

**OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES  
ANALYSIS OF THE NEW JERSEY BUDGET  
FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012**

**BUDGET QUESTIONS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS AND UNITS**

1. The FY 2011 budget required all departments to cope with reduced appropriations. In some instances these reductions could be handled through improved efficiency and operational adjustments. In other instances less money resulted in programmatic reductions, including both fewer recipients and reduced benefits. Please provide examples of operational improvements in your department that saved money in FY11 and provide examples where less government meant reduction in services.

Response

In FY 2011, in order to cope with a reduced budget, the Judiciary improved operational efficiencies and reduced staffing by 60 FTE's. In spite of diminished financial support, judges and staff have been able to maintain the Judiciary's record of excellence by developing partnerships, enhancing programs that help serve the public, and by using existing technologies that maximize the use of our available resources.

2. The FY 2011 budget included reductions requiring Federal approvals, waivers or similar actions in order to achieve the projected savings. Please identify each such reduction in your FY 2011 budget, and indicate whether approvals/waivers have been obtained. If not, please explain whether approvals are still expected in this case, and if so, why. If federal approval is not received, what alternative actions may have to be taken to achieve savings of comparable value?

Response

The Judiciary's actions in FY 2011 for dealing with the budget reduction did not require federal approvals or waivers.

3. The revised budget plan for Fiscal Year 2011 requires appropriation lapses of \$605 million to achieve a balanced budget and an ending surplus. Please list all appropriation items and amounts in your agency's chart of accounts that have been identified to contribute to that lapse target. Please describe the impact of each lapse on the nature, breadth or level of service or benefit provided by each appropriation, and identify and quantify the population that may be affected. Please also identify the amount of FY 2012 funding, if any, recommended to restore, in part or in full, the lapsed amount.

Response

The Judiciary has no planned appropriation lapses for FY 2011.

4. The FY 2011 Appropriation Act assumed savings of \$50 million from privatization initiatives. Please describe all privatization initiatives undertaken/to be undertaken by your department, and specify the effective date, the amount of savings in FY 2011 and FY 2012, respectively, and the reduction in positions, filled and vacant. Please also indicate the private vendor(s) involved in the initiative, and the quantity and quality of services required of the vendor(s) relative to the quantity and quality provided by the department prior to privatization.

Response

The Judiciary's actions for dealing with the budget reduction in FY 2011 and intended actions in FY 2012 did not and do not include any privatization initiatives.

5. For each line item reduction in the department's or unit's FY 2012 budget, specify the change, if any, in the nature, breadth or level of service or benefit that will be provided and identify and quantify the population that may be affected.

Response

The Judiciary's FY 2012 budget reduction comes in the form of elimination of the \$25 million salary program required to meet labor contract obligations. In order to overcome this budget reduction, the Judiciary will delay vital IT strategic initiative investments, identify available operating efficiencies, control the number of filled positions and rely on any available carry-forward funds from FY 2011.

6. For each line item reduction in the department's or unit's FY 2012 budget, please indicate the number of positions (budgeted, funded and filled or unfilled) that will be eliminated and the number of individuals whose employment will be ended. Please also indicate areas where funded and/or filled positions are projected to significantly increase, and the justification (s) for those increases.

Response

The Judiciary plans to continue to manage DSS-funded staff levels as needed through FY 2012.

7. In his budget address, the Governor stated that "Zero-based budgeting...has finally come to New Jersey." This would mark a change from budget processes used in other years. Please provide examples of how the recommended budget for your department is substantively different than it would have been if the budget had been developed by the procedures used in prior years.

Response

As a separate and independent branch of government, the Judiciary uses annually reviewed / updated models to develop required levels of staffing, as a form of zero-based budgeting. The models use historical case load volumes and established levels of productivity to calculate required staffing levels for the upcoming fiscal year.

8. Please identify any reductions in the department's or unit's FY 2012 budget that constitute one-time savings that are not likely to recur in Fiscal Year 2013.

Response

We are deferring planned IT initiative spending for FY 2012.

9. Are any of the appropriations recommended for FY 2012 required to compensate for the effects of Fiscal Year 2010 or FY 2011 reductions? If so, please identify and explain.

Response

No, the Judiciary did not receive any additional appropriations for FY 2012.

10. Please list any anticipated increase in fees, fares or co-payments that are reflected in the FY 2012 budget recommendation, including the amount of revenue or cost reduction, and the intended effective date.

Response

The Judiciary does not anticipate any such increases in FY 2012.

11. Please identify proposed FY 2012 budget reductions which require Federal approvals, waivers or similar actions, and the timetable for seeking and obtaining approvals in order to achieve the projected savings. Please indicate whether approvals/waivers have been previously sought and not obtained, and explain why approvals should be expected in this case. If federal approval is not received, what alternative actions may have to be taken to achieve savings of comparable value? Please also identify proposed budget reductions that may reduce the receipt of federal funds, and the estimated loss of federal funds that would result from such reductions.

Response

The Judiciary's intended actions for dealing with this budget reduction do not require federal approval.