upon the Clerk and the Court will be responsible for its own systems administration.
- The Court is rolling out e-filing (paperless files), and its own Integrated Case Management System (ICMS) within the next year. This staff position is critical to the finalization and implementation of that system.
- The position will be responsible for backup and security of the databases administered by the Court. This information includes sensitive juvenile records,

sole location of court dockets for thousands of foreclosure cases, unique court mandated mediation schedules not found in any other database, and confidential HR information for state employed judges, magistrates and court personnel.

- The position will be key in the development and oversight of multiyear, mission critical projects, and planning and coordinating State and County resources. Examples include the digital court recording of the official court record which requires coordination between the State, Palm Beach County ESS, FDO, and ISS, as well as the online foreclosure scheduling system used by over 500 law firms statewide.

Pursuant to Florida Statute section 28.24, the technology needs of the Court are the responsibility of the County. A \$2 fee on document recording provides funding to the County to offset these technology needs. You have indicated in your agenda item that these technology funds have been insufficient and the General Fund budget is supplementing these fees this year in an amount of \$3,843,000. As you know, we have a good faith disagreement on that conclusion. Our position has been and continues to be that the money brought in from the \$2 fee over the years would more than pay for past and current Court Technology costs, but for instances of improper billing and prior fund sweeps. However, as I understand it, that will not be the subject of our discussion before the Board. I have offered to sit down with you and your budget staff at any time to iron out our disagreement on those issues. Instead, for purposes of this request, we will focus only on the merits of our belief that the position we seek to fill is critical.

I thank you for putting us on the April 20th agenda. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Peter D. Blanc
Chief Judge

PDB:sal

cc: Barbara Dawicke, Court Administrator