

Discussion Points

1. Criminal Justice Reform authorized by Constitutional amendment and implemented under P.L. 2014, c.31 became fully operational statewide on January 1, 2017. The program provides for pretrial detention of certain criminal defendants; establishes non-monetary bail alternatives for release; and authorized the Judiciary to revise fees. These fee increases are deposited in the newly created 21st Century Justice Improvement Fund, to provide for (1) the development, maintenance and administration of a Statewide Pretrial Services Program (\$22 million); (2) the development, maintenance and administration of a Statewide digital e-court information system (\$10 million); and (3) the provision to the poor of legal assistance in civil matters by Legal Services of New Jersey and its affiliates (\$10.1 million). While authority to increase fees became effective immediately in 2014, other provisions became effective January 1, 2017. Prior to full implementation three pilot programs, in Passaic, Morris/Sussex, and Camden vicinages, tested the operation of the criminal justice reform program.

- ***Question:* What are the experiences of the Passaic, Morris/Sussex and Camden vicinages 2016 criminal justice reform pilot programs? What lessons were from the operation of these precursor programs which aided in the State-wide rollout of the program?**

The pilot counties were instrumental in testing and refining the programming and automation used to run the Public Safety Assessment (“PSA”), our risk assessment tool. The piloting process provided an opportunity for judges and Pretrial Services Program (“PSP”) staff to run sample PSAs and discuss sample results with stakeholders in the prosecutors and public defenders offices.

The most important lesson learned during the piloting process was the need to engage with stakeholders as early as possible. Criminal Justice Reform “Kickoff” events held in the pilot counties brought together judges and court staff, prosecutors, public defenders, law enforcement officers, county and municipal officials as well as members of the public. Kickoff events were ultimately held in all 15 vicinages. Ongoing communications and vicinage meetings have since provided continued feedback on the program and have assisted in refining our processes and procedures.

- ***Question:* What is the status of the January 1, 2017 full implementation of criminal justice reform? Is the risk assessment tool in full use across all vicinages? If not, what other measure of risk is in use? Who is conducting the risk assessments? How reliable has the AOC found the risk assessment tools to be?**

The new criminal justice reform process, including the PSP and the use of the PSA, has been fully implemented in all 15 vicinages. In accordance with the statute, the Judiciary’s pretrial services staff conduct the PSA. The Judiciary has found the PSA to be reliable and the PSA score to be one of several important factors in the overall decision-making process.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

- **Question:** Is there an appeal process associated with the risk assessment score? If so, please describe. What data is available concerning the release v. detention decisions that indicates the program is functioning as intended?

The PSA score, as well as the corresponding information upon which it is based, is shared with law enforcement officers, prosecutors, public defenders and private defense attorneys. The information is reviewed and verified by the PSP staff. Any concerns as to the accuracy of that information can be raised before the judge making the release/detention decision. As with any trial court matter, the parties can file an appeal with the Appellate Division for review of the matter. In accordance with the statute, the Court Rules were amended to provide for an expedited appeal process in these cases.

The Judiciary is in the process of reviewing and verifying available data related to this program. This work is ongoing and involved. The Judiciary will provide this data when it is finalized.

- **Question:** Please identify and discuss problems the Judiciary has encountered with the implementation of criminal justice reform. What problems are anticipated in the future? How does the Judiciary plan to address these problems?

Criminal Justice Reform represents an historic shift in the way New Jersey administers criminal justice from the time of arrest to case disposition. It substantially alters criminal justice practices established in New Jersey before the ratification of our modern constitution. This shift is the culmination of the extensive efforts of the three branches of government in collaboration with many other partners. Although the Judiciary has conducted more than 300 communication and outreach sessions throughout the state, there is still more to be done in educating law enforcement, attorneys and the public regarding criminal justice reform. We continue to seek opportunities to speak at community events and gatherings.

Electronic monitoring has also been a significant challenge. It is both expensive and resource-intensive. And we have learned from other jurisdictions who have used it that electronic monitoring is not always effective. In addition, the PSP staff are not law enforcement officers. They must rely heavily on cooperation from the more than 500 police departments throughout the State. In many situations, any delay or hesitation in response could pose a potential risk to victims or witnesses. We are seeking partnerships with law enforcement to strengthen the response to emergent situations.

- **Question:** Has the Judiciary encountered any difficulties with obtaining representation for defendants within the 48 hour timeframe during which a judge must issue a release decision? Are records of prior expungements included in the risk assessment among the variety of databases that contain the defendant's adult criminal history?

All defendants, except for those who have secured private counsel, are provisionally represented by the Office of the Public Defender at the first appearance/release decision, which must be held within 48 hours after the defendant's commitment to the county jail. Thanks to the strong support of the Public Defender, this has not been a problem.

Expunged records are not included in the PSA score calculation. However, prosecutors, who are in the best position to know of the existence of any expunged records, can inform the court of such records and ask that they be considered by the judge as supplemental information.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

2. From the first \$42.1 million collected annually from the increased court fees, \$22 million is statutorily dedicated to the Statewide Pretrial Services Program which handles the court's criminal justice reform responsibilities. In a fiscal note to the underlying bill for P.L.2014, c.31, the AOC stated the annual cost of operating the program would total \$35 million, \$13 million more than the amount of revenue anticipated from increased fee collections authorized under the statute. In addition, in response to a FY 2017 OLS discussion point concerning the amount of revenue to be collected in support of criminal justice reform, the Judiciary stated that the program would run into deficit sometime during FY 2019.

- **Question:** Please provide a major object spending plan for FY 2018 for the Pretrial Services program.

FY 2018 projected spending is estimated to be between \$36 and \$38 million, which includes \$27 million for salaries and benefits and \$10 million for operating expenses.

- **Is the program facing deficit in the current fiscal year?**

Yes, expenses will exceed revenues this year, but due to carryover balances and reserves the full program deficit will not be realized for 1 to 2 years.

- **If not, when does the Judiciary anticipate that it will require additional funding?**

Based on current projections, the program deficit will be realized in FY 2019.

- **If a deficit is still projected, what are reasons for it and how is the Judiciary working to address it?**

The primary reason for the program deficit is that the program was NOT fully funded from inception. To delay the program deficit, the Judiciary has worked diligently to be cost conscious with strict controls over requirements and justification for expense items. In addition, the Judiciary has continuously addressed this deficit problem with the Department of Treasury, Office of Management and Budget.

- **Question:** Please provide an update with respect to the hiring of new staff within the Pretrial Services Unit Central Office (in the AOC Criminal Division) and the local vicinage pretrial services units throughout the State tasked with implementing the criminal justice reform, including the performing of risk assessments and monitoring defendants released pre-trial. Also, how many existing employees have been reassigned to handle the reform efforts? How were these employees prepared for their new roles?

To date, five staff have been authorized and hired in the AOC Central Office Criminal Division: one Court Executive 2B, one Court Executive 2A, one Attorney, one Administrative Specialist 4 and one Administrative Specialist 2. The Administrative Specialist 4 and Attorney were external candidates. The Court Executive 2B and Court Executive 2A were internal candidates. The Administrative Specialist 2 was reassigned from another court division.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

In the 15 vicinage Pretrial Services Units, a total of 173 staff have been authorized as of March 28, 2017 including: 15 Court Executives 1B, 20 Court Services Supervisors 2, 35 Court Services Officers 2, 89 Court Services Officers 1 and 14 Investigators. As of April 17, 2017, 141 of those positions have been filled including: 14 Court Executives 1B, 18 Court Services Supervisors 2, 34 Court Services Officers 2, 69 Court Services Officers 1 and six Investigators. The remaining positions are in the process of being filled. Some of the vacancies are due to attrition. Of the 141 positions filled, 51 were new hires to the Judiciary on or after June 27, 2016. The remaining individuals were employees of the Judiciary prior to June 27, 2016 and the implementation of the Pretrial Services Program.

Pretrial services staff at the AOC and in the vicinages have received significant training. They attended a seven-day core curriculum training session. They have been fully trained on the use of the PSA and all of the underlying systems. Staff have also attended regional and local vicinage training and watched informational videos and webinars. A final two-day training conference was held in December. Additionally, judges and staff at the both the Superior Court and Municipal Court levels are receiving ongoing training regarding technology, Court Rules, legal issues and operational aspects of Criminal Justice Reform.

The additional staff authorized in March are in the process of being hired and will likewise receive in-depth training regarding the PSA and underlying systems. Following the completion of the PSA training, all of the staff hired after the initial implementation will be required to attend an updated version of the seven-day core curriculum training that was provided to previously hired staff.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

3. P.L. 2014, c.31 provides for \$10 million to allow the Judiciary to develop, maintain and operate a statewide digital e-court information system. In response to a FY 2017 OLS discussion point, the Judiciary stated:

The Judiciary has been successful in developing statewide information systems during the last thirty years. . . . The building blocks for eCourts have been developed during the last few years, with each project adding another layer of statewide capabilities.

- **Question: What is the status of this program? What are the Judiciary's plans for the next step in this expansion effort?**

The Judiciary is continually building on the eCourts framework. During the last year we have expanded our efforts across the Criminal, Civil, Family, and Probation Divisions, as well as the Tax Court.

- Criminal Division
 - eCourts Criminal enhancements in 2016 include: attorney association to cases; substitutions of attorney, eFiling of preventative detention motions, electronic notice of violations of probation, eFiling of indictments, integration of the electronic case jacket into the Appellate Division system, and notifications to non-attorney entities such as jails and law enforcement.
 - eCourts filing of the eCDR to the electronic case jacket was implemented July 2016, with the complete Municipal case jacket implemented for Criminal Justice Reform on January 1, 2017.
 - eCourts Criminal was enhanced for Criminal Justice Reform to include a PSP worklist, PSA automation, PSP interview, judicial release/detention decision, pre-trial monitoring, and speedy trial timeframes on January 1, 2017.
 - A centralized reminder system for all court reminders was also implemented for Criminal Justice Reform.
- Civil
 - An electronic case jacket was implemented for Guardianship, including document scanning and uploading features, in July 2016.
 - eCourts centralized certified mailers began in July 2016.
 - An electronic case jacket was implemented for the Civil Division and Small Claims matters in August 2016.
 - eFiling was implemented for Special Civil DC, including an electronic case jacket and notification process, in September 2016.
 - eFiling was implemented for Foreclosure, including an electronic case jacket and notification process, in September 2016.
 - eFiling was implemented for the Civil Division, including an electronic case jacket and automatic motion processing, in April 2017.
 - eFiling was implemented for Guardianship matters, including electronic notification, in April 2017.
 - A programming interface was also provided to high-volume filers for bulk filing of Special Civil DC complaints.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

- Family
 - An electronic case jacket for archived Family Division matters involving dissolution and divorce was implemented in April 2016.
 - An electronic case jacket for Family Division matters involving domestic violence, quasi-criminal issues, child abuse and neglect, and non-dissolution, including eTRO integration and scan and upload capacity, was implemented in December 2016.
- Probation
 - eCourts Probation case jacket was implemented for in March 2017.
- Tax Court
 - eFiling was implemented for certain documents in December 2016.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

4. In response to a FY 2017 OLS discussion point concerning the Judiciary's preparation for the implementation of criminal justice reform and adherence to the 48-hour deadline in which courts must issue a release decision, the Judiciary stated:

The Judiciary will also test its computer interfaces with the State Police and the enhancements to its eCDR and eCourts applications, which will allow it to meet the 48-hour deadline in which courts must issue a release decision, and to track its success in implementing P.L.2014, c.31.

- **Question:** Has the testing been completed? What is the result of this testing?

The Judiciary has developed a state of the art application to ensure that we comply with the timeframes statutorily required under Criminal Justice Reform. The new application requires input from across all three branches of government.

When an individual is arrested and fingerprinted using the LiveScan technology, the officer selects the applicable charges from an electronic master statute table developed by the Judiciary and shared across law enforcement and court systems. This data sharing prefills more than 50 data fields on the complaint system (eCDR) creating an efficiency and ensuring accuracy throughout the justice process. Seconds after receiving the data, the Judiciary sweeps 40 million party records and hundreds of millions of cases to identify the necessary data fields to run the PSA. This data sweep reduces the time that staff must query our systems from hours to seconds.

As law enforcement continues to create a complaint, they use new features in the eCDR system to provide multiple checkpoints and opportunities for review of the summons/warrant decision, charges and other critical information. As a result of the record linking and data sweeps completed through automation, law enforcement and municipal court judges can run a preliminary PSA within minutes of fingerprinting a defendant. Probable cause can also be issued remotely through a secured application eliminating any need to print and deliver a warrant for a judge's signature. Electronic copies are saved in electronic case jackets and are instantaneously available to appropriate parties.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

5. P.L.2016, c.103 creates 20 new judgeships for the Superior Court, with a July 1, 2017 start date for these new positions. These additional judges are intended to help support the operations of the criminal justice reform, both with respect to handling timely pretrial proceedings and ensuring speedy trials for defendants subject to pretrial detention. The legislation does not designate any of the new judgeship to any particular vicinages, giving the Chief Justice complete authority to assign these judges as he deems necessary to support the criminal justice reform. The FY 2018 budget provides \$9.3 million to fund the 20 additional judges to aid in the Criminal Justice Reform program.

- Question:** Based on trends with respect to the volume of pretrial proceedings across the State’s vicinages, which vicinages have a greater need for new judges? For those vicinages that may be targeted to receive one or more new judges, are the current court facilities adequate or will there be a need to expand or upgrade those facilities? Please provide a list of the number of additional judges to be assigned to each vicinage. Please also detail any reassignment of judges among vicinages, and among parts within vicinages, necessitated by the implementation of P.L.2014, c.31.

Many of the reassignments among divisions and across vicinages occur when the Chief Justice issues the General Assignment Order for September 1 each year. This year, the creation of judgeships to support the new work in criminal pretrial proceedings will add to the number of assignments as positions are filled. The chart below shows the number of Superior Court trial judges assigned to each division statewide on April 1 2015, April 1, 2016 and April 1, 2017.

**Superior Court Trial Judges Assigned
April 1, 2015 - April 1, 2017**

Judges Assigned				
	April 1, 2015	April 1, 2016	April 1, 2017	Change April 1 2015 to April 1, 2017
Assignment Judge/ General Equity/Civil	139	140	152	13
Criminal	95	107	116	21
Family	126	122	127	1
Total	360	369	395	35

Note: Two Tax Court Judges are temporarily assigned to Family Division and Civil Division.

The following tables show the assignments of judges by vicinage, county, and division on April 1 2015, April 1, 2016 and April 1, 2017. Between April 1, 2015 and April 1, 2017 the number of judges assigned grew in ten vicinages: Burlington (1), Camden (4), Essex (11), Hudson (2), Mercer (4), Middlesex (5), Passaic (4), Somerset/Hunterdon/Warren (3), Ocean (1), and Cumberland/Gloucester/Salem (1).

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

Superior Court Trial Judges Assigned
April 1, 2015 - April 1, 2017

	Assignment Judge, General Equity, and Civil				Criminal				Family				Total		
	April 1, 2015	April 1, 2016	April 1, 2017		April 1, 2015	April 1, 2016	April 1, 2017		April 1, 2015	April 1, 2016	April 1, 2017		April 1, 2015	April 1, 2016	April 1, 2017
Vicinity 1	9	8	10	Vicinity 1	6	7	7	Vicinity 1	7	7	5	Vicinity 1	22	22	22
Atlantic	8	7	9	Atlantic	4	5	5	Atlantic	6	6	4	Atlantic	18	18	18
Cape May	1	1	1	Cape May	2	2	2	Cape May	1	1	1	Cape May	4	4	4
Bergen	17	16	18	Bergen	5	6	6	Bergen	11	10	9	Bergen	33	32	33
Burlington	6	6	6	Burlington	4	4	4	Burlington	6	6	7	Burlington	16	16	17
Camden	7	8	10	Camden	8	9	9	Camden	7	6	7	Camden	22	23	26
Essex	14	17	18	Essex	12	15	16	Essex	15	14	18	Essex	41	46	52
Hudson	12	11	12	Hudson	8	8	9	Hudson	10	9	11	Hudson	30	28	32
Mercer	5	5	7	Mercer	5	6	7	Mercer	6	6	6	Mercer	16	17	20
Middlesex	14	15	15	Middlesex	5	6	9	Middlesex	10	10	10	Middlesex	29	31	34
Monmouth	10	9	11	Monmouth	7	7	7	Monmouth	8	7	6	Monmouth	25	23	24
Vicinity 10	8	7	8	Vicinity 10	4	5	5	Vicinity 10	9	8	8	Vicinity 10	21	20	21
Morris	6	6	6	Morris	3	4	4	Morris	7	6	6	Morris	16	16	16
Sussex	2	1	2	Sussex	1	1	1	Sussex	2	2	2	Sussex	5	4	5
Passaic	7	8	8	Passaic	7	8	9	Passaic	7	7	8	Passaic	21	23	25
Union	9	9	8	Union	7	7	8	Union	9	9	9	Union	25	25	25
Vicinity 13	5	5	5	Vicinity 13	5	5	6	Vicinity 13	6	8	8	Vicinity 13	16	18	19
Somerset	4	4	4	Somerset	3	3	4	Somerset	4	4	4	Somerset	11	11	12
Hunterdon	1	1	1	Hunterdon	1	1	1	Hunterdon	1	2	2	Hunterdon	3	4	4
Warren	0	0	0	Warren	1	1	1	Warren	1	2	2	Warren	2	3	3
Ocean	9	9	8	Ocean	5	6	6	Ocean	6	7	7	Ocean	20	22	21
Vicinity 15	7	7	8	Vicinity 15	7	8	8	Vicinity 15	9	8	8	Vicinity 15	23	23	24
Cumberland	3	3	3	Cumberland	3	3	3	Cumberland	3	2	2	Cumberland	9	8	8
Gloucester	4	4	4	Gloucester	3	4	4	Gloucester	5	4	5	Gloucester	12	12	13
Salem	0	0	1	Salem	1	1	1	Salem	1	2	1	Salem	2	3	3
State	139	140	152	State	95	107	116	State	126	122	127	State	360	369	395

Note: One Tax Court Judge is temporarily assigned to Civil Division.

Note: One Tax Court Judge is temporarily assigned to Family Division.

Note: Two Tax Court Judges are temporarily assigned to Superior Court - Trial

Below please find a list of recommended assignments for the twenty new judgeships created by P.L. 2016, c. 103. The recommendations reflect needs created both by criminal justice reform and by population growth and filing increases over time in certain vicinages. The residency of the candidates selected will impact the judicial assignments available to the Chief Justice.

<u>Vicinage</u>	<u>Recommended New Positions</u>
Atlantic/Cape May	3
Bergen	1
Burlington	2
Camden	3
Essex	1
Hudson	1
Mercer	-
Middlesex	1
Monmouth	-
Morris/Sussex	-
Passaic	2
Union	1
Somerset/Hunterdon/Warren	1
Ocean	2
Cumberland/Gloucester/Salem	2

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

Judiciary staff at the courthouses have, thus far, been able to accommodate the current number of judges assigned to each vicinage. With the possibility of an additional two to three judges for select vicinages and one for others, management may be tasked with reshuffling courtroom assignments involving recall judges and hearing officers to accommodate the new judges if courtroom space is not readily available. Additionally, calendar scheduling may have to be closely coordinated in order to free-up courtroom space to accommodate the additional workload. Some vicinages had already made plans with their respective county officials to reconfigure existing filing or library space into courtrooms to accommodate the additional judges.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

6. In his testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee during the FY 2017 budget process, the Administrative Director stated that there was a need to convert the current fee-based funding of Criminal Justice Reform to a regular State appropriation. Under this proposed scenario, the fees collected for the program would be deposited directly into the State treasury, and the program would be funded through a State appropriation. Under the current fee-based system, the Judiciary receives revenue from the fee increases and is responsible for funding pension and health benefits costs attributable to the statewide pretrial services program from these revenues, as well as other operating costs. If the program were funded through a direct State appropriation, the pension and health benefits costs would be funded from general State resources.

- ***Question:* What are the estimated FY 2018 fringe benefits costs for the pretrial services program?**

Fringe benefits costs for the PSP are estimated between \$9 and \$10 million for FY 2018.

- **If fringe benefits costs were not charged to Judicial filing fees, at what point will the program's annual costs exceed annual fee revenue?**

The Judiciary is already being charged with the fringe benefits costs on the program staffing in FY 2017. Due to the many unknowns and numerous potential impacts on the programs annual cost, the expenses are projected to exceed the revenue in FY 2018.

The Judiciary continues to urge the Legislature to consider moving away from the current fee-based funding structure and instead fund Criminal Justice Reform through a regular state appropriations. Fees collected for the program should be deposited directly into the State Treasury and the program should be funded through a budget appropriation.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

7. In response to a FY 2017 discussion point, the Judiciary provided the Legislature with a list of fee increases implemented in order to fund Criminal Justice Reform. While this discussion point also requested information on the amount of revenue generated by each of these fees, none was provided.

- **Question:** Please provide the committee with a breakdown of the actual and estimated amount of revenue generated by each fee increase, per fiscal year through FY 2018, since the enactment of P.L.2014, c.31.

Section 12 through 19 of L. 2014, c. 3, which implemented criminal justice reform, authorized the Supreme Court to “revise or supplement filing fees and other statutory fees payable to the court” to fund the Pretrial Services Program and the development and maintenance of a digital e-Court system, as well as provide funding to Legal Services of New Jersey. N.J.S.A. 2B:1-7 (L. 2014, c. 31, § 12). The authority to increase court fees took effect on August 11, 2014 and expired on March 1, 2015.

On October 31, 2014, the Supreme Court adopted Rule 1:43 (“Filing Fees and Other Fees Established Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2B:1-7”), which set forth the schedules of increased filing fees and other fees payable to the court. In accordance with the new law, no fee was increased by more than \$50. The Court’s Order and the new Rule took effect on November 17, 2014.

While the Judiciary closely monitors and can accurately report on the total amount collected by each Court and Division for each individual fund, it is unable to report actual filings and fees collected for each individual fee increase. At present, our computer systems do not fully capture such information. We are in the process of moving to an eCourts platform, which may enable the Judiciary to better track and provide information on filings and fees, among other things, in the future. We should also point out that not all filings are paid filings. Fees may be waived due to indigence, a filer’s check may bounce, and some – including for example, one of the State’s largest filers, the Attorney General’s Office – do not pay filing fees. At times, some paid filings may later be withdrawn.

In specific response to question 7, attached are two charts. The chart titled “FY 2016 Court Filings” reflects filings received by court and document type. Please note these numbers include filings for which there was no payment, i.e. filings by indigent persons or others not required to pay court filing fees. In addition, some document categories are reported in the aggregate, i.e. motions and orders to show cause are combined. The chart titled “FY 2016 21st Century Justice Improvement Fund Collections” reflects the amount of money collected by each Court and Division and deposited into the Fund, which was created by in L. 2014, c. 3, for fiscal year 2016.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

8. On February 15, 2017 the Council on Local Mandates rejected the New Jersey Association of Counties (NJAC) bid to declare portions of the New Jersey criminal justice reform act (P.L.2014, c.31) impermissible, unfunded mandates on the grounds that the provisions implement provisions of the Constitution and are therefore outside of the jurisdiction of the Council. According to the NJAC, the implementation of criminal justice reform would cost the counties an additional \$45 million annually.

- ***Question:*** To what extent has the AOC cooperated with counties to minimize the cost impact of implementing P.L.2014, c.31? What provisions, if any, have been made to provide funding to the counties for their part in implementing the act? Is the AOC concerned that the counties are not budgeting adequate resources for effective implementation of the act?

The Judiciary made significant efforts to include all stakeholders at all levels in the process of implementing Criminal Justice Reform. Both the Attorney General and the county prosecutors participated in the planning of the technology and automation of the new criminal justice reform process. Features were included to make the process more efficient, such as auto-populating many of the complaint's data fields, sharing the PSA with law enforcement and the prosecutor, providing a mechanism for prosecutors to review complaints within the system, automating the tracking of speedy trial dates and deadlines and initiating email noticing of case filings and case actions.

In addition, the Judiciary visited and worked with all 21 county jails to assess the feasibility of conducting Saturday and holiday sessions by video conferencing, rather than opening the courthouse. Based on this effort, almost all counties are conducting "virtual courtrooms" on weekends. This has many cost saving benefits for the counties. Defendants need not be transported to the courthouses. There is less need for Sheriff's Officers to open and secure courthouses. Prosecutors can work from their homes, rather than travelling to a courthouse or county jail. The Judiciary is also exploring the possibility of having the Public Defender take on municipal court defendants.

The Judiciary cannot speak to the provisions made by the counties to budget for their part in implementation of Criminal Justice Reform. However, the AOC has not had any concerns that the counties are not providing adequate financial resources to ensure the success of this initiative.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

9. In his re-nomination interview before the Senate Judiciary Committee on December 19, 2016, public defender nominee Joseph Krakora opined that the State's mental health or drug treatment bed space capacity is inadequate to accommodate all defendants for whom treatment would be a condition of pretrial release under criminal justice reform. As a result, it would be problematic to the court ordering this service.

- ***Question:* What actions, if any, have the Judiciary taken to address this problem? How has the lack of bed spaces in licensed treatment facilities affected pretrial release of defendants?**

No funding was provided by the State to the Judiciary to address drug treatment or mental health needs related to Criminal Justice Reform. The Judiciary is not aware of any funding provided to the Executive Branch for this purpose. The Judiciary has worked with community organizations and the Public Defender to assemble lists of service providers in each county and may make referrals where appropriate.

The main goals of PSP are to ensure that the defendant returns to court when scheduled and ensure that the defendant avoids any additional criminal charges pending trial. Although the lack of bed space has not yet affected these goals, there is a concern that pretrial defendants seeking assistance with problems such as mental health, drug addiction or homelessness will not be served due to resource constraints.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

10. P.L.2017, c.15 provides that homeowners affected by Superstorm Sandy could apply for mortgage forbearance and, if their property is in foreclosure, a stay of foreclosure proceedings. According to the Senate Budget and Appropriations Committee statement to the underlying bill (Assembly Bill Number 333 of 2016) approximately 70,000 households would be eligible to apply for mortgage forbearance and a stay of foreclosure proceedings. However, no information is available concerning the number of Sandy-impacted homeowners who would apply for mortgage forbearance.

- **Question:** Does the Judiciary anticipate that this enactment would have a significant effect on the number of foreclosures?

On March 30, 2017, the Judiciary received a file from the Department of Consumer Affairs identifying 30,618 properties potentially subject to this new law. As of April 11, 2017, the Judiciary has received a total of five requests to stay pending foreclosure cases. Based on the empirical data to date, the Judiciary does not believe this new law will have a significant effect on the number of foreclosure cases.

- **Question:** What is the current status of the Judiciary's total foreclosure caseload? What is the average time required for a foreclosure case to reach resolution? What is the average length of time required for a Sheriff's foreclosure sale?

The Judiciary's residential foreclosure process has been routinely criticized in the press, with articles indicating that the average length of time to complete a foreclosure process is greater than 1000 days. New Jersey's judicial process in foreclosure is often cited as being the primary cause of delay in moving foreclosure properties to sale. However, there is little emphasis placed on the decreasing inventory pending before the courts and the considerable delay caused by lenders, servicers and their counsel in complying with federal and state requirements.

In October 2012, active foreclosure filings reached a record high with more than 138,000 matters pending in the Superior Court. The administrative functions of the Office of Foreclosure and surge of new complaints filed between 2008 and 2010 attributed to a growing backlog. Since that time, remedial measures implemented by the Office of the Superior Court Clerk have significantly reduced the number of active matters pending with the court and the time to disposition. As of April 1, 2017, there are 47,748 active foreclosure matters pending with the court. This reflects a 64% decrease of active matters in less than five years.

For the past two years, the Judiciary has taken extraordinary measures to reduce the number of active pending foreclosure matters. The Judiciary centralized foreclosure operations under the Office of the Superior Court Clerk to allow for consistency and efficiency. Stringent standards were implemented related to the recommendation of judgments and motions to ensure quality assurance and timely processing. The Clerk of the Superior Court also engaged in outreach efforts with the lenders, services and attorneys to address concerns related to foreclosure with an objective to prioritize and expedite matters pending greater than 18 months with the Judiciary.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

New foreclosure filings reached their high water mark to date in 2009-10, with more than 60,000 new actions filed. Then, as the lender-servicers worked to conform their practices to reflect the new safeguards used to ensure the integrity of the foreclosure process, the number of new foreclosure actions dramatically decreased in 2011 and 2012. The number of new filings in 2013 marked a dramatic increase of more than 100% from the year prior. In 2014, there was a 29% increase in new foreclosure filings. 2015 marked a second consecutive year of more than 50,000 new filings. 2016 demonstrated a decline in the number of new complaints filed, with a decrease of 36% over the prior year. It is anticipated that 2017 will reflect a similar filing trend as 2016.

Court Year	Filings
2010	63,993
2011	33,873
2012	19,267
2013	42,035
2014	54,322
2015	54,518
2016	34,668
2017 (anticipated)	34,000

It should be noted that many sources cited by the press calculate the timeline for foreclosure from the initial date of the first missed mortgage payment – an event over which the court has no influence – through the actual disposal of the real estate asset by the bank, another event well outside the control of the court. The judicial time frame for a foreclosure matter – that is, from the filing of the complaint through the entry of judgment – is but a fraction of the overall time for cases filed after the lender-servicers conformed their practices in 2012. On average, for matters ripe for judgment, the average time to disposition is between 5 and 7 months, that is, between 150 and 210 days.

With regard to Sheriff's sales, N.J.S.A. 2A:50-64(a)(3), requires the sheriff to “schedule a sale date within 120 days of the sheriff's receipt of any writ of execution issued by the court in any foreclosure proceeding.” The Office of the Superior Court Clerk contacts each county Sheriff's Office weekly. While some counties report scheduling the date for sale within 120 days after receipt of the writ, most do not. No counties conduct the actual sale within the 120 days. Most counties schedule and conduct the actual sale date 6 months or more from date of receipt of the writ.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

11. P.L.2017, c.2, the “New Jersey Open Data Initiative” requires that certain information generated by State departments and agencies be provided on the Internet to the public without cost and to other State departments and agencies. Several State departments, including the Judiciary currently operate websites accessible to the general public.

- ***Question:*** **Has the enactment of this statute prompted the Judiciary to review and update its website to facilitate ease of navigation and search? What changes, if any, are necessary to comply with the statute?**

N.J.S.A. 52:18A-234.1, et. seq. (the “New Jersey Open Data Initiative”) applies to “the Executive Branch, including the Department of the Treasury, and any division, office, board, bureau, commission, authority or entity therein.” N.J.S.A. 52:18A-234.3. It does not apply to the Judiciary.

The Judiciary website at njcourts.gov has, however, recently has undergone a makeover. The redesign of this critical communications tool is the result of a survey administered by the Supreme Court Committee on Access and Fairness to gather feedback from court users on their overall court experience. A working group formed by Judge Grant, Administrative Director of the Courts, was charged with identifying ways to improve the website.

The new website has improved usability with a much cleaner, more modern layout. The responsive pages are accessible on all devices, including desktops, laptops, tablets and smart phones. This is especially important as more people, use only tablets or smart phones to access the Internet. The site also complies with industry guidelines for web-reading devices used by those who are blind or have limited vision.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

12. In response to a FY 2017 OLS discussion point, the Judiciary stated that the five-year phase-in of the mandatory drug court would be completed in July, 2017, with the addition of the Camden, Union, and Morris/Sussex vicinages.

- **Question:** Please provide the committee with an update on the phase-in. Does the Judiciary have enough operating data with which to determine the impact on the program's retention and completion rates, and number of participants who become re-offenders? If so, please provide a comparison of the number, retention and completion rates of mandatory participants involved with the program versus those who voluntarily request to participate in the program and are accepted.

The statewide implementation of mandatory drug court will be complete July 2017. We do not have data on the impact of mandatory drug court on recidivism because the mandatory program implementation began five years ago and the drug court program takes five years to complete. We do, however, have data on the retention of defendants who are sentenced into mandatory drug court program compared with voluntary admissions. For the past 12 months, retention for mandatory drug court program defendants is 85.6%, while retention for voluntary drug court program defendants is 80.7%. For the past 24 months, retention for mandatory drug court program defendants is 82.4%, while retention for voluntary drug court program defendants is 73%. For the past 36 months, retention for mandatory drug court program defendants is 81.7%, while retention for voluntary drug court program defendants is 67.3%.

- **Question:** Are there sufficient treatment services available for the expanded number of drug court participants? Has funding been sufficient for the effective operation of the program?

There are sufficient treatment programs for drug court participants. With regard to funding, over this past year we transitioned to billing Medicaid for out-patient services after the Division of Mental Health Services increased rates to treatment providers. Currently, funding for this program is sufficient.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

13. According to the AOC, there are currently 17 Superior Court vacancies scattered among 11 counties with another 10 in seven counties anticipated by the end of 2017. This number is greatly reduced from the 42 vacancies existing last year at this time. P.L.2016, c.103 creates 20 new judgeships for the Superior Court, effective July 1, 2017 to assist the courts with Criminal Justice Reform.

- **Question: How has the reduction in Superior Court judicial vacancies affected court operations and case backlogs?**

Most of the reduction in vacancies and the increase in the number of Superior Court Trial Judges was very recent. Between March 1, 2016 and October 1, 2016 the number of judges assigned only increased by 2 judges. In the next five months, the number of judges increased by 27 - from 371 judges on October 1, 2016 to 398 judges on March 1, 2017. Even though the influx of new judges was largely in October through January, the Judiciary reduced non-multicounty litigation backlog by 3% from 28,972 cases in February 2016 to 28,153 cases in February 2017.

- **How will the Judiciary meet the logistical and training demands caused by the increase in judges?**

The recent increased influx of new judges and the 20 new judge seats that will be filled are accommodated within the current judge training scheme. The current training regime for new judges has evolved to reflect the necessary flexibility associated with the appointments process. Lawyers transitioning to the bench receive training and are provided with resources. Once confirmed by the Senate, the Judicial Education and Performance Unit within the Office of Professional and Governmental Services at the AOC, sends to each new judge information regarding training, the judge mentor program, and recordings and materials from recent trainings.

The Judicial Education and Performance Unit organizes sessions of the Comprehensive Judicial Orientation Program (“CJOP”). The CJOP program is intensive training in each of the trial divisions. Over the course of 2 to 4 days, fellow judges train new judges in accordance with established training protocols. These intensive subject matter specific training sessions serve as a portion of the two – three week orientation protocol, which also includes training with local judges in their vicinage, for these judges. CJOP sessions are scheduled as needed and occur on a rolling basis. Every single new judge appointed is scheduled for this training and the system is flexible to accommodate both timing and number of new judges. For example, family judges in particular, given the variety of case types they encounter and the sensitivity of the docket type, receive 4 days of intensive small group in person training. This training includes topics associated with demeanor, child support guidelines and enforcement, domestic violence, custody, parenting time, dissolution, and juvenile.

In addition to ongoing mentoring and the CJOP program, new judges attend the New Judge Orientation Program. This program includes general topics as well as trial division specific areas. A myriad of topics from ethics to domestic violence to evidence are covered. For family judges, this training consists of 6 full days of intensive in person small group training. Note that the New Judge Orientation program applies to experienced judges who are assigned to a new trial division as well as newly appointed judges.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

As training relates to new judges, during the course of their first year on the bench, a judge spends a minimum of 83 CLE credit hours training. Stated differently, the typical new judge spends a minimum of 16 working days in classroom-based training. This is in addition to the hours spent observing other judges in the vicinage, attending CLE programs given by the bar associations, attending other education events and logging into Judiciary sponsored web-based training.

As training relates to all judges, judges are required to attend the annual Judicial College. This intensive training event has grown over the years to include many course offerings specific to particular docket types over the course of 2 and a half days. Attention is paid to ensuring there are learning opportunities for every judge in attendance – spanning years of experience on the bench and addressing each trial division.

In addition to the Judicial College, CJOP, and New Judge Orientation each trial division also has mandatory training sessions each Spring. For example, the Family judges have a two-day event during which the first day is comprised of case type specific courses. The second day is comprised entirely of domestic violence courses. These courses are aimed at addressing the cycle of domestic violence, the latest in domestic violence theory, and the domestic violence law. Criminal and Civil judges likewise have two day spring conferences addressing the education needs particular to those divisions as well.

The judiciary also hosts cross discipline training for Children in Court judges and stakeholders as well as training for Drug Court judges and stakeholders.

In addition to the in person mandatory Judicial College, the two day division trainings, CJOP, and New Judge Orientation, the Judiciary provides substantive training using various technological means. Namely, the judiciary hosts a number of web based training sessions for judges on a variety of important topics.

The Judiciary maintains a vast audio, video, and document library of all previously held live trainings. This library is available to judges on demand. This provides judges with many opportunities to review and refresh themselves on any number of topics taught at any past live training session. In addition to these audio recordings, the Judicial Education and Performance Unit maintains video footage of actual court proceedings for judges to view on demand. This provides judges with examples of how various matters should be handled.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

14. The “Sexual Assault Survivor Protection Act of 2015” (P.L.2015, c.147) authorizes persons alleging that they are victims of certain sexual offenses to seek protective orders against the accused. (Criminal charges need not be filed against the accused and there is no requirement for the alleged victim to report the incident to law enforcement.) If an alleged victim is a minor, a parent or guardian can file an application for a protective order on the minor’s behalf. The court may issue a temporary protective order on an emergency basis, without the accused’s presence. If the accused is not present, law enforcement serves the order on the accused. Within 10 days of the issuance of the temporary order, a hearing is held in Superior Court to determine whether a final order should be issued. A final order remains in effect until a further order of a Superior Court judge. A person who violates a protective order is guilty of a criminal offense. The enactment took effect May 7, 2016.

- ***Question:* How many applications for temporary and final protective orders have been received since that date? How many temporary and final orders have been issued? What costs have been incurred by the Judiciary in processing these cases? Has additional staff been hired? Have judges been diverted from other cases to handle the issuance of protective orders?**

Since “Sexual Assault Survivor Protection Act of 2015” (P.L. 2015, c. 147) took effect on May 7, 2016, 112 applications for temporary orders have been made. Of those 112 applications, 94 temporary protective orders have been issued and 30 final protective orders issued. Resources were expended to update the case management system and develop forms to process these matters. The sexual assault cases are handled in the same manner as the domestic violence cases and have been integrated into the domestic violence case scheduling. No additional staffing has been needed and judges have not been diverted from other cases to hear these applications.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

15. Under the “Prevention of Domestic Violence Act of 1991,” P.L.1991, c.261 (C.2C:25-17 et seq.) domestic violence cases involving restraining orders are handled in Family Court.

- ***Question:*** Are sexual assault protective orders handled in Family Court as are domestic violence cases involving restraining orders? Have the judges that handle these cases received specific training? What is the intake process for victims seeking sexual assault protective orders?

Sexual assault protective order matters are handled in the Family Division the same way as the domestic violence cases, and have been integrated into the domestic violence case scheduling. At the 2016 Family Division Education Conference judges and staff received specific training on the law and procedure.

The intake process for sexual assault protective orders is similar to domestic violence, with the exception that the police do not take complaints. Sexual assault protective order applications are taken during court hours at the local Superior Court Family Division. As in domestic violence cases, the victim may go before a judge or a hearing officer. If the hearing officer denies the victim relief, they may have a hearing de novo before the judge. If a temporary protective order is entered, it is sent to the local police for service on the defendant and a final hearing is scheduled within 10 days.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

16. Pursuant to P.L.2015, c.261, new expungement reforms took effect April 18, 2016, which permit a person to file a single court application to expunge multiple convictions, provide for a shorter, three-year waiting period for expunging disorderly and petty disorderly persons offenses if “in the public interest” (instead of a five-year waiting period), and expedite the process for expunging records for an arrest or charge that did not result in a conviction or finding of guilt. The reforms also permit successful graduates of the drug court program to have all records of prior arrests, detentions, convictions, and proceedings for most offenses enumerated in the Criminal Code expunged.

- ***Question:*** Since the reforms took effect, has there been a noticeable increase in applicants seeking expungements? Has the ability to file one application to expunge multiple convictions resulted in efficiencies for courts? Has the Judiciary undertaken any efforts to inform the public generally, and specifically past drug court graduates, about the expungement reforms, which could be beneficial to persons currently being denied educational or employment opportunities due to their criminal records? What costs, if any, have the Judiciary incurred as a result of this enactment.

A letter was sent to all prior Drug Court Program graduates informing them of the change to the expungement law and how it may affect them. Current Drug Court Program participants have also been informed about the new law and the requirements associated with it. As of April 14, 2017, 107 Drug Court Program expungements have been ordered.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

17. The Judiciary has recently implemented certain technology-based services to assist jurors and attorneys.

- **Question:** Please provide a summary of these initiatives. Is the Judiciary planning any other initiatives to assist those interacting with the courts?

The Judiciary continues to invest in our technology infrastructure to assist the public in their interaction with our court system. Jurors can interact with the courts electronically when summoned for jury duty through an online questionnaire. During that process jurors can opt to receive a text message reminder for their jury service. In 2016, 1.5 million text reminders were sent. Jurors can also download a mobile app to receive directions on parking, restaurants or contact information needed for their jury service.

The Supreme Court mandated that our State's 80,000 attorneys use the online license registration process. This system streamlines a paper driven process and offers multiple payment mechanisms. Attorneys can also download a mobile app to receive courthouse information, search for approved CLE classes, view the attorney index page and even watch webcasts on Supreme Court hearings.

Some other technology initiatives implemented by the Judiciary in 2016 include: upgrades to over 500 access points expanding the coverage for public wireless internet in courthouses and jury rooms throughout the state; increased public access internet bandwidth by 400%; and development of virtual courtrooms for Criminal Justice Reform.

As we continue to invest in our infrastructure, the Judiciary plans to complete projects in a variety of areas in 2017. For example, the Judiciary will explore remote testimony via video; use of American Sign Language interpreters via video conference; rewriting the attorney management system to further streamline the registration process; and on-line disposition of minor criminal matters through a virtual municipal court.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

18. In response to prison overcrowding in the early 1980s, the Legislature authorized and funded the New Jersey Intensive Supervision Program (ISP), an intermediate form of punishment administered by the Judiciary that allows certain offenders sentenced to State correctional facilities an opportunity to work their way back into the community under intensive supervision.

- **Question:** What metrics has the Judiciary adopted to measure the success of ISP, and what degree of success does the data indicate? How are program participants selected? What are the average recidivism rates for those who have successfully completed the program? Does the ISP program have the necessary funding and resources to fully achieve its goals?

The Judiciary uses several metrics to evaluate the success of ISP. In FY 2016 the cost of ISP was approximately \$15,168 per participant; compared to \$45,454 for incarceration. That is a savings of \$30,286 per participant. Multiplied by 1,148 participants, this equals a savings of \$34,768,328 per year for taxpayers. With a 94.6% employment rate, ISP was able to collect over \$2.3 million dollars in fines, penalties and restitution. The program has disbursed over \$1.1 million dollars in restitution to victims. In FY 2016, ISP participants paid \$191,000 in child support and performed 166,900 hours of community service. In addition, in FY 2016, ISP performed 30,805 drug screens with a rate of 94% negative. This, in spite of the fact that 81% of ISP participants report drug use in their pre-sentence report. Historically, the ISP graduation rate is 48%.

ISP participants are required to apply for the program. Some applicants apply at sentencing. ISP has an officer performing outreach at the Department of Corrections (“DOC”) intake area, and providing information and applications there. Applications are also available at all prison locations throughout the State. Once an application is received, it is screened for eligibility based on the instant offense. For example, applicants convicted of any first degree offense are not eligible. After it is determined that the applicant is eligible, a probation officer will run a criminal history, interview the applicant as well as the proposed network sponsor and team, conduct a home inspection of the proposed residence upon re-entry and prepare a report. If approved, the applicant may be evaluated by the ISP screening board, which consists of an ISP staff member, a DOC representative and a citizen volunteer. If approved by the screening board, the applicant will then be scheduled for an ISP court date where a panel of judges must unanimously agree to admit the applicant into the program. Historically, about 30% of the applicants are admitted into the program.

The recidivism rate for those who successfully complete the program is 18.1%.

The ISP program does not have the necessary funding and resources to continue to fully achieve its goals. The existing treatment budget of approximately \$ 1.5 million dollars has not been increased in eight fiscal years. The biggest fiscal challenge facing ISP occurred in January 2017. For approximately five years, ISP has been able to utilize State Parole Board treatment beds at no cost to ISP. This January, however, the Judiciary was notified that ISP and Drug Court would not be able to utilize the beds due to fiscal restraints. The value of these beds for ISP is estimated at \$1.2 million dollars per year. The Judiciary does not have the resources to absorb this loss with our current treatment budget. This will negatively impact both new applicants for ISP that need temporary placement, as well as existing clients who require a sanction short of returning to State prison.

FY 2016 Court Filings

All State Courts

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Affixing Court Seal	11,638
Exemplification	670
Certified copy of any document	6,922
Non-Party Notice ("Appearance")	8,948
Substitution of Attorney	33,515

Supreme Court*

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Notice of Appeal or Cross Appeal; Petition and Cross Petition for Cert or Review	1,257
First paper filed if not in a pending case or if made after judgment entered	1,589

Superior Court, Appellate Division*

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Notice of Appeal or Cross Appeal	3,014
First paper filed if not in a pending case or if made after judgment entered	1,221

Superior Court, Law Division, Civil Part

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Complaint	85,177
Filing of First Paper by Anyone Other Than Plaintiff	40,855
Motion/Order to Show Cause	153,650
Civil Law Writs	6,526
Assignment of Judgment	46
Warrant to Satisfy Judgment	1761
Warrant for Arrest	506

*The Supreme Court, Appellate Division and Tax Court filing numbers do not include unpaid filings. The Superior Court filing numbers reflect both paid and unpaid filings.

Superior Court, Law Division, Special Civil Part

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Motion Fee	71,646
Filing Small Claim	32,202
Filing Tenancy Complaint	160,715
Writ of execution or replevin	11,266
Wage Garnishment	53,310
Warrant for Arrest	1,153
Answer w/ crossclaim, counterclaim, 3rd party claim	306
Small Claims Counterclaim	595
Assignment of Judgment	249
Warrant to Satisfy with DJ	6,220
Warrant to Satisfy without DJ	26,714
Small Claims Warrant to Satisfy	473
Small Claims Wage Garnishment	1,224

Superior Court, Law Division, Chancery Part General Equity

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Filing Complaint	2,825
Filing Answer	2,111
Filing Motion	4,939
Foreclosure Complaint	45,806
Foreclosure Answer	8,688
Foreclosure Motion	61,224
Foreclosure Writs	41,985
Foreclosure Assignments	897

Superior Court, Law Division, Chancery Part Family

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Filing Divorce Complaint	31,002
Filing First Responsive Pleading in Dissolution	8,698
Motions in Dissolution Matters	115,030

Superior Court Clerk's Office

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Docketing or recording judgment in the judgment and order docket	25,193
Recording assignment, subordination, cancellation, postponement, or release of judgment	22,595
Issuing or recording executions	17,249
Issuing or recording any other documents	23,663

Tax Court

<u>Document</u>	<u>Total Number of Filings: Fiscal Year 2016</u>
Filing motion in non-small claim, local, or state	2,424
Filing fee for non-small claims cases	8,863
Counterclaim for one parcel for non-small claims (non-taxing district)	189
Additional contiguous parcel/condo in common ownership for Counterclaim by a non-taxing district in non-small claims	29
Filing fee for state and local property small claims cases	5,791
Counterclaim for one parcel for small claims (non-taxing district)	11

21st Century Revenue Collections

	<u>FY15¹</u>	<u>FY16²</u>	<u>Total</u>
Civil	\$ 10,985,045	\$ 18,808,460	\$ 29,793,505
Special Civil	\$ 10,622,688	\$ 17,971,359	\$ 28,594,047
Family	\$ 2,056,935	\$ 3,463,765	\$ 5,520,700
Appellate	\$ 110,380	\$ 180,030	\$ 290,410
Supreme Court	\$ 11,520	\$ 25,820	\$ 37,340
Tax Court	\$ 669,035	\$ 871,955	\$ 1,540,990
Probation	\$ 8,331	\$ 89,779	\$ 98,110
Other Court Fees	\$ 1,539,794	\$ 2,655,310	\$ 4,195,104
	<u>\$ 26,003,728</u>	<u>\$ 44,066,478</u>	<u>\$ 70,070,206</u>

1) FY15 collections from 11/17/14 - 6/30/15

2) FY16 collections from 7/1/15 - 6/30/16