Agenda Item #: 5A-1 ERS TIME Certain

PALM BEACH COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: April 20, 2010

[] Consent [X) Regular [] Public Hearing

Department: Administration

Submitted By: Administration

Submitted For: 15th Judicial Circuit

I. EXECUTIVE BRIEF

Motion and Title: Staff recommends motion to deny: a request by the County Judiciary to fill a vacant System Administrator 2 position.

Summary: This System Administrator 2 position became vacant as a result of an internal promotion into a State funded position in fall 2009. The cost of filling the vacancy for the 2011 fiscal year will be \$71,300 plus an amount for the current year. The vacancy has generated \$56,000 in savings so far.

While Court technology costs are supposed to be paid for by State authorized fees, those have been insufficient and the general fund budget is supplementing those fees, this year in an amount of \$3,843,000. The vacancy is one of 10 County positions assigned to the Court Technology staff. There were 3 positions in 2002.

Per Board direction to try to reduce the general fund budget while minimizing layoffs, County management has implemented as strict a policy as possible of not filling positions that become vacant. This has and will cause the elimination of approximately 600 positions over 3 years out of 4500.

County Administration does not view this position as critical, the Judiciary says it is. A timing alternative was suggested to wait till the June budget workshop for further Board direction.

Background and Policy Issues: In lieu of ISS, more responsibilities have been assumed by personnel under the direct control of the Judiciary for information technology (IT) over the past few years. Court staff is responsible for desktops and servers in all courthouses, developing and maintaining court applications and managing projects. In past years, ISS support of judicial operations as well as Court staff were funded by State authorized fees. With the decline of housing transactions, those fees have declined substantially and been inadequate for the past two years. We have made substantial reductions in County IT costs for all County agencies to reduce our budget including staffing levels.

Attachments:

1. Judiciary request

Recommended by: _				
	Department Director	Date		
Approved By:	delle	4/14/10		
	County Administration	Date		

A. Five Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:

Fisca	al Years	20_10	20_//	20 <u>12</u>	20 <u>13</u>	20 <u>14</u>	
	Costs	y)	<u> </u>	>			
NET FISC			(71,300)	7			
	IONAL FTE S (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. <u>REVIEW COMMENTS</u>							
A. OFMB Fiscal and/or Contract Dev. and Control Comments: Deleting this position will SAVE \$ 11,300							
B. Lega	Allisho OFME	26 NO 25	Contr	June J. ract Dev. and	Jewelroux Control	4115/10	
Assi	ulf stant County	<u> </u>	10				

C. Other Department Review:

Department Director

REVISED 9/03 ADM FORM 01 (THIS SUMMARY IS NOT TO BE USED AS A BASIS FOR PAYMENT.)



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.

Sincerel toht

Peter D. Blanc Chief Judge

PDB:sal

cc: Barbara Dawicke, Court Administrator